



NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guideline[®])

Prostate Cancer

Version 2.2014

NCCN.org

NCCN Guidelines for Patients[®] available at www.nccn.org/patients

Continue



***James L. Mohler, MD/Chair** ^ω
Roswell Park Cancer Institute

Philip W. Kantoff, MD/Vice Chair †
Dana-Farber/Brigham and Women's
Cancer Center | Massachusetts General
Hospital Cancer Center

Andrew J. Armstrong, MD, ScM †
Duke Cancer Institute

Robert R. Bahnson, MD ^ω
The Ohio State University Comprehensive Cancer
Center - James Cancer Hospital
and Solove Research Institute

Michael Cohen, MD
Huntsman Cancer Institute
at the University of Utah

Anthony Victor D'Amico, MD, PhD §
Dana-Farber/Brigham and Women's
Cancer Center | Massachusetts General
Hospital Cancer Center

James A. Eastham, MD ^ω
Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center

Charles A. Enke, MD §
Fred & Pamela Buffett Cancer Center at
The Nebraska Medical Center

Thomas A. Farrington
Prostate Health Education Network (PHEN)

Celestia S. Higano, MD ^ω †
University of Washington/
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center/ Seattle
Cancer Care Alliance

Eric Mark Horwitz, MD §
Fox Chase Cancer Center

Christopher J. Kane, MD ^ω
UC San Diego Moores Cancer Center

Mark H. Kawachi, MD ^ω
City of Hope Comprehensive
Cancer Center

Michael Kuettel, MD, MBA, PhD §
Roswell Park Cancer Institute

Timothy M. Kuzel, MD †
Robert H. Laurie Comprehensive Cancer Center
of Northwestern University

Richard J. Lee, MD, PhD †
Dana-Farber/Brigham and Women's
Cancer Center | Massachusetts General Hospital
Cancer Center

Arnold W. Malcolm, MD §
Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center

David Miller, MD, MPH ^ω
University of Michigan
Comprehensive Cancer Center

Elizabeth R. Plimack, MD, MS †
Fox Chase Cancer Center

Julio M. Pow-Sang, MD ^ω
Moffitt Cancer Center

David Raben, MD
University of Colorado Cancer Center

Sylvia Richey, MD †
St. Jude Children's Research Hospital/
University of Tennessee Health Science Center

Mack Roach, III, MD §
UCSF Helen Diller Family
Comprehensive Cancer Center

Eric Rohren, MD, PhD ¥
The University of Texas
MD Anderson Cancer Center

Stan Rosenfeld
University of California San Francisco
Patient Services Committee Chair

Edward Schaeffer, MD, PhD ^ω
The Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center
at Johns Hopkins

Eric J. Small, MD †
UCSF Helen Diller Family
Comprehensive Cancer Center

Guru Sonpavde, MD †
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Comprehensive Cancer Center

Sandy Srinivas, MD †
Stanford Cancer Institute

Cy Stein, MD, PhD †
City of Hope Comprehensive Cancer Center

Seth A. Strope, MD, MPH
Siteman Cancer Center at Barnes-
Jewish Hospital and Washington
University School of Medicine

Jonathan Tward, MD, PhD §
Huntsman Cancer Institute
at the University of Utah

¥Diagnostic interventional radiology
§ Radiotherapy/Radiation oncology
^ω Urology
† Medical oncology
£ Supportive care, including palliative, pain management,
pastoral care, and oncology social work
¤ Pathology
*Writing committee member

NCCN
Maria Ho, PhD
Dorothy A. Shead, MS

Continue

[NCCN Guidelines Panel Disclosure](#)

[NCCN Prostate Cancer Panel Members](#)[Summary of Guidelines Updates](#)[Initial Prostate Cancer Diagnosis, Staging Workup, Risk Group \(PROS-1\)](#)[Very Low-Risk: Initial Therapy, Adjuvant Therapy \(PROS-2\)](#)[Low-Risk: Initial Therapy, Adjuvant Therapy \(PROS-3\)](#)[Intermediate-Risk: Initial Therapy, Adjuvant Therapy \(PROS-4\)](#)[High-Risk, Very High-Risk, and Metastatic Disease:](#)[Initial Therapy, Adjuvant Therapy \(PROS-5\)](#)[Monitoring, Recurrence \(PROS-6\)](#)[Radical Prostatectomy Biochemical Failure \(PROS-7\)](#)[Radiation Therapy Recurrence \(PROS-8\)](#)[Advanced Disease: Systemic Therapy \(PROS-9\)](#)[Advanced Disease: Additional Systemic Therapy for Castration-Recurrent Prostate Cancer \(PROS-10\)](#)[Principles of Life Expectancy Estimation \(PROS-A\)](#)[Principles of Imaging \(PROS-B\)](#)[Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation \(PROS-C\)](#)[Principles of Radiation Therapy \(PROS-D\)](#)[Principles of Surgery \(PROS-E\)](#)[Principles of Androgen Deprivation Therapy \(PROS-F\)](#)[Principles of Immunotherapy and Chemotherapy \(PROS-G\)](#)[Staging \(ST-1\)](#)

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management for any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

To find clinical trials online at NCCN Member Institutions, [click here: nccn.org/clinical_trials/physician.html](#).

NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise specified.

See [NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus](#)

These guidelines are a statement of evidence and consensus of the authors regarding their views of currently accepted approaches to treatment. Any clinician seeking to apply or consult these guidelines is expected to use independent medical judgment in the context of individual clinical circumstances to determine any patient's care or treatment. The National Comprehensive Cancer Network makes no representations or warranties of any kind, regarding their content use or application and disclaims any responsibility for their application or use in any way. These guidelines are copyrighted by National Comprehensive Cancer Network. All rights reserved. These guidelines and the illustrations herein may not be reproduced in any form without the express written permission of NCCN. ©2014.

Summary of changes in the 2.2014 version of the NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer from the 1.2014 version include:

DISCUSSION

- The discussion section was updated to reflect the changes in the algorithm.

Summary of changes in the 1.2014 version of the NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer from the 4.2013 version include:

PROS-1

- Life expectancy ≤ 5 y and asymptomatic, no further workup or treatment until symptomatic, except for high-risk patients, changed high-risk patients to *high- or very-high-risk groups*.
- Changed the header from Recurrence Risk to *Risk Group*.
- Low-risk group, changed Gleason score from 2-6 to ≤ 6 .
- Added footnote b: [See Principles of Imaging \(PROS-B\)](#).

PROS-2

- Initial therapy, Active surveillance:
 - ▶ Changed PSA at least as often as every 6 mo to *PSA no more often than every 6 mo unless clinically indicated*.
 - ▶ Changed DRE at least as often as every 12 mo to *DRE no more often than every 12 mo unless clinically indicated*.
 - ▶ Changed Repeat prostate biopsy as often as every 12 mo to *Repeat prostate biopsy no more often than every 12 mo unless clinically indicated*.
 - ▶ Modified footnote f: “Active surveillance involves actively monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to intervene with potentially curative therapy if the cancer progresses.”
- Expected patient survival, changed ≥ 10 y to 10-20 y.
- Expected patient survival ≥ 20 y, initial therapy RT: removed (Daily IGRT with IMRT/3D-CRT).
- Adjuvant therapy, lymph node metastasis: changed the order of options to ADT (category 1) \pm RT (category 2B) or Observation.
- Footnote j is new: Observation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or a change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent.

PROS-4

- Expected patient survival < 10 y:
 - ▶ Replaced Active surveillance with *Observation*.
 - ▶ Added footnote j to Observation
 - ▶ Initial therapy, RT: removed (Daily IGRT with IMRT/3D-CRT) \pm short-term neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjuvant ADT (4-6 mo).
- Expected patient survival ≥ 10 y:
 - ▶ Initial therapy, RT: removed (Daily IGRT with IMRT/3D-CRT) \pm short-term neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjuvant ADT (4-6 mo).
 - ▶ Adjuvant therapy, lymph node metastasis: changed the order of options to ADT (category 1) \pm RT (category 2B) or Observation (category 2B).
 - ▶ Undetectable PSA, added *or nadir*.
 - ▶ Changed Detectable PSA to *PSA failure*.
 - ▶ Changed Post-radical prostatectomy recurrence to *Radical Prostatectomy Biochemical Failure*.
 - ▶ Changed Post-radiation therapy recurrence to *Radiation therapy recurrence*.

PROS-5

- Initial therapy, RT: removed “(Daily IGRT with IMRT/3D-CRT) + long-term neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjuvant.”
- High-risk group, Initial therapy: RP + PLND removed (*select patients with no fixation*).
- Added footnote j to Observation.
- Changed Post-radical prostatectomy recurrence to *Radical Prostatectomy Biochemical Failure*.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

[Continued on next page](#)

UPDATES

PROS-6

- Initial management or pathology, N1 or M1, monitoring; removed (including DRE).
- Post-RP recurrence, failure of PSA to fall to undetectable levels; added (*PSA persistence*).
- Post-RP recurrence, undetectable PSA after RP with a subsequent detectable PSA that increases on 2 or more determinations; added (*PSA recurrence*).
- Changed Post-radical prostatectomy recurrence to *Radical Prostatectomy Biochemical Failure*.

PROS-7

- Changed Post-radical prostatectomy recurrence to *Radical Prostatectomy Biochemical Failure*.
- Failure of PSA to fall to undetectable levels; added (PSA persistence).
- Undetectable PSA after RP with a subsequent detectable PSA that increases on 2 or more determinations; added (*PSA recurrence*).
- Changed the order of the tests.
- Added ± *C-11 choline PET*.
- Following ± bone scan added (*methylene diphosphonate [MDP] or sodium fluoride [NaF]*).
- Added footnote j to Observation.

PROS-8

- Changed Post-radiation therapy recurrence to *Radiation Therapy Recurrence*.
- Changed the order of the tests.
- Changed prostate biopsy to *TRUS biopsy*.
- Changed endorectal MRI to *prostate MRI*.
- Added ± *C-11 choline PET*.
- Added *Observation*.
- Added footnote j to Observation.

PROS-9

- Added *Observation*.
- Added footnote j to Observation.
- Added footnote b, [See Principles of Imaging \(PROS-B\)](#).

PROS-10

- Studies negative for *distant* metastases
- Observation *especially if PSADT ≥10 mo*
- Secondary hormone therapy, added *especially if PSADT <10 mo*.
- Changed steroids to *corticosteroids*.
- Replaced footnote: “Frequency of imaging should be based on individual risk, age, PSADT, Gleason score, and overall health” with “[See Principles of Imaging \(PROS-B\)](#).”

PROS-11

- Studies positive for *distant* metastases
- Added *Best supportive care* as an option for symptomatic CRPC.

PROS-B

- This is a new page, Principles of Imaging.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

[Continued on next page](#)

UPDATES

PROS-C 1 of 2

- Added the following bullet: *The 2014 NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer distinguishes between active surveillance and observation. Both involve at least every 6 mo monitoring but active surveillance may involve surveillance prostate biopsies. Evidence of progression will prompt conversion to potentially curative treatment in active surveillance patients, whereas monitoring continues until symptoms develop or are imminent (ie, PSA >100 ng/mL) in observation patients, who will then begin palliative ADT.*
- Modified the third bullet: *Active surveillance is preferred for men with very low-risk prostate cancer and life expectancy ≤20 y. Observation is preferred for men with low-risk prostate cancer with life expectancy <10 y. [See Risk Group Criteria \(PROS-2\)](#).*
- Added the following bullet: *Observation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or change in exam or PSA levels that suggest symptoms are imminent.*
- Modified the sixth bullet for consistency:
 - ▶ Changed PSA at least as often as every 6 mo to *PSA no more often than every 6 mo unless clinically indicated.*
 - ▶ Changed DRE at least as often as every 12 mo to *“DRE no more often than every 12 mo unless clinically indicated.”*
- Removed: *Needle biopsy may be performed within 18 mo if initial prostate biopsy ≥10 cores and as often as every 12 mo.*
- Modified the statement: *Repeat prostate biopsies are not indicated when life expectancy is <10 y or appropriate when men are on observation.*

PROS-C 2 of 2

- Added: *Advantages of observation:*
 - ▶ *Avoidance of possible side effects of unnecessary definitive therapy and early initiation and/or continuous ADT.*
- Added: *Disadvantages of observation:*
 - ▶ *Risk of urinary retention or pathologic fracture without prior symptoms or concerning PSA level.*

PROS-D 1 of 2

- Primary External Beam Radiation Therapy (EBRT):
 - ▶ Added the following bullet: *Moderately hypofractionated image-guided IMRT regimens (2.4 to 4 Gy per fraction over 4 to 6 weeks) have been tested in randomized trials reporting similar efficacy and toxicity to conventionally fractionated IMRT. They can be considered as an alternative to conventionally fractionated regimens when clinically indicated.*
 - ▶ Added the following bullet: *Extremely hypofractionated image-guided IMRT/SBRT regimens (6.5 Gy per fraction or greater) are an emerging treatment modality with single institutional and pooled reports of similar efficacy and toxicity to conventionally fractionated regimens. They can be considered as a cautious alternative to conventionally fractionated regimens at clinics with appropriate technology, physics, and clinical expertise.”*
 - ▶ *Removed: “Treatment results appear better when disease burden is lower. Radiation should be administered before PSA exceeds 0.5 ng/mL.*
- Primary/Salvage Brachytherapy
 - ▶ First bullet: changed 4-6 mo ADT to 2-3 y neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjunct ADT.
 - ▶ Modified bullet: *Patients with a very large prostate or very small prostate, symptoms of bladder outlet obstruction (high IPSS), or a previous transurethral resection of the prostate are more difficult to implant and may suffer increased risk of side effects. Neoadjuvant ADT may be used to shrink the prostate to an acceptable size; however, increased toxicity would be expected from the ADT and prostate size may not decline.*
 - ▶ Modified bullet: *High-dose rate (HDR) brachytherapy can be used alone or in combination with EBRT (40-50 Gy) instead of LDR. Commonly used boost regimens include 9.5 to 11.5 Gy x 2 fractions, 5.5 to 7.5 Gy x 3 fractions, and 4.0 to 6.0 Gy x 4 fractions. A commonly used regimen for HDR treatment alone include 13.5 Gy x 2 fractions.*

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

[Continued on next page](#)

UPDATES

PROS-D 2 of 2

- **Post-Prostatectomy Radiation Therapy**
 - ▶ Indications for adjuvant RT include pT3 disease, positive margin(s), Gleason score 8-10, or seminal vesicle involvement. Adjuvant RT is usually given within 1 year after RP and once any operative side effects have improved/stabilized. *Added Patients with positive surgical margins and PSADT >9 mo may benefit the most.*
 - ▶ The recommended prescribed doses for adjuvant/salvage post-prostatectomy RT are 64 - 68 *changed to 70 Gy in standard fractionation.*
 - ▶ The defined target volumes include the prostate bed. *Added: The pelvic lymph nodes may be irradiated, but pelvic radiation is not necessary.*

PROS-F

- **Split Timing of ADT for Advanced Disease to 2 new sections: ADT for Biochemical Failure and ADT for Metastatic Disease.**
- **ADT for Biochemical Failure:**
 - ▶ Added a new bullet: *Some patients are candidates for salvage a radiation after failed operation or RP or cryosurgery after failed radiation. Men with prolonged PSA doubling times (>12 mo) and who are older are candidates for observation. Men who choose ADT should consider intermittent ADT. A phase 3 trial that compared intermittent to continuous ADT showed that intermittent ADT was not inferior to continuous ADT with respect to survival, and quality of life was better for the intermittent ADT arm. The 7% increase in prostate cancer deaths in the intermittent ADT arm was balanced by more non-prostate cancer deaths in the continuous ADT arm.*
- **ADT for Metastatic Disease:**
 - ▶ Added a new bullet: *ADT is the gold standard for men with metastatic prostate cancer.*
 - ▶ Added a new bullet: *A phase 3 trial compared continuous ADT to intermittent ADT, but the study was statistically inconclusive for non-inferiority, however, quality of life measures for erectile function and mental health were better in the intermittent ADT arm after 3 months off ADT compared to the continuous ADT arm.*
 - ▶ Added a new bullet: *Close monitoring of PSA and testosterone levels and possibly imaging is required when using intermittent ADT, especially during off-treatment periods, and patients may need to switch to continuous ADT upon signs of disease progression.*

PROS-G


- **Added the following bullets:**
 - ▶ *Systemic chemotherapy should be reserved for men with mCRPC, in particular those who are symptomatic except when studied in a clinical trial. Certain subsets of patients with mCRPC who have more anaplastic features may benefit from earlier chemotherapy, but this has not been studied adequately in prospective trials.*
 - ▶ *Every-3-week docetaxel with or without prednisone is the preferred first-line chemotherapy treatment based on phase 3 clinical trial data for men with symptomatic mCRPC. Radium 223 has been studied in symptomatic patients who are not candidates for docetaxel-based regimens and resulted in improved overall survival. Although abiraterone and enzalutamide have not been studied in this setting, both therapies were beneficial in patients with symptoms after docetaxel and are reasonable options in this setting. Mitoxantrone and prednisone may provide palliation but have not been shown to extend survival. (See PROS-F, 3 of 4).*

**INITIAL PROSTATE
CANCER DIAGNOSIS**

**INITIAL CLINICAL
ASSESSMENT**

STAGING WORKUP^b

RISK GROUP
Clinically Localized:



^aSee Principles of Life Expectancy Estimation (PROS-A).


^bSee Principles of Imaging (PROS-B).

^cIn selected patients where complications such as hydronephrosis or metastasis can be expected within 5 y, androgen deprivation therapy (ADT) or radiation therapy (RT) may be considered. High-risk factors include bulky T3-T4 disease or Gleason score 8-10.

^dPatients with multiple adverse factors may be shifted into the next highest risk group.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.



^aSee Principles of Life Expectancy Estimation (PROS-A).

^eThe Panel remains concerned about the problems of over-treatment related to the increased diagnosis of early prostate cancer from PSA testing. See [NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early Detection](#). Active surveillance is recommended for these subsets of patients.

^fActive surveillance involves actively monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to intervene with potentially curative therapy if the cancer progresses. See [Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation \(PROS-C\)](#).

^gSee [Principles of Radiation Therapy \(PROS-D\)](#).

^hSee [Principles of Surgery \(PROS-E\)](#).

ⁱAdverse laboratory/pathologic features include: positive margins, seminal vesicle invasion, extracapsular extension, or detectable PSA.


^jObservation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or a change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent. See [Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation \(PROS-C\)](#).

^kSee [Principles of Androgen Deprivation Therapy \(PROS-F\)](#).

^lCriteria for progression are not well defined and require physician judgement; however, a change in risk group strongly implies disease progression.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.



^aSee Principles of Life Expectancy Estimation (PROS-A).

^eThe Panel remains concerned about the problems of over-treatment related to the increased diagnosis of early prostate cancer from PSA testing. See [NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early Detection](#). Active surveillance is recommended for these subsets of patients.

^fActive surveillance involves actively monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to intervene with potentially curative therapy if the cancer progresses. See [Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation \(PROS-C\)](#).

^gSee [Principles of Radiation Therapy \(PROS-D\)](#).

^hSee [Principles of Surgery \(PROS-E\)](#).


ⁱAdverse laboratory/pathologic features include: positive margins, seminal vesicle invasion, extracapsular extension, or detectable PSA.

^jObservation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or a change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent. See [Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation \(PROS-C\)](#).

^kSee [Principles of Androgen Deprivation Therapy \(PROS-F\)](#).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.



^aSee [Principles of Life Expectancy Estimation \(PROS-A\)](#).

^dPatients with multiple adverse factors may be shifted into the next highest risk group.

^gSee [Principles of Radiation Therapy \(PROS-D\)](#).

^hSee [Principles of Surgery \(PROS-E\)](#).

ⁱAdverse laboratory/pathologic features include: positive margins, seminal vesicle invasion, extracapsular extension, or detectable PSA.

^jObservation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or a change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent. See [Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation \(PROS-C\)](#).


^kSee [Principles of Androgen Deprivation Therapy \(PROS-F\)](#).

^lCriteria for progression are not well defined and require physician judgement; however, a change in risk group strongly implies disease progression.

^mActive surveillance of intermediate and high-risk clinically localized cancers is not recommended in patients with a life expectancy >10 years (category 1).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.



^dPatients with multiple adverse factors may be shifted into the next highest risk group.

^gSee Principles of Radiation Therapy (PROS-D).

^hSee Principles of Surgery (PROS-E).

ⁱAdverse laboratory/pathologic features include: positive margins, seminal vesicle invasion, extracapsular extension, or detectable PSA.

^jObservation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or a change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent. See Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation (PROS-C).

^kSee Principles of Androgen Deprivation Therapy (PROS-F).

ⁿPrimary therapy with ADT should be considered only for patients who are not candidates for definitive therapy.


Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

INITIAL MANAGEMENT OR PATHOLOGY

MONITORING

RECURRENCE




^oPSA as frequently as every 3 mo may be necessary to clarify disease status, especially in high-risk men.

^PRTOG-ASTRO (Radiation Therapy Oncology Group-American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology) Phoenix Consensus-1) PSA rise by 2 ng/mL or more above the nadir PSA is the standard definition for biochemical failure after EBRT with or without HT; and 2) the date of failure is determined "at call" (not backdated). They recommended that investigators be allowed to use the ASTRO Consensus Definition after EBRT alone (with no hormonal therapy) with strict adherence to guidelines as to "adequate follow-up" to avoid the artifacts resulting from short follow-up. For example, if the median follow-up is 5 years, control rates at 3 years should be cited. Retaining a strict version of the ASTRO definition allows comparison with a large existing body of literature.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

RADICAL PROSTATECTOMY BIOCHEMICAL FAILURE



^b See Principles of Imaging (PROS-B).


^g See Principles of Radiation Therapy (PROS-D).

^j Observation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or a change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent See Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation (PROS-C).

^k See Principles of Androgen Deprivation Therapy (PROS-F).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

RADIATION THERAPY RECURRENCE



^b See Principles of Imaging (PROS-B).

^g See Principles of Radiation Therapy (PROS-D).

^h See Principles of Surgery (PROS-E).

^j Observation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or a change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent See Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation (PROS-C).


^k See Principles of Androgen Deprivation Therapy (PROS-F).

^p RTOG-ASTRO (Radiation Therapy Oncology Group - American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology) Phoenix Consensus - 1) PSA rise by 2 ng/mL or more above the nadir PSA is the standard definition for biochemical failure after EBRT with or without HT; and 2) the date of failure is determined "at call" (not backdated). They recommended that investigators be allowed to use the ASTRO Consensus Definition after EBRT alone (with no hormonal therapy) with strict adherence to guidelines as to "adequate follow-up" to avoid the artifacts resulting from short follow-up. For example, if the median follow-up is 5 years, control rates at 3 years should be cited. Retaining a strict version of the ASTRO definition allows comparison with a large existing body of literature.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

ADVANCED DISEASE: SYSTEMIC THERAPY



^b See Principles of Imaging (PROS-B).

^j Observation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or a change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent See Principles of Active Surveillance and Observation (PROS-C).

^q Assure castrate level of testosterone.


^r See Principles of Immunotherapy and Chemotherapy (PROS-G).

^s See NCCN Guidelines for Small Cell Lung Cancer.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.


ADVANCED DISEASE: ADDITIONAL SYSTEMIC THERAPY FOR CASTRATION-RECURRENT PROSTATE CANCER



^b[See Principles of Imaging \(PROS-B\)](#).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

ADVANCED DISEASE: ADDITIONAL SYSTEMIC THERAPY FOR CASTRATION-RECURRENT PROSTATE CANCER



^bSee Principles of Imaging (PROS-B).

^kSee Principles of Androgen Deprivation Therapy (PROS-F).

^rSee Principles of Immunotherapy and Chemotherapy (PROS-G).

^tRadium-223 is not approved for use in combination with docetaxel or any other chemotherapy. See Principles of Radiation Therapy (PROS-D, page 2 of 2).

^uSipuleucel-T is appropriate for asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic patients with ECOG performance status 0-1. Sipuleucel-T is not indicated in patients with hepatic metastases or life expectancy <6 months.

^vFor patients who are not candidates for docetaxel-based regimens.

^wAlthough most patients without symptoms are not treated with chemotherapy, the survival benefit reported for docetaxel applies to those with or without symptoms. Docetaxel may be considered for patients with signs of rapid progression or hepatic metastases despite lack of symptoms.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF LIFE EXPECTANCY ESTIMATION

- Life expectancy estimation is critical to informed decision-making in prostate cancer early detection and treatment.
- Estimation of life expectancy is possible for groups of men but challenging for individuals.
- Life expectancy can be estimated using the Social Security Administration tables (www.ssa.gov/OACT/STATS/table4c6.html).
- Life expectancy can then be adjusted using the clinician's assessment of overall health as follows:
 - Best quartile of health - add 50%
 - Worst quartile of health - subtract 50%
 - Middle two quartiles of health - no adjustment
- Example of 5-year increments of age are reproduced from the [NCCN Guidelines for Senior Adult Oncology](#) for life expectancy estimation.¹

¹Howard DH. Life expectancy and the value of early detection. J Health Econ 2005;24:891-906.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF IMAGING

Goals of Imaging

- Imaging is performed for the detection and characterization of disease in order to guide appropriate management.
- Imaging studies should be performed based on the best available clinical evidence and not influenced by business or personal interests of the care provider.
- Imaging techniques can evaluate anatomic or functional parameters.
 - Anatomic imaging techniques include plain film radiographs, ultrasound, CT, and MRI.
 - Functional imaging techniques include radionuclide bone scan, PET, and advanced MR techniques, such as spectroscopy and diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI).

Efficacy of Imaging

- The utility of imaging for men with early biochemical failure after RP depends on risk group prior to operation, pathologic Gleason grade and stage, PSA, and PSA doubling time (PSADT) after recurrence. Low and intermediate risk groups with low serum PSAs postoperatively have a very low risk of positive bone scans or CT scans.
- Frequency of imaging should be based on individual risk, age, PSADT, Gleason score, and overall health.
- Bone scans are rarely positive in asymptomatic men with PSA <10 ng/mL.

Plain Radiography

- Plain radiography can be used to evaluate symptomatic regions in the skeleton and is particularly useful for evaluation of risk for pathologic fracture. However, conventional plain x-rays will not detect a bone lesion until nearly 50% of the mineral content of the bone is lost or gained.

Ultrasound

- Ultrasound uses high-frequency sound waves to image small regions of the body.
 - Standard ultrasound imaging provides anatomic information.
 - Vascular flow can be assessed using Doppler ultrasound techniques.
- Endorectal ultrasound is used to guide transrectal biopsies of the prostate.
- Endorectal ultrasound can be considered for patients with suspected recurrence after RP.
- Advanced ultrasound techniques for imaging of the prostate and for differentiation between prostate cancer and prostatitis are under evaluation.

[Continued on next page](#)

PRINCIPLES OF IMAGING

Bone Scan

- Radionuclide bone scan (also termed skeletal scintigraphy) is a nuclear medicine technique to evaluate for osseous metastatic disease.
 - A radioactive compound with affinity for bone matrix is injected and allowed to localize skeletal structures.
 - Sites of increased uptake imply accelerated bone turnover, and may indicate metastatic disease.
 - Osseous metastatic disease may be diagnosed based on the overall pattern of activity, or in conjunction with anatomic imaging.
- The primary bone scan techniques are:
 - Conventional bone scan performed using 99mTc-medronate and a gamma camera, either using planar imaging or 3-D imaging with single photon emission CT (SPECT).
 - PET bone scan performed using 18F-NaF and a PET scanner.
 - Additive value may be obtained from both techniques when imaging is performed using a hybrid imaging device (SPECT/CT, or PET/CT), which allows registration of SPECT or PET radiotracer localization on CT anatomy.
- Bone scan is indicated in the initial evaluation of patients at high risk for skeletal metastases.
 - T1 disease and PSA ≥ 20 , T2 disease and PSA ≥ 10 , Gleason score ≥ 8 , or T3/T4 disease
 - Any stage disease with symptoms suggestive of osseous metastatic disease
- Bone scan can be considered for the evaluation of the post-prostatectomy patient when there is failure of PSA to fall to undetectable levels, or when there is undetectable PSA after RP with a subsequent detectable PSA that increases on 2 or more subsequent determinations.
- Bone scan can be considered for the evaluation of patients with a rising PSA or positive DRE after RT if the patient is a candidate for additional local therapy.

Computed Tomography

- CT provides a high level of anatomic detail, and may detect gross extracapsular disease, nodal metastatic disease, and visceral metastatic disease.
 - CT is generally not sufficient to evaluate the prostate gland itself.
- CT may be performed with or without oral and intravenous contrast, and CT technique should be optimized to maximize diagnostic utility while minimizing radiation dose to the patient.
- CT is used for initial staging in select patients ([PROS-1](#))
 - T3 or T4 disease
 - Patients with T1 or T2 disease and nomogram indicated probability of lymph node involvement $>10\%$ may be candidates for pelvic imaging, but the level of evidence is low.
- CT may be considered in patients after RP when PSA fails to fall to undetectable levels or when an undetectable PSA becomes detectable and increases on 2 or more subsequent determinations, or after RT for rising PSA or positive DRE if the patient is a candidate for additional local therapy.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

[Continued on next page](#)

PROS-B
(2 of 3)

PRINCIPLES OF IMAGING

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

- The strengths of MRI include high soft tissue contrast and characterization, multiparametric image acquisition, multiplanar imaging capability, and advanced computational methods to assess function.
 - ▶ MRI can be performed with or without the administration of intravenous contrast material
 - ▶ Resolution of MR images in the pelvis can be augmented with the use of an endorectal coil
- Standard MRI techniques can be considered for initial evaluation of high-risk patients.
 - ▶ T3 or T4 disease
 - ▶ Patients with T1 or T2 disease and nomogram indicated probability of lymph node involvement >10% may be candidates for pelvic imaging, but the level of evidence is low.
- MRI may be considered in patients after RP when PSA fails to fall to undetectable levels or when an undetectable PSA becomes detectable and increases on 2 or more subsequent determinations, or after RT for rising PSA or positive DRE if the patient is a candidate for additional local therapy
- Advanced MRI techniques (endorectal MRI, MR perfusion/diffusion, contrast enhancement, and MR spectroscopy) may provide additional information in certain clinical settings, such as rising PSA or positive DRE after RT in the setting of a negative prostate biopsy. Application of this technology may be particularly useful in men being considered for local salvage therapy

Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography

- PET/CT using choline tracers may identify sites of metastatic disease in men with biochemical recurrence after primary treatment failure
 - ▶ Other choline radiotracers are under evaluation.
 - ▶ Further study is needed to determine the best use of choline PET/CT imaging in patients with prostate cancer.
- Oncologic PET/CT is performed typically using 8F-fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG), a radioactive analog of glucose.
 - ▶ In certain clinical settings, the use of FDG-PET/CT may provide useful information, but its routine use is not recommended at this time.
 - ▶ Data on the utility of FDG-PET/CT in patients with prostate cancer is limited.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF ACTIVE SURVEILLANCE AND OBSERVATION

- The NCCN Prostate Cancer Panel and the NCCN Prostate Cancer Early Detection Panel ([See NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early Detection](#)) remain concerned about over-diagnosis and over-treatment of prostate cancer. The Panel recommends that patients and their physicians (ie, urologist, radiation oncologist, medical oncologist, primary care physician) consider active surveillance based on careful consideration of the patient's prostate cancer risk profile, age, and health.
- The 2014 NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer distinguish between active surveillance and observation. Both involve at least every-6-month monitoring but active surveillance may involve surveillance prostate biopsies. Evidence of progression will prompt conversion to potentially curative treatment in active surveillance patients, whereas monitoring continues until symptoms develop or are eminent (ie, PSA >100 ng/mL) in observation patients, who will then begin palliative ADT.
- Active surveillance is preferred for men with very low-risk prostate cancer and life expectancy ≤ 20 y. Observation is preferred for men with low-risk prostate cancer with life expectancy <10 y. [See Risk Group Criteria \(PROS-2\)](#).
- Active surveillance involves actively monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to intervene with curative intent if the cancer progresses.
- Observation involves monitoring the course of disease with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for the development of symptoms or change in exam or PSA levels that suggest symptoms are imminent.
- Patients with clinically localized prostate cancers who are candidates for definitive treatment and choose active surveillance should have regular follow-up. Follow-up should be more rigorous in younger men than in older men. Follow-up should include:
 - PSA no more often than every 6 mo unless clinically indicated
 - DRE no more often than every 12 mo unless clinically indicated
 - Needle biopsy of the prostate should be repeated within 6 mo of diagnosis if initial biopsy was <10 cores or assessment discordant (eg, palpable tumor contralateral to side of positive biopsy)
 - A repeat prostate biopsy should be considered if prostate exam changes or PSA increases, but neither parameter is very reliable for detecting prostate cancer progression.
 - A repeat prostate biopsy should be considered as often as annually to assess for disease progression, because PSA kinetics may not be as reliable as monitoring parameters to determine progression of disease.
 - Repeat prostate biopsies are not indicated when life expectancy is less than 10 y or appropriate when men are on observation.
 - PSADT appears unreliable for identification of progressive disease that remains curable. Although multi-parametric MRI is not recommended for routine use, it may be considered if PSA rises and systematic prostate biopsy is negative to exclude the presence of an anterior cancer.
- Cancer progression may have occurred if:
 - Gleason grade 4 or 5 cancer is found upon repeat prostate biopsy
 - Prostate cancer is found in a greater number of prostate biopsies or occupies a greater extent of prostate biopsies

[Continued on next page](#)

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF ACTIVE SURVEILLANCE AND OBSERVATION

- **Advantages of active surveillance:**
 - ▶ **Avoidance of possible side effects of definitive therapy that may be unnecessary**
 - ▶ **Quality of life/normal activities potentially less affected**
 - ▶ **Risk of unnecessary treatment of small, indolent cancers reduced**
- **Advantages of observation:**
 - ▶ **Avoidance of possible side effects of unnecessary definitive therapy and early initiation and/or continuous ADT**
- **Disadvantages of active surveillance:**
 - ▶ **Chance of missed opportunity for cure**
 - ▶ **Risk of progression and/or metastases**
 - ▶ **Subsequent treatment may be more complex with increased side effects**
 - ▶ **Nerve sparing may be more difficult, which may reduce chance of potency preservation after surgery**
 - ▶ **Increased anxiety**
 - ▶ **Requires frequent medical exams and periodic biopsies, which are not without complications**
 - ▶ **Uncertain long-term natural history of prostate cancer**
- **Disadvantages of observation:**
 - ▶ **Risk of urinary retention or pathologic fracture without prior symptoms or concerning PSA level.**

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF RADIATION THERAPY

Primary External Beam Radiation Therapy (EBRT)

- Highly conformal RT techniques should be used to treat prostate cancer.
- Doses of 75.6 to 79.2 Gy in conventional fractions to the prostate (\pm seminal vesicles for part of the therapy) are appropriate for patients with low-risk cancers. For patients with intermediate- or high-risk disease, doses up to 81.0 Gy provide improved PSA-assessed disease control.
- Moderately hypofractionated image-guided IMRT regimens (2.4 to 4 Gy per fraction over 4-6 weeks) have been tested in randomized trials reporting similar efficacy and toxicity to conventionally fractionated IMRT. They can be considered as an alternative to conventionally fractionated regimens when clinically indicated.
- Extremely hypofractionated image-guided IMRT/SBRT regimens (6.5 Gy per fraction or greater) are an emerging treatment modality with single institutional and pooled reports of similar efficacy and toxicity to conventionally fractionated regimens. They can be considered as a cautious alternative to conventionally fractionated regimens at clinics with appropriate technology, physics, and clinical expertise.
- Patients with high-risk cancers are candidates for pelvic lymph node irradiation and the addition of neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjuvant ADT for a total of 2 to 3 y (category 1).
- Patients with intermediate-risk cancer may be considered for pelvic lymph node irradiation and 4- to 6-mo neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjuvant ADT.
- Patients with low-risk cancer should not receive pelvic lymph node irradiation or ADT.
- The accuracy of treatment should be improved by attention to daily prostate localization, with techniques of IGRT using CT, ultrasound, implanted fiducials, electromagnetic targeting/tracking, or an endorectal balloon to improve oncologic cure rates and reduce side effects.

Primary/Salvage Brachytherapy

- Permanent low-dose rate (LDR) brachytherapy as monotherapy is indicated for patients with low-risk cancers. For intermediate-risk cancers, consider combining brachytherapy with EBRT (40-50 Gy) \pm 4- to 6-mo neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjuvant ADT. Patients with high-risk cancers may be treated with a combination of EBRT (40-50 Gy) and brachytherapy \pm 2 to 3 y-neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjuvant ADT.
- Patients with a very large prostate or very small prostate, symptoms of bladder outlet obstruction (high IPSS), or a previous transurethral resection of the prostate are more difficult to implant and may suffer increased risk of side effects. Neoadjuvant ADT may be used to shrink the prostate to an acceptable size; however, increased toxicity would be expected from ADT and prostate size may not decline.
- Post-implant dosimetry must be performed to document the quality of the implant.
- The recommended prescribed doses for LDR monotherapy are 145 Gy for Iodine-125 and 125 Gy for Palladium-103. The corresponding boost doses after 40 to 50 Gy EBRT are 110 Gy and 90 to 100 Gy, respectively.
- High-dose rate (HDR) brachytherapy can be used alone or in combination with EBRT (40-50 Gy) instead of LDR. Commonly used boost regimens include 9.5 to 11.5 Gy x 2 fractions, 5.5 to 7.5 Gy x 3 fractions, and 4.0 to 6.0 Gy x 4 fractions. A commonly used regimen for HDR treatment alone includes 13.5 Gy x 2 fractions.
- Permanent LDR or temporary HDR brachytherapy can be used as treatment for a local recurrence following EBRT or primary brachytherapy. Radiation dose depends on the original primary external beam dose and ranges from 100 to 110 Gy for LDR and 9 to 12 Gy x 2 fractions for HDR.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

[Continued on next page](#)

PRINCIPLES OF RADIATION THERAPY

Post-Prostatectomy Radiation Therapy

- Evidence supports offering adjuvant/salvage RT in all men with adverse pathologic features or detectable PSA and no evidence of disseminated disease.
- Indications for adjuvant RT include pT3 disease, positive margin(s), Gleason score 8-10, or seminal vesicle involvement. Adjuvant RT is usually given within 1 year after RP and once any operative side effects have improved/stabilized. Patients with positive surgical margins and PSADT >9 mo may benefit the most.
- Indications for salvage RT include an undetectable PSA that becomes detectable and then increases on 2 subsequent measurements. Treatment is most effective when pre-treatment PSA is <1 ng/mL and PSADT is slow.
- The recommended prescribed doses for adjuvant/salvage post-prostatectomy RT are 64-70 Gy in standard fractionation.
- The defined target volumes include the prostate bed. The pelvic lymph nodes may be irradiated, but pelvic radiation is not necessary.

Radiopharmaceutical Therapy

- Radium-223 is an alpha-emitting radiopharmaceutical that has been shown to extend survival in men who have CRPC with symptomatic bone metastases, but no visceral metastases. Radium-223 differs from beta-emitting agents, such as samarium 153 and strontium 89, which are palliative and have no survival advantage. Radium-223 causes double-strand DNA breaks and has a short radius of activity. Grade 3-4 hematologic toxicity (2% neutropenia, 3% thrombocytopenia, 6% anemia) occurs at a low risk.
- Radium-223 is administered intravenously once a month for 6 months by an appropriately licensed facility, usually in nuclear medicine or RT departments.
- Prior to the initial dose, patients must have absolute neutrophil count $\geq 1.5 \times 10^9/L$, platelet count $\geq 100 \times 10^9/L$, and hemoglobin $\geq 10g/dL$.
- Prior to subsequent doses, patients must have absolute neutrophil count $\geq 1 \times 10^9/L$ and platelet count $\geq 50 \times 10^9/L$ (per label, although this may be too low in practice). Radium-223 should be discontinued if a delay of 6 to 8 weeks does not result in the return of blood counts to these levels.
- Non-hematologic side effects are generally mild, and include nausea, diarrhea, and vomiting. These symptoms are likely related to the fact that radium-223 is predominantly eliminated by fecal excretion.
- At the present time, except on a clinical trial, radium-223 is not intended to be used in combination with chemotherapy due to the potential for additive myelosuppression.
- Concomitant use of denosumab or zoledronic acid does not interfere with the beneficial effects of radium-223 on survival.

Palliative Radiotherapy

- 800 cGy as a single dose should be used instead of 3000 cGy in 10 fractions for non-vertebral metastases.
- Widespread bone metastases can be palliated using strontium 89 or samarium 153 with or without focal external beam radiation.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF SURGERY**Pelvic Lymph Node Dissection:**

- An extended PLND will discover metastases approximately twice as often as a limited PLND. Extended PLND provides more complete staging and may cure some men with microscopic metastases; therefore, an extended PLND is preferred when PLND is performed.
- An extended PLND includes removal of all node-bearing tissue from an area bound by the external iliac vein anteriorly, the pelvic sidewall laterally, the bladder wall medially, the floor of the pelvis posteriorly, Cooper's ligament distally, and the internal iliac artery proximally.
- A PLND can be excluded in patients with <2% predicated probability of nodal metastases by nomograms, although some patients with lymph node metastases will be missed.
- PLND can be performed using an open, laparoscopic, or robotic technique.

Radical Prostatectomy:

- RP is an appropriate therapy for any patient with clinically localized prostate cancer that can be completely excised surgically, who has a life expectancy of ≥ 10 years, and has no serious comorbid conditions that would contraindicate an elective operation.
- High-volume surgeons in high-volume centers generally provide better outcomes.
- Laparoscopic and robot-assisted RP are used commonly. In experienced hands, the results of these approaches appear comparable to open surgical approaches.
- Blood loss can be substantial with RP, but can be reduced by careful control of the dorsal vein complex and periprostatic vessels.
- Urinary incontinence can be reduced by preservation of urethral length beyond the apex of the prostate and avoiding damage to the distal sphincter mechanism. Bladder neck preservation may decrease the risk of incontinence. Anastomotic strictures increase the risk of long-term incontinence.
- Recovery of erectile function is directly related to age at RP, preoperative erectile function, and the degree of preservation of the cavernous nerves. Replacement of resected nerves with nerve grafts has not been shown to be beneficial. Early restoration of erections may improve late recovery.
- Salvage RP is an option for highly selected patients with local recurrence after EBRT, brachytherapy, or cryotherapy in the absence of metastases, but the morbidity (ie, incontinence, loss of erection, anastomotic stricture) is high.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF ANDROGEN DEPRIVATION THERAPY

ADT for Localized Disease

- Neoadjuvant ADT for RP is strongly discouraged outside of a clinical trial.
- Giving ADT before, during, and/or after radiation prolongs survival in selected radiation managed patients.
- Studies of short-term (4-6 mo) and long-term (2-3 y) neoadjuvant ADT all have used complete androgen blockade. Whether the addition of an antiandrogen is necessary will require further studies.
- In the largest randomized trial to date using antiandrogen bicalutamide alone at high dose (150 mg), there were indications of a delay in recurrence of disease but no improvement in survival. Longer follow-up is needed.
- In one randomized trial, immediate and continuous use of ADT in men with positive nodes following RP resulted in significantly improved overall survival compared to men who received delayed ADT. Therefore, such patients should be considered for immediate ADT.
- Many of the side effects of continuous ADT are cumulative over time on ADT.

ADT for Biochemical Failure

- The timing of ADT for patients whose only evidence of cancer is a rising PSA is influenced by PSA velocity, patient anxiety, and the short- and long-term side effects of ADT.
- Most patients will have a good 15-year prognosis, but their prognosis is best approximated by the absolute level of PSA, the rate of change in the PSA level (PSADT), and the initial stage, grade, and PSA level at the time of definitive therapy.
- Earlier ADT may be better than delayed ADT, although the definitions of early and late (what level of PSA) are controversial. Since the benefit of early ADT is not clear, treatment should be individualized until definitive studies are done. Patients with a shorter PSADT (or a rapid PSA velocity) and an otherwise long life expectancy should be encouraged to consider ADT earlier.
- Some patients are candidates for salvage after biochemical failure, which may include radiation after failed operation or RP or cryosurgery after failed radiation.
- Men with prolonged PSA doubling times (>12 mo) and who are older are candidates for observation.
- Men who choose ADT should consider intermittent ADT. A phase 3 trial that compared intermittent to continuous ADT showed that intermittent ADT was not inferior to continuous ADT with respect to survival, and quality of life was better for the intermittent ADT arm. The 7% increase in prostate cancer deaths in the intermittent ADT arm was balanced by more non-prostate cancer deaths in the continuous ADT arm.

[Continued on next page](#)

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF ANDROGEN DEPRIVATION THERAPY

ADT for Metastatic Disease

- ADT is the gold standard for men with metastatic prostate cancer.
- A phase 3 trial compared continuous ADT to intermittent ADT, but the study was statistically inconclusive for non-inferiority, however, quality of life measures for erectile function and mental health were better in the intermittent ADT arm after 3 months off ADT compared to the continuous ADT arm.
- Close monitoring of PSA and testosterone levels and possibly imaging is required when using intermittent ADT, especially during off-treatment periods, and patients may need to switch to continuous ADT upon signs of disease progression.

Optimal ADT

- LHRH agonist or antagonist (medical castration) and bilateral orchiectomy (surgical castration) are equally effective.
- Combined androgen blockade (medical or surgical castration combined with an antiandrogen) provides modest to no benefit over castration alone in patients with metastatic disease.
- Antiandrogen therapy should precede or be coadministered with LHRH agonist and be continued in combination for at least 7 days for patients with overt metastases who are at risk of developing symptoms associated with the flare in testosterone with initial LHRH agonist alone.
- Antiandrogen monotherapy appears to be less effective than medical or surgical castration and should not be recommended. The side effects are different but overall more tolerable.
- No clinical data support the use of triple androgen blockade (finasteride or dutasteride with combined androgen blockade).
- Patients who do not achieve adequate suppression of serum testosterone (less than 50 ng/dL) with medical or surgical castration can be considered for additional hormonal manipulations (with estrogen, antiandrogens, or steroids), although the clinical benefit remains uncertain. The optimal level of serum testosterone decline has yet to be defined.

[Continued on next page](#)

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF ANDROGEN DEPRIVATION THERAPY

Secondary Hormonal Manipulation

- Androgen receptor activation and autocrine/paracrine androgen synthesis are potential mechanisms of recurrence of prostate cancer during ADT (castration-recurrent prostate cancer [CRPC]). Thus, castrate levels of testosterone should be maintained while additional therapies are applied.
- Once the tumor becomes resistant to initial ADT, there are a variety of options that may afford clinical benefit. The available options are based on whether the patient has evidence of metastases by imaging, non-metastatic CRPC vs. metastatic CRPC (mCRPC), and whether or not the patient is symptomatic.
- In the setting in which patients are docetaxel-naive and have no or minimal symptoms, administration of secondary hormonal manipulations including addition of, or switching to, a different anti-androgen (flutamide, bicalutamide, nilutamide, enzalutamide), addition of adrenal/paracrine androgen synthesis inhibitors (ketoconazole, abiraterone), or use of an estrogen, such as DES, can be considered.
- In a randomized controlled trial in the setting of mCRPC prior to docetaxel chemotherapy, abiraterone (1000 mg daily on an empty stomach) and low-dose prednisone (5 mg BID) compared to prednisone alone improved radiographic progression-free survival (rPFS), time to initiation of chemotherapy, time to onset or worsening of pain, and time to deterioration of performance status. There was a trend toward improvement in overall survival. Use of abiraterone and prednisone in this setting is a category 1 recommendation. The side effects of abiraterone that require ongoing monitoring include hypertension, hypokalemia, peripheral edema, atrial fibrillation, congestive heart failure, liver injury, and fatigue, as well as the known side effects of ADT and long-term corticosteroid use.
- In uncontrolled studies of docetaxel-naive men, enzalutamide (160 mg daily) resulted in significant PSA declines, but the use of enzalutamide in the setting is category 2A until the results of the completed randomized, controlled trial in this setting are reported. The side effects of enzalutamide that require long-term monitoring include fatigue, diarrhea, hot flashes, headache, and seizures (reported in 0.9% of men on enzalutamide).
- Both randomized trials of abiraterone and enzalutamide in the pre-docetaxel setting were conducted in men who had no or minimal symptoms due to mCRPC. How these agents compare to docetaxel for pain palliation in this population of patients is not clear. Both drugs have palliative effects in the post-docetaxel setting. Abiraterone is approved in this setting and has a category 1 recommendation. Enzalutamide awaits approval in this setting. Both drugs are suitable options for men who are not good candidates to receive docetaxel.
- In the post-docetaxel CRPC population, enzalutamide and abiraterone plus prednisone have been shown to extend survival in randomized, controlled trials. Therefore, each agent has a category 1 recommendation.
- Evidence-based guidance on the sequencing of these agents in either pre- or post-docetaxel remains unavailable.

[Continued on next page](#)

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF ANDROGEN DEPRIVATION THERAPY

Monitor/Surveillance

- ADT has a variety of adverse effects including hot flashes, loss of libido and erectile dysfunction, shrinkage of penis and testicles, loss of muscle mass and strength, fatigue, depression, hair loss, osteoporosis, greater incidence of clinical fractures, obesity, insulin resistance, alterations in lipids, and greater risk for diabetes and cardiovascular disease. Patients and their medical providers should be advised about these risks prior to treatment.
- Screening and treatment for osteoporosis are advised according to guidelines for the general population from the National Osteoporosis Foundation (www.nof.org). The National Osteoporosis Foundation guidelines include recommendations for: 1) supplemental calcium (1200 mg daily) and vitamin D3 (800-1000 IU daily) for all men >50 y of age; and 2) additional treatment for men when the 10-y probability of hip fracture is $\geq 3\%$ or the 10-y probability of a major osteoporosis-related fracture is $\geq 20\%$. Fracture risk can be assessed using FRAX[®], the algorithm recently released by WHO. ADT should be considered “secondary osteoporosis” when using the FRAX[®] algorithm. Treatment options to increase bone density, a surrogate for fracture risk, include denosumab (60 mg SQ every 6 mo), zoledronic acid (5 mg IV annually), and alendronate (70 mg PO weekly).
- A baseline DEXA scan should be obtained before starting therapy in men at increased risk for fracture based on FRAX[®] screening. A follow-up DEXA scan after 1 year of therapy is recommended by the International Society for Clinical Densitometry, although there is no consensus on the optimal approach to monitoring the effectiveness of drug therapy. Use of biochemical markers of bone turnover to monitor response to therapy is not recommended.
- The serum level of 25-hydroxy vitamin D and average daily dietary intake of vitamin D will assist the nutritionist in making a patient-specific recommendation for vitamin D supplementation. There are currently no guidelines on how often to monitor vitamin D levels. However, for those who require monitoring with DEXA scans, it makes sense to check the serum vitamin D level at the same time.
- Denosumab (60 mg SQ every 6 mo), zoledronic acid (5 mg IV annually), and alendronate (70 mg PO weekly) increase bone mineral density, a surrogate for fracture risk, during ADT for prostate cancer. Treatment with either denosumab, zoledronic acid, or alendronate sodium is recommended when the absolute fracture risk warrants drug therapy.
- Screening for and intervention to prevent/treat diabetes and cardiovascular disease are recommended in men receiving ADT. These medical conditions are common in older men and it remains uncertain whether strategies for screening, prevention, and treatment of diabetes and cardiovascular disease in men receiving ADT should differ from the general population.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF IMMUNOTHERAPY AND CHEMOTHERAPY

- Men with advanced prostate cancer should be encouraged to participate in clinical trials and referred early to a medical oncologist.
- Men with asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic mCRPC may consider immunotherapy.
 - ▶ Sipuleucel-T has been shown in a phase 3 clinical trial to extend mean survival from 21.7 mo in the control arm to 25.8 mo in the treatment arm, which constitutes a 22% reduction in mortality risk.
 - ▶ Sipuleucel-T is well tolerated; common complications include chills, pyrexia, and headache.
 - ▶ Sipuleucel-T may be considered for men with castration-recurrent metastatic prostate cancer who have:
 - ◊ Good performance status (ECOG 0-1)
 - ◊ Estimated life expectancy >6 mo
 - ◊ No hepatic metastases
 - ◊ No or minimal symptoms
- Systemic chemotherapy should be reserved for men with mCRPC, in particular those who are symptomatic except when studied in a clinical trial. Certain subsets of patients with mCRPC who have more anaplastic features may benefit from earlier chemotherapy, but this has not been studied adequately in prospective trials.
- Every 3-week docetaxel with or without prednisone is the preferred first-line chemotherapy treatment based on phase 3 clinical trial data for men with symptomatic mCRPC. Radium-223 has been studied in symptomatic patients who are not candidates for docetaxel-based regimens and resulted in improved overall survival. Although abiraterone and enzalutamide have not been studied in this setting, both therapies were beneficial in patients with symptoms after docetaxel and are reasonable options in this setting. Mitoxantrone and prednisone may provide palliation but have not been shown to extend survival. ([See PROS-F, 3 of 4](#)).
- Only regimens utilizing docetaxel on an every-3-week schedule demonstrated beneficial impact on survival. The duration of therapy should be based on the assessment of benefit and toxicities. In the pivotal trials establishing survival advantage of docetaxel-based chemotherapy, patients received up to 10 cycles of treatment if no progression and no prohibitive toxicities were noted.
- Rising PSA should not be used as the sole criteria for progression. Assessment of response should incorporate clinical and radiographic criteria.
- Men who have failed docetaxel-based chemotherapy should be encouraged to participate in clinical trials. However, cabazitaxel with prednisone has been shown in a randomized phase 3 study to prolong overall survival, progression-free survival, and PSA and radiologic responses when compared with mitoxantrone and prednisone and is FDA approved in the post-docetaxel second-line setting. Selection of patients without severe neuropathy and adequate liver, kidney, and bone marrow function is necessary, given the high risk of neutropenia and other side effects in this population, with consideration of prophylactic granulocyte growth factor injections.

[Continue on the next page](#)

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF IMMUNOTHERAPY AND CHEMOTHERAPY

- **Mitoxantrone has not demonstrated a survival improvement in this post-docetaxel setting but remains a palliative therapeutic option, particularly in men who are not candidates for cabazitaxel therapy. No chemotherapy regimen to date has demonstrated improved survival or quality of life following cabazitaxel, and trial participation should be strongly encouraged. Outside of a clinical trial, several systemic agents have shown palliative benefits in single-arm studies. Treatment decisions should be individualized based on comorbidities and functional status. Finally, for patients who have not demonstrated definitive evidence of progression on prior docetaxel therapy, retreatment with this agent can be attempted.**
- **In men with CRPC who have bone metastases, denosumab and zoledronic acid have been shown to prevent disease-related skeletal complications, which include fracture, spinal cord compression, or the need for surgery or RT to bone.**
 - ▶ **When compared to zoledronic acid, denosumab was shown to be superior in prevention of skeletal-related events.**
 - ▶ **Choice of agent may depend on underlying comorbidities, whether the patient has been treated with zoledronic acid previously, logistics, and/or cost considerations.**
 - ◊ **Zoledronic acid is given intravenously every 3 to 4 weeks. The dose is based on the serum creatinine obtained just prior to each dose and must be adjusted for impaired renal function. Zoledronic acid is not recommended for creatinine clearance <30 mL/min.**
 - ◊ **Denosumab is given subcutaneously every 4 weeks. Although renal monitoring is not required, denosumab is not recommended in patients with creatinine clearance <30 mL/min. When creatinine clearance is <60 mL/min, the risk for severe hypocalcemia increases. Even in patients with normal renal function, hypocalcemia is seen twice as often with denosumab than zoledronic acid and all patients on denosumab should be treated with vitamin D and calcium with periodic monitoring of serum calcium levels.**
 - ▶ **Osteonecrosis of the jaw is seen with both agents; risk is increased in patients who have tooth extractions, poor dental hygiene, or a dental appliance. Patients should be referred for dental evaluation before starting either zoledronic acid or denosumab. If invasive dental procedures are required, bone-targeted therapy should be withheld until the dentist indicates that the patient has healed completely from all dental procedure(s).**
 - ▶ **The optimal duration of therapy for either denosumab or zoledronic acid remains uncertain.**
 - ▶ **The toxicity profile of denosumab when denosumab is used in patients who have been treated with zoledronic acid remains uncertain.**
 - ▶ **Clinical trials are in progress that assess a role for zoledronic acid or denosumab in men beginning ADT for bone metastases.**

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

Table 1.
TNM Staging System For Prostate Cancer**Primary Tumor (T)****Clinical**

TX	Primary tumor cannot be assessed
T0	No evidence of primary tumor
T1	Clinically inapparent tumor neither palpable nor visible by imaging
T1a	Tumor incidental histologic finding in 5% or less of tissue resected
T1b	Tumor incidental histologic finding in more than 5% of tissue resected
T1c	Tumor identified by needle biopsy (e.g., because of elevated PSA)
T2	Tumor confined within prostate*
T2a	Tumor involves one-half of one lobe or less
T2b	Tumor involves more than one-half of one lobe but not both lobes
T2c	Tumor involves both lobes
T3	Tumor extends through the prostatic capsule **
T3a	Extracapsular extension (unilateral or bilateral)
T3b	Tumor invades the seminal vesicle(s)
T4	Tumor is fixed or invades adjacent structures other than seminal vesicles: bladder, levator muscles, and/or pelvic wall.

*Note: Tumor found in one or both lobes by needle biopsy, but not palpable or reliably visible by imaging, is classified as T1c.

**Note: Invasion into the prostatic apex or into (but not beyond) the prostatic capsule is not classified as T3, but as T2.

Pathologic(pT)*

pT2	Organ confined
pT2a	Unilateral, involving one-half of one side or less
pT2b	Unilateral, involving more than one-half of one side but not both sides
pT2c	Bilateral disease
pT3	Extraprostatic extension
pT3a	Extraprostatic extension or microscopic invasion of the bladder neck**
pT3b	Seminal vesicle invasion
pT4	Invasion of bladder, rectum

*Note: There is no pathologic T1 classification.

**Note: Positive surgical margin should be indicated by an R1 descriptor (residual microscopic disease).

Regional Lymph Nodes (N)**Clinical**

NX	Regional lymph nodes were not assessed
N0	No regional lymph node metastasis
N1	Metastasis in regional lymph node(s)

Pathologic

PNX	Regional nodes not sampled
pN0	No positive regional nodes
pN1	Metastases in regional nodes(s)

Distant Metastasis (M)*

M0	No distant metastasis
M1	Distant metastasis
M1a	Non-regional lymph node(s)
M1b	Bone(s)
M1c	Other site(s) with or without bone disease

*Note: When more than one site of metastasis is present, the most advanced category is used. pM1c is most advanced.

[Continue](#)

Used with the permission of the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC), Chicago, Illinois. The original and primary source for this information is the AJCC Cancer Staging Manual, Seventh Edition (2010), published by Springer Science+Business Media, LLC (SBM). (For complete information and data supporting the staging tables, visit www.springer.com.) Any citation or quotation of this material must be credited to the AJCC as its primary source. The inclusion of this information herein does not authorize any reuse or further distribution without the expressed, written permission of Springer SBM, on behalf of the AJCC.

ANATOMIC STAGE/PROGNOSTIC GROUPS *

Group	T	N	M	PSA	Gleason
I	T1a-c	N0	M0	PSA < 10	Gleason ≤ 6
	T2a	N0	M0	PSA < 10	Gleason ≤ 6
IIA	T1-2a	N0	M0	PSA X	Gleason X
	T1a-c	N0	M0	PSA < 20	Gleason 7
	T1a-c	N0	M0	PSA ≥ 10 < 20	Gleason ≤ 6
	T2a	N0	M0	PSA < 20	Gleason ≤ 7
IIB	T2b	N0	M0	PSA < 20	Gleason ≤ 7
	T2b	N0	M0	PSA X	Gleason X
	T2c	N0	M0	Any PSA	Any Gleason
	T1-2	N0	M0	PSA ≥ 20	Any Gleason
III	T3a-b	N0	M0	Any PSA	Any Gleason
IV	T4	N0	M0	Any PSA	Any Gleason
	Any T	N1	M0	Any PSA	Any Gleason
	Any T	Any N	M1	Any PSA	Any Gleason

*Note: When either PSA or Gleason is not available, grouping should be determined by T stage and/or either PSA or Gleason as available.

Histopathologic Type

This classification applies to adenocarcinomas and squamous carcinomas, but not to sarcoma or transitional cell carcinoma of the prostate. Adjectives used to describe variants of prostate adenocarcinomas include mucinous, signet ring cell, ductal, adenosquamous and neuroendocrine small cell carcinoma. Transitional cell (urothelial) carcinoma of the prostate is classified as a urethral tumor. There should be histologic confirmation of the disease.

Histopathologic Grade (G)

Gleason score is recommended because as the grading system of choice, it takes into account the inherent morphologic heterogeneity of prostate cancer, and several studies have clearly established its prognostic value. A primary and a secondary pattern (the range of each is 1–5) are assigned and then summed to yield a total score. Scores of 2–10 are thus theoretically possible. The vast majority of newly diagnosed needle biopsy detected prostate cancers are graded Gleason score 6 or above. (If a single pattern of disease is seen, it should be reported as both grades. For example, if a single focus of Gleason pattern 3 disease is seen, it is reported as Gleason score 3 + 3 = 6.) In a radical prostatectomy, if a tertiary pattern is present, it is commented upon but not reflected in the Gleason score. It is recommended that radical prostatectomy specimens should be processed in an organized fashion where a determination can be made of a dominant nodule or separate tumor nodules. If a dominant nodule/s is present, the Gleason score of this nodule should be separately mentioned as this nodule is often the focus with highest grade and/or stage of disease.

Gleason X

Gleason ≤ 6

Gleason 7

Gleason 8-10

Gleason score cannot be processed

Well differentiated (slight anaplasia)

Moderately differentiated (moderate anaplasia)

Poorly differentiated/undifferentiated (marked anaplasia)

Used with the permission of the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC), Chicago, Illinois. The original and primary source for this information is the AJCC Cancer Staging Manual, Seventh Edition (2010), published by Springer Science+Business Media, LLC (SBM). (For complete information and data supporting the staging tables, visit www.springer.com.) Any citation or quotation of this material must be credited to the AJCC as its primary source. The inclusion of this information herein does not authorize any reuse or further distribution without the expressed, written permission of Springer SBM, on behalf of the AJCC.



Discussion

NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus

Category 1: Based upon high-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 2A: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 2B: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 3: Based upon any level of evidence, there is major NCCN disagreement that the intervention is appropriate.

All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise noted.

Table of Contents

Overview	MS-2
Estimates of Life Expectancy	MS-2
Risk Stratification	MS-2
Imaging	MS-3
Observation	MS-4
Active Surveillance	MS-4
Rationale.....	MS-5
Application	MS-5
Surveillance Program and Reclassification Criteria	MS-6
Radical Prostatectomy	MS-7
Pelvic Lymph Node Dissection	MS-8
Radiation Therapy	MS-9
External Beam Radiation Therapy.....	MS-9
Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy	MS-10
Brachytherapy.....	MS-11
Proton Therapy	MS-12

Radiation for Metastases.....	MS-12
Other Local Therapies	MS-13
Androgen Deprivation Therapy	MS-13
Types of ADT	MS-13
ADT for Low-Risk Patients	MS-14
ADT for Intermediate-Risk Patients	MS-14
ADT for High-Risk or Very High-Risk Patients.....	MS-14
Adjuvant ADT after Radical Prostatectomy.....	MS-15
ADT for Biochemical Recurrence	MS-15
ADT for Nodal or Metastatic Disease	MS-16
Adverse Effects of Traditional ADT.....	MS-16
Hormone Therapy for CRPC	MS-18
Chemotherapy and Immunotherapy	MS-19
Docetaxel	MS-19
Cabazitaxel	MS-19
Sipuleucel-T	MS-20
Agents Related to Bone Health in CRPC.....	MS-20
NCCN Recommendations	MS-21
Initial Prostate Cancer Diagnosis	MS-21
Initial Clinical Assessment and Staging Evaluation.....	MS-21
Very Low Risk	MS-21
Low Risk	MS-22
Intermediate Risk	MS-22
High Risk.....	MS-22
Very High Risk	MS-22
Nodal and Metastatic Disease.....	MS-23
Disease Monitoring.....	MS-23
Adjuvant or Salvage Therapy after Radical Prostatectomy	MS-24
Post-Irradiation Recurrence.....	MS-25
Management of ADT-Naïve Advanced Disease.....	MS-26
CRPC.....	MS-26
Summary	MS-30
Table 1. Active Surveillance Experience in North America	MS-30
References	MS-31

Overview

Prostate cancer has surpassed lung cancer as the most common cancer in men. It is generally accepted that these changes resulted from prostate-specific antigen (PSA) screening that detected many early-stage prostate cancers. An estimated 233,000 new cases will be diagnosed in 2014, accounting for 27% of new cancer cases in men in 2014.¹ Fortunately, the age-adjusted death rates from prostate cancer have declined (-4.1% annually from 1994 to 2001). Researchers have estimated prostate cancer to account for 29,480 deaths in 2014.¹ This comparatively low death rate suggests that unless prostate cancer is becoming biologically less aggressive, increased public awareness with earlier detection and treatment has begun to affect mortality from this prevalent cancer. However, early detection and treatment of prostate cancers that do not threaten life expectancy result in unnecessary side effects, which impair quality of life and health care expenses, while decreasing the value of PSA and digital rectal exam (DRE) as early detection tests.

Estimates of Life Expectancy

Estimates of life expectancy have emerged as a key determinant of primary treatment, particularly when considering active surveillance or observation. While it is possible to estimate life expectancy for groups of men, it is more difficult to extrapolate these estimates to an individual patient. Life expectancy can be estimated using the Minnesota Metropolitan Life Insurance Tables or the Social Security Administration Life Insurance Tables² and adjusted for individual patients by adding or subtracting 50% based upon whether one believes the patient is in the healthiest quartile or the unhealthiest quartile, respectively.³ As an example, the Social Security Administration Life Expectancy for a 65-year-old American man is 16 years. If judged to be in the upper quartile of health, a life expectancy of 24 years is assigned. If judged to be in

the lower quartile of health, a life expectancy of 8 years is assigned. Thus, treatment recommendations could change dramatically using the NCCN Guidelines if a 65-year-old man was judged to be in either very poor or excellent health.

Risk Stratification

Optimal treatment of prostate cancer requires assessment of risk: how likely is a given cancer to be confined to the prostate or to spread to the regional lymph nodes? How likely is the cancer to progress or metastasize after treatment? How likely is adjuvant or salvage radiation going to control cancer after an unsuccessful radical prostatectomy? Prostate cancers are best characterized by clinical (TNM) stage determined by DRE, Gleason score in the biopsy specimen, and serum PSA level. Imaging studies (ultrasound, MRI) have been investigated intensively but have yet to be accepted as essential adjuncts to staging.

The NCCN Guidelines incorporate a risk stratification scheme that uses a minimum of stage, grade, and PSA to assign patients to risk groups. These risk groups are used to select the appropriate options that should be considered for treatment and to predict the probability of biochemical failure after definitive local therapy.⁴ Risk group stratification has been published widely and validated, and provides a better basis for treatment recommendations than clinical stage alone.^{5,6} The NCCN Guidelines Panel recognized that heterogeneity exists within each risk group. For example, an analysis of 12,821 patients reported that men assigned to the intermediate-risk group by clinical stage (T2b–T2c) had a lower risk of recurrence than men categorized according to Gleason score (7) or PSA level (10–20 ng/mL).⁷ A similar trend of superior recurrence-free survival was observed in men placed in the high-risk group by clinical stage (T3a) compared to those assigned by Gleason

score (8–10) or PSA level (>20 ng/mL), although it did not reach statistical significance.

The more clinically relevant information that is used in the calculation of time to PSA failure, the more accurate the result. The Partin tables^{8,9} were the first to achieve widespread use for counseling men with clinically localized prostate cancer. The tables give the probability (95% confidence intervals) that a patient with a certain clinical stage, Gleason score, and PSA will have a cancer of each pathologic stage. A nomogram is a predictive instrument that takes a set of input data (variables) and makes predictions about an outcome. Nomograms predict more accurately for the individual patient than risk groups, because they combine the relevant prognostic variables, regardless of value. Nomograms can be used to inform treatment decision-making for men contemplating active surveillance,¹⁰ radical prostatectomy,¹¹⁻¹³ neurovascular bundle preservation¹⁴⁻¹⁶ or omission of pelvic lymph node dissection (PLND) during radical prostatectomy,¹⁷ brachytherapy,^{11,18,19} or external beam radiation therapy (EBRT).^{11,20} Biochemical progression-free survival can be reassessed postoperatively using age, diagnostic serum PSA, and pathologic grade and stage.^{21,22} Potential success of adjuvant or salvage radiation therapy (RT) after unsuccessful radical prostatectomy can be assessed using a nomogram.^{11,23}

None of the current models predict with perfect accuracy, and only some of these models predict metastasis^{11,22,24,25} and cancer-specific death.^{13,26} Given the competing causes of mortality, many men who sustain PSA failure will not live long enough either to develop clinical evidence of distant metastases or to die from prostate cancer. Those with a short PSA doubling time are at greatest risk of death. Not all PSA failures are clinically relevant; thus, PSA doubling time may be a more useful measure of risk of death.²⁷ The NCCN Guidelines Panel

recommends that NCCN risk groups be used to begin the discussion of options for the treatment of clinically localized prostate cancer, and that nomograms be used to provide additional and more individualized information.

Imaging

Imaging techniques are useful for detecting metastases and tumor recurrence. Anatomic imaging techniques include radiographs, ultrasound, CT, and MRI. Functional techniques include radionuclide bone scan, PET, and advanced MRI such as spectroscopy and diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI).

Transrectal ultrasonography (TRUS) is the most common technique for anatomic visualization of the prostate. TRUS is used to guide transrectal biopsies, and can be considered for patients with biochemical recurrence after surgery.

The utility of imaging for men with an early biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy depends on disease risk prior to operation, pathologic stage and grade and PSA and PSA doubling time after recurrence. Low- and intermediate-risk patients with low serum PSA levels postoperatively have a very low risk of positive bone scans or CT scans.^{28,29} In a series of 414 bone scans performed in 230 men with a biochemical recurrence after RP, the rate of a positive bone scan for men with PSA under 10 ng/mL was only 4%.³⁰ Serial PSA measurements can be helpful in stratifying men at highest risk of progression and metastases. Some men have detectable PSA after radical prostatectomy due to benign prostate tissue in the prostate fossa. They have low stable PSAs and a very low risk of prostate cancer progression.³¹

MRI can provide additional high-resolution information on tissue properties, such as diffusion and enhancement. MRI enables soft tissue contrast and characterization and advanced computational methods are available to assess function. An endorectal surface coil can be used to enhance image resolution.³² Advanced MRI techniques may be particularly useful when considering salvage therapy for men with increasing PSA or positive DRE in the setting of a negative prostate biopsy. These include endorectal MRI, MR perfusion or diffusion, contrast enhancement, and MR spectroscopy. Multiparametric MRI shows promise and a recent consensus conference should help with standardization of techniques and reporting.³³

C-11 choline PET/CT has been used to detect and differentiate prostate cancer from benign tissue.³⁴ The sensitivity and specificity of the technique in restaging patients with biochemical failure are 85% and 88%, respectively.³⁵ C-11 choline PET/CT may be useful to detect distant metastases in these patients.

Observation

Observation involves monitoring the course of prostate cancer with the expectation to deliver palliative therapy for development of symptoms or change in exam or PSA that suggests symptoms are imminent. Observation thus differs from active surveillance. The goal of observation is to maintain quality of life by avoiding non-curative treatment when prostate cancer is unlikely to cause mortality or significant morbidity. The main advantage of observation is avoidance of possible side effects of unnecessary definitive therapy or ADT. But patients may be at risk for urinary retention or pathologic fracture without prior symptoms or increasing PSA level.

Observation is applicable to elderly men or frail patients with comorbidity that will likely out-compete prostate cancer. Johansson and

colleagues³⁶ observed that only 13% of men developed metastases 15 years after diagnosis of T0-T2 disease and only 11% had died from prostate cancer. Since prostate cancer will not be treated for cure for patients with shorter life expectancies, observation for as long as possible is a reasonable option based on physician's discretion. Monitoring should include PSA and DRE. When symptoms develop or are imminent, patients can begin palliative ADT.

Active Surveillance

Active surveillance (also referred to as watchful waiting, expectant management, or deferred treatment) involves actively monitoring the course of the disease with the expectation to intervene if the cancer progresses. Unlike observation, active surveillance is mainly applicable to younger men with seemingly indolent cancer with the goal to defer treatment and its potential side effects. Because these patients have a longer life expectancy, they should be followed closely and treatment should start promptly should the cancer progress so as not to miss the chance for cure.

The advantages of active surveillance include: 1) avoiding the side effects of definitive therapy that may not be necessary; 2) retaining quality of life and normal activities; 3) ensuring that small indolent cancers do not receive unnecessary treatment; and 4) decreased initial costs. The disadvantages of active surveillance include: 1) chance of missed opportunity for cure; 2) the cancer may progress or metastasize before treatment; 3) treatment of a larger, more aggressive cancer may be more complex with greater side effects; 4) nerve sparing at subsequent radical prostatectomy may be more difficult, which may reduce the chance of potency preservation after operation; 5) the increased anxiety of living with an untreated cancer;³⁷ 6) the requirement for frequent medical examinations and periodic prostate

biopsies; 7) the uncertain long-term natural history of untreated prostate cancer; and 8) the timing and value of periodic imaging studies have not been determined.

Rationale

The NCCN Guidelines Panel remains concerned about the problems of over-treatment related to the increased frequency of diagnosis of prostate cancer from widespread use of PSA for early detection or screening (see [NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early Detection](#)).

The debate about the need to diagnose and treat every man who has prostate cancer is fueled by: the high prevalence of prostate cancer upon autopsy of the prostate³⁸; the high frequency of positive prostate biopsies in men with normal DREs and serum PSA values³⁹; the contrast between the incidence and mortality rates of prostate cancer; and the need to treat an estimated 37 men with screen-detected prostate cancer^{40,41} or 100 men with low-risk prostate cancer⁴² to prevent one death from the disease. The controversy regarding over-treatment of prostate cancer and the value of prostate cancer early detection⁴⁰⁻⁴⁶ has been informed further by publication of the Goteborg study, a subset of the European Randomized Study for Screening of Prostate Cancer (ERSPC).⁴⁷ Many believe that this study best approximates proper use of PSA for early detection since it was population-based and involved a 1:1 randomization of 20,000 men who received PSA every 2 years and used thresholds for prostate biopsy of PSA >3 and >2.5 since 2005. The follow-up of 14 years is longer than the European study as a whole (9 years) and Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian (PLCO) (11.5 years). Prostate cancer was diagnosed in 12.7% of the screened group compared to 8.2% of the control group. Prostate cancer mortality was 0.5% in the screened group and 0.9% in the control group, which gave a 40% absolute

cumulative risk reduction of prostate cancer death (compared to ERSPC 20% and PLCO 0%). Most impressively, 40% of the patients were initially managed by active monitoring and 28% were still on active surveillance at the time these results were analyzed. To prevent a prostate cancer death, 12 men would need to be diagnosed and treated as opposed to the ERSPC as a whole where 37 needed to be treated. Thus, early detection when applied properly should reduce prostate cancer mortality. However, that reduction comes at the expense of over-treatment that may occur in as many as 50% of men treated for PSA-detected prostate cancer.⁴⁸

The best models of prostate cancer detection and progression estimate that 23% to 42% of all U.S. screen-detected cancers are overtreated⁴⁹ and that PSA detection was responsible for up to 12.3 years of lead-time bias.⁵⁰ The NCCN Guidelines Panel responded to these evolving data with careful consideration of which men should be recommended active surveillance. However, the NCCN Guidelines Panel recognizes the uncertainty associated with the estimation of chance of competing causes of death, the definition of very low- or low-risk prostate cancer, the ability to detect disease progression without compromising chance of cure, and the chance and consequences of treatment side effects.

Application

Epstein and colleagues⁵¹ introduced clinical criteria to predict pathologically “insignificant” prostate cancer. Insignificant prostate cancer is identified by: clinical stage T1c, biopsy Gleason score ≤6, the presence of disease in fewer than 3 biopsy cores, ≤50% prostate cancer involvement in any core, and PSA density <0.15 ng/mL/g. Despite the usefulness of these criteria, physicians are cautioned against using these as the sole decision maker. Studies have shown that as many as 8% of cancers that qualified as being insignificant using

the Epstein criteria were not organ-confined based on postoperative findings.^{21,52} A new nomogram may be better.⁵³ Although many variations upon this definition have been proposed (reviewed by Bastian, and colleagues⁵⁴), a consensus of the NCCN Guidelines Panel was reached that insignificant prostate cancer, especially when detected early using serum PSA, poses little threat to men with life expectancy less than 20 years. The confidence that Americans with very low-risk prostate cancer have a very small risk of prostate cancer death is enhanced by lead time bias introduced by PSA early detection that ranges from an estimated 12.3 years in a 55-year-old man to 6 years in a 75-year-old man.⁵⁰

The role for active surveillance should increase with the shift towards earlier-stage diagnosis attributed to PSA testing. However, results from randomized or cohort studies comparing this deferral strategy with immediate treatment are mixed, partly due to heterogeneity of the patient populations (reviewed by Sanda and Kaplan⁵⁵).

Ultimately, a recommendation for active surveillance must be based on careful individualized weighing of a number of factors: life expectancy, general health condition, disease characteristics, potential side effects of treatment, and patient preference. Race is emerging as another important factor to consider, since African-American men who meet the criteria of very low-risk have been reported to show higher rates of upgrading and adverse pathology compared to men of other races.⁵⁶

Surveillance Program and Reclassification Criteria

Each of the major active surveillance series has used different criteria for reclassification.⁵⁷⁻⁶¹ Reclassification criteria have been met by 23% of men with a median follow-up of 7 years in the Toronto experience,⁵⁹ 33% of men with a median follow-up of 3 years in the Johns Hopkins experience,⁶¹ and 16% of men with a median follow-up of 3.5 years in

the UCSF experience⁵⁸ (Table 1). Uncertainty regarding reclassification criteria and the desire to avoid missing an opportunity for cure have driven several reports in the past year that have dealt with the validity of commonly used reclassification criteria. The Toronto group demonstrated that a PSA trigger point of PSA doubling time <3 years could not be improved upon by using a PSA threshold of 10 or 20, PSA doubling time calculated in various ways, or PSA velocity >2 ng/mL/yr.⁶² The Johns Hopkins group used biopsy-demonstrated reclassification to Gleason pattern 4 or 5 or increased tumor volume on biopsy as their only criteria for reclassification. Of 290 men on an annual prostate biopsy program, 35% demonstrated reclassification at a median follow-up of 2.9 years.⁶³ Unfortunately, neither PSA doubling time (AUC 0.59) nor PSA velocity (AUC 0.61) was associated with prostate biopsy reclassification. Both groups have concluded that PSA kinetics cannot replace regular prostate biopsy, although treatment of most men who demonstrate reclassification on prostate biopsy prevents evaluation of biopsy reclassification as a criterion for treatment or reduction of survival.

Repeat biopsy is useful to determine whether higher-grade elements are evolving although the risks appear small,⁶⁴ which may influence prognosis and, hence, the decision to continue active surveillance or to proceed to definitive local therapy. Treatment of all men who developed Gleason pattern 4 on annual prostate biopsies has thus far avoided a prostate cancer death among 769 men in the Johns Hopkins study.⁶¹ However, whether treatment of all who progress to Gleason pattern 4 was necessary remains uncertain. Studies remain in progress to identify the best trigger points when interventions with curative intent may still be successful.

The Toronto group published on 3 patients who died of prostate cancer in their experience with 450 men.⁵⁹ These 3 deaths led to them to revise

their criteria for offering men active surveillance, since each of these 3 men probably had metastatic disease at the time of entry onto active surveillance. In 450 men followed for a median of 6.8 years, overall survival was 78.6% and prostate cancer-specific survival was 97.2%.⁵⁹ Of the 30% (n=145) of men who progressed, 8% were from an increase in Gleason score, 14% were for PSA doubling time <3 years, 1% were for development of a prostate nodule, and 3% were for anxiety. One hundred and thirty-five of these 145 men were treated: 35 by radical prostatectomy, 90 by RT with or without androgen deprivation therapy (ADT), and 10 with ADT alone. Follow-up is available for 110 of these men and 5-year biochemical progression-free survival is only 62% for those undergoing radical prostatectomy and 43% for those undergoing radiation. By comparison, among 192 men on active surveillance who underwent delayed treatment at a median of 2 years after diagnosis in the Johns Hopkins experience,⁶¹ 5-year biochemical progression-free survival was 96% for those undergoing radical prostatectomy and 75% for those undergoing radiation. These experiences contrast with the UCSF experience where 74 men who progressed on active surveillance and underwent radical prostatectomy were compared with 148 men who were matched by clinical parameters. The two groups were similar by pathologic Gleason grade, pathologic stage, and margin positivity. All men treated by radical prostatectomy after progression on active surveillance had freedom from biochemical progression at median follow-up 37.5 months, compared to 97% of men in the primary radical prostatectomy group at median follow-up 35.5 months.

The panel believes there is an urgent need for further clinical research regarding the criteria for recommending active surveillance, the criteria for reclassification on active surveillance, and the schedule for active surveillance especially as it pertains to prostate biopsies, which unfortunately come within an increasing burden. Literature suggests

that as many as 7% of men undergoing prostate biopsy will suffer an adverse event,⁴⁴ those with urinary tract infection are often fluoroquinolone-resistant,⁶⁵ and radical prostatectomy may become technically challenging after multiple sets of biopsies, especially as it pertains to potency preservation.⁶⁶

Radical Prostatectomy

Radical prostatectomy is appropriate for any patient whose tumor is clinically confined to the prostate. However, because of potential perioperative morbidity, radical prostatectomy should be reserved for patients whose life expectancy is 10 years or more. Stephenson and colleagues¹³ reported a low 15-year prostate cancer-specific mortality of 12% in patients who underwent radical prostatectomy (5% for low-risk patients), although it is unclear whether the favorable prognosis is due to the effectiveness of the procedure or the low lethality of cancers detected in the PSA era.

Radical prostatectomy was compared to watchful waiting in a randomized trial of 695 patients with early-stage prostate cancer (mostly T2).⁶⁷ With a median follow-up of 12.8 years, those assigned to the radical prostatectomy group had significant improvements in disease-specific survival, overall survival, and risk of metastasis and local progression. Overall, 15 men needed to be treated to avert one death; that number fell to 7 for men younger than 65 years of age. The results of this trial offer high-quality evidence to support radical prostatectomy as a treatment option.

Some patients at high or very high risk may still benefit from radical prostatectomy. In an analysis of 842 men with Gleason scores 8 to 10 at biopsy who underwent radical prostatectomy, predictors of unfavorable outcome included PSA level over 10 ng/mL, clinical stage T2b or higher, Gleason score 9 or 10, higher number of biopsy cores

with high-grade cancer, and over 50% core involvement.⁶⁸ Patients without these characteristics showed higher 10-year biochemical-free and disease-specific survival after radical prostatectomy compared to those with unfavorable findings (31% vs. 4% and 75% vs. 52%, respectively).

Radical prostatectomy is a salvage option for patients experiencing biochemical recurrence after primary RT, but morbidity (incontinence, erectile dysfunction, and bladder neck contracture) remains significantly higher than when radical prostatectomy is used as initial therapy.^{69,70} Overall and cancer-specific 10-year survival ranged from 54% to 89% and 70% to 83%, respectively.⁶⁹

Operative Techniques and Adverse Effects

Long-term cancer control has been achieved in most patients with both the retropubic and the perineal approaches; high-volume surgeons in high-volume centers generally provide superior outcomes.^{71,72} Laparoscopic and robot-assisted radical prostatectomy are used commonly and are considered comparable to conventional approaches in experienced hands.^{73,74} In a cohort study using U.S. Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Medicare-linked data on 8837 patients, minimally invasive compared to open radical prostatectomy was associated with shorter length of hospital stay, less need for blood transfusions, and fewer surgical complications, but rates of incontinence and erectile dysfunction were higher.⁷⁵ Oncologic outcome of a robotic versus open approach was similar when assessed by use of additional therapies⁷⁵ or rate of positive surgical margins,⁷⁶ although longer follow-up is necessary. A meta-analysis on 19 observational studies (n=3893) reported less blood loss and lower transfusion rates with minimally invasive techniques than with open operation.⁷⁶ Risk of positive surgical margins was the same. Two recent meta-analyses showed a statistically significant advantage in favor of a robotic approach

compared to an open approach in 12-month urinary continence⁷⁷ and potency recovery.⁷⁸

An analysis of the Prostate Cancer Outcomes Study on 1655 men with localized prostate cancer compared long-term functional outcomes after radical prostatectomy or RT.⁷⁹ At 2 and 5 years, patients who underwent radical prostatectomy reported higher rates of urinary continence and erectile function but lower rates of bowel urgency. However, no significant difference was observed at 15 years. In a large retrospective cohort study involving 32,465 patients, patients who received RT had a lower 5-year incidence of urological procedures than those who underwent radical prostatectomy, but higher incidence for hospital admissions, rectal or anal procedures, open surgical procedures, and secondary malignancies.⁸⁰

Return of urinary continence after radical prostatectomy may be improved by preserving the urethra beyond the prostatic apex and by avoiding damage to the distal sphincter mechanism. Bladder neck preservation may allow more rapid recovery of urinary control.⁸¹ Anastomotic strictures that increase the risk of long-term incontinence are less frequent with modern surgical techniques. Recovery of erectile function is related directly to the degree of preservation of the cavernous nerves, age at surgery, and preoperative erectile function. Improvement in urinary function also was seen with nerve-sparing techniques.⁸² Replacement of resected nerves with nerve grafts does not appear to be effective for patients undergoing wide resection of the neurovascular bundles.⁸³

Pelvic Lymph Node Dissection

The decision to perform PLND should be guided by the probability of nodal metastases. The NCCN Guidelines Panel chose 2% as the cutoff

for PLND since this avoids 47.7% of PLNDs at a cost of missing 12.1% of positive pelvic lymph nodes.⁸⁴

PLND should be performed using an extended technique.^{85,86} An extended PLND includes removal of all node-bearing tissue from an area bounded by the external iliac vein anteriorly, the pelvic side wall laterally, the bladder wall medially, the floor of the pelvis posteriorly, Cooper's ligament distally, and the internal iliac artery proximally. Removal of more lymph nodes using the extended technique has been associated with an increased likelihood of finding lymph node metastases, thereby providing more complete staging.⁸⁷⁻⁸⁹ A survival advantage with more extensive lymphadenectomy has been suggested by several studies, possibly due to elimination of microscopic metastases.^{88,90-92} PLND can be performed safely laparoscopically, robotically, or open, and complication rates should be similar for the three approaches.

Radiation Therapy

External Beam Radiation Therapy

Over the past several decades, RT techniques have evolved to allow higher doses of radiation to be administered safely. 3D conformal radiation therapy (3D-CRT) uses computer software to integrate CT images of the patients' internal anatomy in the treatment position, which allows higher cumulative doses to be delivered with lower risk of late effects.^{24,93-95} The second-generation 3D technique, intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT), is used increasingly in practice⁹⁶ because compared to 3D-CRT, it significantly reduces the risk of gastrointestinal toxicities and rates of salvage therapy without increasing side effects, although treatment cost is increased.⁹⁷⁻⁹⁹

Daily prostate localization using image-guided radiation therapy (IGRT) is essential with either 3D-CRT or IMRT for target margin reduction and treatment accuracy. Imaging techniques, such as ultrasound, implanted fiducials, electromagnetic targeting and tracking, or endorectal balloon, can improve cure rates and decrease complications.

These techniques have permitted safer dose escalation, and results of randomized trials have suggested that dose escalation is associated with improved biochemical outcomes.¹⁰⁰⁻¹⁰³ Kuban and colleagues¹⁰³ published an analysis on their dose-escalation trial of 301 patients with stage T1b to T3 prostate cancer. Freedom from biochemical or clinical failure was higher in the group randomized to 78 Gy compared to 70 Gy (78% vs. 59%, $P = .004$) at a median follow-up of 8.7 years. The difference was even greater among patients with diagnostic PSA >10 ng/mL (78% vs. 39%, $P = .001$). In light of these findings, the conventional 70 Gy dose is no longer considered adequate. A dose of 75.6 to 79.2 Gy in conventional fractions to the prostate (with or without seminal vesicles) is appropriate for patients with low-risk cancers. Intermediate-risk and high-risk patients should receive doses up to 81.0 Gy.^{97,104,105} Moderately hypofractionated image-guided IMRT regimens (2.4–4 Gy per fraction over 4–6 weeks) have been tested in randomized trials and efficacy and toxicity have been similar to conventionally fractionated IMRT.^{106,107} These RT techniques can be considered as an alternative to conventionally fractionated regimens when clinically indicated.

EBRT of the primary prostate tumor shows several distinct advantages over radical prostatectomy. RT avoids complications associated with operation, such as bleeding and transfusion-related effects, and risks associated with anesthesia, such as myocardial infarction and pulmonary embolus. 3D-CRT and IMRT techniques are available widely and are possible for patients over a wide range of ages. EBRT includes

a low risk of urinary incontinence and stricture as well as a good chance of short-term preservation of erectile function.¹⁰⁸

The disadvantages of EBRT include a treatment course of 8 to 9 weeks. Up to 50% of patients have some temporary bladder or bowel symptoms during treatment. There is a low but definite risk of protracted rectal symptoms from radiation proctitis, and the risk of erectile dysfunction increases over time.^{108,109} In addition, if the cancer recurs, salvage radical prostatectomy is associated with a higher risk of complications than primary radical prostatectomy.¹¹⁰ Contraindications to RT include prior pelvic irradiation, active inflammatory disease of the rectum, or a permanent indwelling Foley catheter. Relative contraindications include very low bladder capacity, chronic moderate or severe diarrhea, bladder outlet obstruction requiring a suprapubic catheter, and inactive ulcerative colitis.

EBRT for Early Disease

EBRT is one of the principle treatment options for clinically localized prostate cancer. The NCCN Guidelines Panel consensus was that modern RT and surgical series show similar progression-free survival in low-risk patients treated with radical prostatectomy or RT. In a study of 3546 patients treated with brachytherapy plus EBRT, disease-free survival remained steady at 73% between 15 and 25 years of follow up.¹¹¹

EBRT for High-Risk or Very High-Risk Patients

EBRT has demonstrated efficacy in patients at high risk and very high risk. One study randomized 415 patients to EBRT alone or EBRT plus 3-year ADT.¹¹² In another study (RTOG 8531), 977 patients with T3 disease treated with RT were randomized to adjuvant ADT or ADT at relapse.¹¹³ Two other randomized phase III trials evaluated long-term ADT with or without radiation in mostly T3 patients.^{114,115} In all four

studies, the combination group showed improved disease-specific and overall survival compared to single-modality treatment.

Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy

The relatively slow proliferation rate of prostate cancer is reflected in a low α/β ratio,¹¹⁶ most commonly reported between 1 and 4. These values are similar to that for the rectal mucosa. Since the α/β ratio for prostate cancer is similar to or lower than the surrounding tissues responsible for most of the toxicity reported with RT, appropriately designed radiation treatment fields and schedules using extremely hypofractionated regimens should result in similar cancer control rates without an increased risk of late toxicity.

Stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT) is an emerging treatment technique that delivers highly conformal, high-dose radiation in 5 or fewer treatment fractions, which are safe to administer only with precise, image-guided delivery.¹¹⁷ Single institution series with median follow-up as long as 6 years report excellent biochemical progression-free survival and similar early toxicity (bladder, rectal, and quality of life) compared to standard radiation techniques.¹¹⁶⁻¹²² According to a pooled analysis of phase II trials, the 5-year biochemical relapse free survival is 95%, 84%, and 81% for low-, intermediate-, and high-risk patients, respectively.¹²³ SBRT can be considered cautiously as an alternative to conventionally fractionated regimens at clinics with appropriate technology, physics, and clinical expertise. Longer follow-up and prospective multi-institutional data are required to evaluate longer-term results, especially since late toxicity theoretically could be worse in hypofractionated regimens compared to conventional fractionation (1.8-2.0 Gy per fraction).

Brachytherapy

Brachytherapy is used traditionally for low-risk cases since earlier studies found it less effective than EBRT for high-risk disease.^{6,124}

However, increasing evidence suggests that technical advancements in brachytherapy may provide a role for contemporary brachytherapy in high-risk localized and locally advanced prostate cancer.¹²⁵

Brachytherapy involves placing radioactive sources into the prostate tissue. There are currently two methods for prostate brachytherapy: low dose-rate (LDR) and high dose-rate (HDR).

LDR Brachytherapy

LDR brachytherapy consists of placement of permanent seed implants in the prostate. The short range of the radiation emitted from these low-energy sources allows delivery of adequate dose levels to the cancer within the prostate, whereas excessive irradiation of the bladder and rectum can be avoided. Current brachytherapy techniques attempt to improve the radioactive seed placement and radiation dose distribution.

The advantage of brachytherapy is that the treatment is completed in 1 day with little time lost from normal activities. In appropriate patients, the cancer-control rates appear comparable to radical prostatectomy (over 90%) for low-risk tumors with medium-term follow-up.¹²⁶ In addition, the risk of incontinence is minimal in patients without a previous transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP), and erectile function is preserved in the short term.¹⁰⁹ Disadvantages of brachytherapy include the requirement for general anesthesia and the risk of acute urinary retention. Irritative voiding symptoms may persist for as long as 1 year after implantation. The risk of incontinence is greater after TURP because of acute retention and bladder neck contractures, and many patients develop progressive erectile dysfunction over several years. IMRT causes less acute and late genitourinary toxicity and similar

freedom from biochemical failure compared with iodine-125 or palladium-103 permanent seed implants.^{127,128}

Permanent brachytherapy as monotherapy is indicated for patients with low-risk cancers (cT1c–T2a, Gleason grade 2-6, PSA <10 ng/mL). For intermediate-risk cancers, brachytherapy may be combined with EBRT (45 Gy) with or without neoadjuvant ADT, but the complication rate increases.^{129,130} Patients with high-risk cancers are generally considered poor candidates for permanent brachytherapy.

Patients with very large or very small prostates, symptoms of bladder outlet obstruction (high International Prostate Symptom Score), or a previous TURP are not ideal candidates for brachytherapy. For these patients, implantation may be more difficult and there is an increased risk of side effects. Neoadjuvant ADT may be used to shrink the prostate to an acceptable size, however, increased toxicity would be expected from ADT and prostate size may not decline. Post-implant dosimetry should be performed to document the quality of the implant.¹³¹ The recommended prescribed doses for monotherapy are 145 Gy for iodine-125 and 125 Gy for palladium-103.

HDR Brachytherapy

HDR brachytherapy, which involves temporary insertion of a radiation source, is a newer approach that provides a “boost” dose in addition to EBRT for patients at high risk of recurrence. Combining EBRT (40-50 Gy) and HDR brachytherapy allows dose escalation while minimizing acute or late toxicity in patients with high-risk localized or locally advanced cancer.¹³²⁻¹³⁵ Studies have demonstrated reduced risk of recurrence with the addition of brachytherapy to EBRT.¹³⁶⁻¹³⁸ An analysis of a cohort of 12,745 high-risk patients found that treatment with brachytherapy (HR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.49-0.86) or brachytherapy plus EBRT (HR, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.66-0.90) lowered disease-specific mortality

compared to EBRT alone.¹³⁹ Common boost doses include 9.5 to 11.5 Gy x 2 fractions, 5.5 to 7.5 Gy x 3 fractions, or 4.0 to 6.0 Gy x 4 fractions. A commonly used regimen for HDR treatment alone includes 13.5 Gy x 2 fractions.

Addition of ADT (2 or 3 years) to brachytherapy and EBRT is common for patients at high risk of recurrence. The outcome of trimodality treatment is excellent, with 9-year progression-free survival and disease-specific survival reaching 87% and 91%, respectively.^{140,141} However, it remains unclear whether the ADT component contributes to outcome improvement. D'Amico and colleagues studied a cohort of 1342 patients with PSA over 20 ng/mL and clinical T3/T4 and/or Gleason score 8 to 10 disease.¹⁴² Addition of either EBRT or ADT to brachytherapy did not confer an advantage over brachytherapy alone. The use of all three modalities reduced prostate cancer-specific mortality compared to brachytherapy alone (adjusted HR, 0.32; 95% CI, 0.14-0.73). Other analyses did not find an improvement in failure rate when ADT was added to brachytherapy and EBRT.^{143,144}

Two groups have observed a lower risk of urinary frequency, urgency, and rectal pain with HDR brachytherapy compared with LDR brachytherapy (permanent seed implant).^{145,146} Vargas and colleagues¹⁴⁷ reported that HDR brachytherapy results in a lower risk of erectile dysfunction than LDR brachytherapy.

Proton Therapy

Proton beams can be used as an alternative radiation source.¹⁴⁸ The costs associated with proton beam facility construction and proton beam treatment are high.¹⁴⁹ Two comparisons between men treated with proton beam therapy and EBRT show similar early toxicity rates.^{149,150} A single-center report of prospectively collected quality-of-life data 3 months, 12 months, and >2 years after treatment revealed significant

problems with incontinence, bowel dysfunction, and impotence.¹⁵⁰ Perhaps most concerning is that only 28% of men with normal erectile function maintained normal erectile function after therapy.

The NCCN panel echoed the following statement by ASTRO in its review of proton beam therapy: "Prostate cancer has the most patients treated with conformal proton therapy of any other disease site. The outcome is similar to IMRT therapy, however, with no clear advantage from clinical data for either technique in disease control or prevention of late toxicity. This is a site where further head-to-head clinical trials may be needed to determine the role of proton beam therapy. In addition, careful attention must be paid to the role of dosimetric issues including correction for organ motion in this disease. Based on current data, proton therapy is an option for prostate cancer, but no clear benefit over the existing therapy of IMRT photons has been demonstrated."¹⁵¹

Radiation for Metastases

Radiation is an effective means of palliating bone metastases from prostate cancer. In May 2013, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved radium-223 dichloride, an alpha particle-emitting radioactive agent. This first-in-class radiopharmaceutical was approved for treatment of metastatic castration-recurrent prostate cancer (CRPC) in patients with symptomatic bone metastases and no known visceral metastatic disease. Approval was based on clinical data from a multicenter, phase III, randomized trial including 921 men with symptomatic CRPC, 2 or more bone metastases, and no known visceral disease.¹⁵² Fifty-seven percent of the patients received prior docetaxel and all patients received best supportive care. Patients were randomized in a 2:1 ratio to 6 monthly radium-223 intravenous injections or placebo. Compared to placebo, radium-223 significantly improved overall survival (median 14.9 months vs. 11.3 months; HR,

0.70; 95% CI, 0.058–0.83; $P < .001$) and prolonged time to first skeletal-related event (SRE) (median 15.6 months vs. 9.8 months). Grade 3/4 hematologic toxicity was low (3% neutropenia, 6% thrombocytopenia, 13% anemia), likely due to the short range of radioactivity.¹⁵² Fecal elimination of the agent led to generally mild non-hematological side effects, which included nausea, diarrhea, and vomiting.

Beta-emitting radiopharmaceuticals are an effective and appropriate option for patients with wide-spread metastatic disease, particularly if they are no longer candidates for effective chemotherapy.¹⁵³ Since many patients have multifocal bone pain, systemic targeted treatment of skeletal metastases offers the potential of pain relief with minimal side effects. Unlike the alpha-emitting agent radium-223, beta-emitters confer no survival advantage and are palliative. Radiopharmaceuticals developed for the treatment of painful bone metastases most commonly used for prostate cancer include strontium-89 (89Sr) and samarium-153 (153Sm).¹⁵⁴

Isolated symptomatic bone metastases can be managed with EBRT. Recent studies have confirmed the common practice in Canada and Europe of managing prostate cancer with bone metastases with a short course of radiation. A short course of 8 Gy x 1 is as effective as and less costly than 30 Gy in 10 fractions.¹⁵⁵ In a randomized trial of 898 patients with bone metastases, grade 2-4 acute toxicity was observed less often in the 8-Gy arm (10%) than the 30-Gy arm (17%) ($P = .002$); however, the retreatment rate was higher in the 8-Gy group (18%) than in the 30-Gy group (9%) ($P < .001$).¹⁵⁶ Most patients should be managed with a single fraction of 8 Gy for non-vertebral metastases based on therapeutic guidelines from the American College of Radiology.¹⁵³

Other Local Therapies

Cryosurgery, also known as cryotherapy or cryoablation, is an evolving minimally invasive therapy that achieves damage to tumor tissue through local freezing. The reported 5-year biochemical disease-free rate following cryotherapy ranged from 65% to 92% in low-risk patients using different definitions of biochemical failure.¹⁵⁷ A report suggests that cryotherapy and radical prostatectomy give similar oncologic results for unilateral prostate cancer.¹⁵⁸ A study by Donnelly and colleagues¹⁵⁹ randomly assigned 244 men with T2 or T3 disease to either cryotherapy or RT. All patients received neoadjuvant ADT. There was no difference in 3-year overall or disease-free survival. Patients who received cryotherapy reported poorer sexual function.¹⁶⁰ For patients with locally advanced cancer, cryoablation was associated with lower 8-year biochemical progression-free rate compared to EBRT in a small trial of 62 patients, although disease-specific and overall survival were similar.¹⁶¹

Other emerging local therapies, such as high intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) and vascular-targeted photodynamic (VTP), also warrant further study.¹⁶²

Androgen Deprivation Therapy

ADT is administered as primary systemic therapy in advanced disease or as neoadjuvant/concomitant/adjuvant therapy in combination with radiation in localized or locally advanced prostate cancers.

Types of ADT

ADT can be accomplished using bilateral orchiectomy (surgical castration) or a luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone (LHRH, also known as gonadotropin-releasing hormone or GnRH) agonist or antagonist (medical castration), which are equally effective. In patients

with overt metastases who are at risk of developing symptoms associated with the flare in testosterone with initial LHRH agonist alone, anti-androgen therapy should precede or be coadministered with LHRH agonist for at least 7 days to diminish ligand binding to the androgen receptor.^{163,164} LHRH antagonists rapidly and directly inhibit the release of androgens, unlike LHRH agonists that initially stimulate LHRH receptors before leading to hypogonadism. Therefore, no initial flare is associated with these agents and no coadministration of anti-androgen is necessary. Medical or surgical castration combined with an anti-androgen is known as combined androgen blockade (CAB). No prospective randomized studies have demonstrated a survival advantage with CAB over the serial use of an LHRH agonist and an anti-androgen.¹⁶⁵ Meta-analysis data suggest that bicalutamide may provide an incremental relative improvement in overall survival by 5% to 20% over LHRH agonist monotherapy, but a clinical trial is necessary to test this hypothesis.^{166,167} More complete disruption of the androgen axis (finasteride or dutasteride, anti-androgen, plus medical or surgical castration) provides little if any benefit over castration alone.¹⁶⁸ Anti-androgen monotherapy appears to be less effective than medical or surgical castration and is not used routinely as primary ADT. The side effects are different than ADT, but anti-androgen monotherapy appears more tolerable.

ADT for Low-Risk Patients

In the community, ADT has been used commonly as primary therapy for early-stage, low-risk disease, especially in the elderly. This practice has been challenged by a large cohort study of 19,271 elderly men with T1-T2 tumors.¹⁶⁹ No survival benefit was found in patients receiving ADT compared to observation alone. Placing elderly patients with early prostate cancer on ADT should not be routine practice.

ADT for Intermediate-Risk Patients

The addition of short-term ADT to radiation improved overall and cancer-specific survival in three randomized trials containing 20% to 60% of men with intermediate-risk prostate cancer (Tran Tasman Radiation Oncology Group [TROG] 9601, Dana Farber Cancer Institute [DFCI] 95096, and Radiation Therapy Oncology Group [RTOG] 9408).¹⁷⁰⁻¹⁷² Only a cancer-specific survival benefit was noted in a fourth trial that recruited mostly high-risk men (RTOG 8610).¹⁷³ The addition of short-course ADT to RT in men with intermediate-risk disease is an option.

ADT for High-Risk or Very High-Risk Patients

As discussed in the *Radiation Therapy* section, ADT combined with RT is an effective primary treatment for patients at high risk or very high risk. Combination therapy was associated consistently with improved disease-specific and overall survival compared to single-modality treatment in randomized phase III studies.¹¹²⁻¹¹⁵

Increasing evidence favors long-term over short-term neoadjuvant/concurrent/adjuvant ADT for high-risk patients. The RTOG 9202 trial included 1521 patients with T2c-T4 prostate cancer who received 4 months of ADT before and during RT.¹⁷⁴ They were randomized to no further treatment or an additional 2 years of ADT. At 10 years, the long-term group was superior for all endpoints except overall survival. A subgroup analysis of patients with Gleason score 8 to 10 found an advantage in overall survival for long-term ADT (32% vs. 45%, $P = .0061$). The European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) 22961 trial also showed superior survival when 2.5 years of ADT were added to RT given with 6 months of ADT in 970 patients, most of whom had T2c-T3, N0 disease.¹⁷⁵ In a secondary analysis of RTOG 8531 that mandated lifelong ADT, those

who adhered to the protocol had better survival than those who discontinued ADT within 5 years.¹⁷⁶

Adjuvant ADT after Radical Prostatectomy

Neoadjuvant or adjuvant ADT generally confers no added benefit in men who have undergone radical prostatectomy.¹⁷⁷ The role of adjuvant ADT after radical prostatectomy is restricted to cases where positive pelvic lymph nodes are found, although reports in this area reveal mixed findings. Messing and colleagues randomly assigned patients to immediate ADT or observation who were found to have positive lymph nodes at the time of radical prostatectomy.¹⁷⁸ At a median follow-up of 11.9 years, those receiving immediate ADT had a significant improvement in overall survival (HR, 1.84; 95% CI, 1.01-3.35). However, a meta-analysis resulted in a recommendation against ADT for pathologic lymph node metastatic prostate cancer in the ASCO guidelines.¹⁶⁵ A cohort analysis of 731 men with positive nodes failed to demonstrate a survival benefit of ADT initiated within 4 months of radical prostatectomy compared to observation.¹⁷⁹

Anti-androgen monotherapy (bicalutamide) after completion of primary treatment was investigated as an adjuvant therapy in patients with localized or locally advanced prostate cancer, but results did not support its use in this setting.^{180,181}

ADT for Biochemical Recurrence

Patients with a rising PSA level and with no symptomatic or clinical evidence of cancer after definitive treatment present a therapeutic dilemma regarding the role of ADT. Some of these patients will ultimately die of their cancer. Timing of ADT for patients whose only evidence of cancer is a rising PSA is influenced by PSA velocity, patient and physician anxiety, and the short-term and long-term side effects of ADT. Although early, sustained ADT is acceptable, an alternative is

close observation until progression of cancer, at which time appropriate therapeutic options may be considered. Earlier ADT may be better than delayed therapy, although the definitions of early and late (ie, what level of PSA) remain controversial. Because the benefit of ADT is unclear,¹⁶⁵ treatment should be individualized until definitive studies are completed. Patients with an elevated PSA and/or a shorter PSA doubling time (rapid PSA velocity) and an otherwise long life expectancy should be encouraged to consider ADT earlier.

Intermittent Versus Continuous ADT

ADT is associated with substantial side effects, which generally increase with the duration of treatment. Intermittent ADT is an approach based on the premise that cycles of androgen deprivation followed by re-exposure may delay “androgen independence,” reduce treatment morbidity, and improve quality of life.^{182,183}

The Canadian-led PR.7 trial provided the best phase III data to date comparing intermittent and continuous ADT in non-metastatic patients experiencing biochemical failure. Crook and colleagues¹⁸⁴ randomly assigned 1386 patients with PSA >3 ng/mL after radiation therapy to intermittent ADT or continuous ADT. At a median follow-up of 6.9 years, the intermittent approach was non-inferior to continuous ADT with respect to overall survival (8.8 vs. 9.1 years, respectively; HR, 1.02; 95% CI, 0.86–1.21). More patients died from prostate cancer in the intermittent ADT arm (120 of 690 patients) than the continuous ADT arm (94 of 696 patients) but this was balanced by more non-prostate cancer deaths in the continuous ADT arm. Physical function, fatigue, urinary problems, hot flashes, libido, and erectile dysfunction showed modest improvement in the intermittent ADT group.

The test population was heterogenous, so it remains unclear which of these asymptomatic patients benefitted from treatment. It is possible

that many of these patients could have delayed ADT without harm. The test population had a low disease burden and 59% of deaths in the trial were not related to prostate cancer, a follow-up longer than 6.9 years may be required for disease-specific deaths to out-balance deaths by other causes.

An unplanned Cox regression analysis of the trial showed that men with Gleason sum >7 in the continuous ADT arm lived 14 months longer than those with the same Gleason sum in the intermittent ADT arm.¹⁸⁴ The caveats to this analysis are that pathology was not centrally reviewed and the study was not powered to detect a small difference based on Gleason sum.

ADT for Nodal or Metastatic Disease

The EORTC 30846 trial randomized 234 treatment-naïve, node-positive patients to immediate versus delayed ADT.¹⁸⁵ At 13 years, the authors report similar survival between the two arms, although the study was not powered to show non-inferiority.

ADT is the gold standard of initial treatment for patients with metastatic disease at presentation.¹⁶⁵ A PSA value of 4 ng/mL or less after 7 months of ADT is associated with improved survival of patients newly diagnosed with metastatic prostate cancer.¹⁸⁶

Intermittent versus Continuous ADT

Hussain and colleagues¹⁸⁷ conducted the SWOG (Southwest Oncology Group) 9346 trial to evaluate intermittent and continuous ADT in metastatic patients. After 7 months of induction ADT, 1535 patients whose PSA dropped to 4 ng/mL or below (thereby demonstrating androgen-sensitivity) were randomized to intermittent or continuous ADT. At a median follow-up of 9.8 years, median survival was 5.1 years for the intermittent ADT arm and 5.8 years for the continuous ADT arm.

The hazard ratio for death with intermittent ADT was 1.10 with a 90% confidence interval between 0.99 and 1.23, which exceeded the pre-specified upper boundary of 1.20 for non-inferiority. The authors stated that the survival results were inconclusive, and that a 20% greater mortality risk with the intermittent approach cannot be ruled out. The study demonstrated better erectile function and mental health in patients receiving intermittent ADT at 3 months, but the difference became insignificant thereafter.

In a post hoc stratification analysis of the trial, patients with minimal disease had a median survival of 5.4 years when receiving intermittent ADT versus 6.9 years when receiving continuous ADT (HR, 1.19; 95% CI, 0.98–1.43).¹⁸⁷ The median survival was 4.9 years in the intermittent ADT arm compared to 4.4 years in the continuous ADT arm for patients with extensive disease (HR, 1.02; 95% CI, 0.85–1.22). These subgroup analyses are hypothesis-generating.

Adverse Effects of Traditional ADT

ADT has a variety of adverse effects including hot flashes, hot flushes, vasomotor instability, osteoporosis, greater incidence of clinical fractures, obesity, insulin resistance, alterations in lipids, and greater risk for diabetes and cardiovascular disease.^{188,189} In general, the side effects of continuous ADT increase with the duration of treatment. Patients and their medical providers should be advised about these risks prior to treatment.

Bone Health During ADT

ADT is associated with greater risk for clinical fractures. In large population-based studies, for example, ADT was associated with a 21% to 54% relative increase in fracture risk.¹⁹⁰⁻¹⁹² Longer treatment duration conferred greater fracture risk. Age and comorbidity also were associated with higher fracture incidence. ADT increases bone turnover

and decreases bone mineral density,¹⁹³⁻¹⁹⁶ a surrogate for fracture risk. Bone mineral density of the hip and spine decreases by approximately 2% to 3% per year during initial therapy. Most studies have reported that bone mineral density continues to decline steadily during long-term therapy. ADT significantly decreases muscle mass,¹⁹⁷ and treatment-related sarcopenia appears to contribute to frailty and increased risk of falls in older men.

The NCCN Guidelines Panel recommends screening and treatment for osteoporosis according to guidelines for the general population from the National Osteoporosis Foundation.¹⁹⁸ The National Osteoporosis Foundation guidelines include: 1) supplemental calcium (1200 mg daily) and vitamin D3 (800-1000 IU daily) for all men older than age 50 years; and 2) additional treatment for men when the 10-year probability of hip fracture is $\geq 3\%$ or the 10-year probability of a major osteoporosis-related fracture is $\geq 20\%$. Fracture risk can be assessed using the algorithm FRAX®, recently released by WHO.¹⁹⁹ ADT should be considered “secondary osteoporosis” using the FRAX® algorithm.

Earlier randomized controlled trials have demonstrated that bisphosphonates increase bone mineral density, a surrogate for fracture risk, during ADT.²⁰⁰⁻²⁰² In 2011, the FDA approved denosumab as a treatment to prevent bone loss and fractures during ADT. Denosumab binds to and inhibits the receptor activator of NF- κ B ligand (RANKL), thereby blunting osteoclast function and delaying generalized bone resorption and local bone destruction. Approval was based on a phase III study that randomized 1468 non-metastatic prostate cancer patients undergoing ADT to either biannual denosumab or placebo. At 24 months, denosumab increased bone mineral density by 6.7% and reduced fractures (1.5% vs. 3.9%) compared to placebo.²⁰³ Denosumab also was approved for prevention of SREs in patients with bone metastasis (see *Chemotherapy and Immunotherapy*).

Currently, treatment with denosumab (60 mg every 6 months), zoledronic acid (5 mg IV annually), or alendronate (70 mg PO weekly) is recommended when the absolute fracture risk warrants drug therapy. A baseline dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (DEXA) scan before start of therapy and a follow-up DEXA scan after one year of therapy is recommended by the International Society for Clinical Densitometry to monitor response. Use of biochemical markers of bone turnover is not recommended. There are no existing guidelines on the optimal frequency of vitamin D testing, but vitamin D levels can be measured when DEXA scans are obtained.

Diabetes and Cardiovascular Disease

In a landmark population-based study, ADT was associated with higher incidence of diabetes and cardiovascular disease.²⁰⁴ After controlling for other variables, including age and comorbidity, ADT with a GnRH agonist was associated with a greater risk for new diabetes (HR, 1.44; $P < .001$), coronary artery disease (HR, 1.16; $P < .001$), and myocardial infarction (HR, 1.11; $P = .03$). Studies that have evaluated the potential relationship between ADT and cardiovascular mortality produced mixed results.^{173,204-210}

Several mechanisms may contribute to a greater risk for diabetes and cardiovascular disease during ADT. ADT increases fat mass and decreases lean body mass.^{197,211,212} ADT with a GnRH agonist increases fasting plasma insulin levels^{213,214} and decreases insulin sensitivity.²¹⁵ ADT also increases serum levels of cholesterol and triglycerides.^{213,216}

Cardiovascular disease and diabetes are leading causes of morbidity and mortality in the general population. Based on the observed adverse metabolic effects of ADT and the association between ADT and higher incidence of diabetes and cardiovascular disease, screening for and

intervention to prevent/treat diabetes and cardiovascular disease are recommended for men receiving ADT. Whether strategies for screening, prevention, and treatment of diabetes and cardiovascular disease in men receiving ADT should differ from those of the general population remains uncertain.

Hormone Therapy for CRPC

Most men with advanced disease eventually stop responding to traditional ADT and are categorized as castration-recurrent (also known as castration-resistant). Research has shown enhancement of autocrine and/or paracrine androgen synthesis in the tumor microenvironment of men receiving ADT.^{217,218} This demonstrates the importance of androgen signaling from non-gonadal sources in CRPC, previously thought to be resistant to further hormone therapies. The development of novel hormonal agents demonstrating efficacy in the metastatic CRPC setting dramatically changed the paradigm of CRPC treatment.

Abiraterone Acetate

In April 2011, the FDA approved the androgen synthesis inhibitor, abiraterone acetate, in combination with low-dose prednisone, for the treatment of men with metastatic CRPC who have received prior chemotherapy containing docetaxel.

FDA approval in the post-docetaxel setting was based on the results of a phase III, randomized, placebo-controlled trial (COU-AA-301) in men with metastatic CRPC previously treated with docetaxel-containing regimens.^{219,220} Patients were randomized to receive either abiraterone acetate 1000 mg orally once daily (n=797) or placebo once daily (n=398), and both arms received daily prednisone. In the final analysis, the median survival was 15.8 vs. 11.2 months in the abiraterone and placebo arm, respectively (HR, 0.74; 95% CI, 0.64-0.86; $P < .0001$).²²⁰

Time to radiographic progression, PSA decline, and pain palliation also were improved by abiraterone acetate.^{220,221}

FDA approval in the pre-docetaxel setting occurred December 10, 2012 and was based on a randomized phase 3 trial of abiraterone acetate and prednisone (n=546) versus prednisone alone (n=542) in men with asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic, metastatic CRPC.²²² Most men in this trial were not taking narcotics for cancer pain and none had visceral metastatic disease or prior ketoconazole exposure. The co-primary endpoint of radiographic progression-free survival was improved by treatment from 8.3 to 16.5 months (HR, 0.53; $P < .001$). Overall survival was improved by treatment from 27.2 months to not reached (HR, 0.75; $P = .01$), but this did not meet pre-specified statistical significance. Key secondary endpoints of time to symptomatic deterioration, time to chemotherapy initiation, time to pain progression, and PSA progression-free survival improved significantly with abiraterone treatment, and PSA declines (62% vs. 24% with >50% decline) and radiographic responses (36% vs. 16% RECIST responses) were more common.

The most common adverse reactions with abiraterone acetate/prednisone (>5%) were fatigue (39%); back or joint discomfort (28%-32%); peripheral edema (28%); diarrhea, nausea, or constipation (22%); hypokalemia (17%); hypophosphatemia (24%); atrial fibrillation (4%); muscle discomfort (14%); hot flushes (22%); urinary tract infection; cough; hypertension (22%, severe hypertension in 4%); urinary frequency and nocturia; dyspepsia; or upper respiratory tract infection. The most common adverse drug reactions that resulted in drug discontinuation were increased aspartate aminotransferase and/or alanine aminotransferase (11%-12%), or cardiac disorders (19%, serious in 6%). Thus, monitoring of liver function, potassium and phosphate levels, and blood pressure readings on a monthly basis, at

least initially is warranted during abiraterone acetate/prednisone therapy. Symptom-directed assessment for cardiac disease also is warranted, particularly in patients with pre-existing cardiovascular disease.

Enzalutamide

On August 31, 2012, the FDA approved enzalutamide, an anti-androgen, for treatment of men with metastatic CRPC who had received prior docetaxel chemotherapy. Approval was based on the results of the AFFIRM randomized, phase 3, placebo-controlled trial.²²³ AFFIRM randomized 1199 men to enzalutamide or placebo in a 2:1 ratio and the primary endpoint was overall survival. Median survival was improved with enzalutamide from 13.6 to 18.4 months (HR, 0.63; $P < .001$). Survival was improved in all subgroups analyzed, which included men with poor performance status, high or low PSA values, visceral metastases, significant pain, and more than 2 prior chemotherapy regimens. Secondary endpoints also were improved significantly, which included the proportion of men with >50% PSA decline (54% vs. 2%), radiographic response (29% vs. 4%), radiographic progression-free survival (8.3 vs. 2.9 months), and time to first SRE (16.7 vs. 13.3 months). Quality of life measured using validated surveys was improved with enzalutamide compared to placebo. Adverse events were mild, and included fatigue (34% vs. 29%), diarrhea (21% vs. 18%), hot flushes (20% vs. 10%), headache (12% vs. 6%), and seizures (0.6% vs. 0%). The incidence of cardiac disorders did not differ between the arms. Enzalutamide is dosed at 160 mg daily.

Patients in the AFFIRM study were maintained on GnRH agonist/antagonist therapy and could receive bone supportive care medications. The seizure risk in the enzalutamide FDA label was 0.9% versus 0.6% in the manuscript.^{223,224} Thus, enzalutamide represents a new treatment option for men in the post-docetaxel metastatic CRPC

setting and is a reasonable choice in men who are not candidates for chemotherapy. Level 1 evidence to support the routine use of enzalutamide in the pre-docetaxel setting may derive from the results of the PREVAIL phase 3 randomized study, which completed accrual in 2012. There is evidence of clinical activity from uncontrolled studies of enzalutamide in the pre-chemotherapy metastatic CRPC setting.²²⁵

Chemotherapy and Immunotherapy

Recent research has expanded the therapeutic options for patients with metastatic CRPC depending on the presence or absence of symptoms.

Docetaxel

Two randomized phase III studies evaluated docetaxel-based regimens in symptomatic or rapidly progressive disease (TAX 327 and SWOG 9916).²²⁶⁻²²⁸ TAX 327 compared docetaxel (every three weeks or weekly) plus prednisone to mitoxantrone plus prednisone in 1006 men.²²⁷ Every 3-week docetaxel resulted in higher median overall survival than mitoxantrone (18.9 vs. 16.5 months; $P = .009$). This survival benefit was maintained at extended follow-up.²²⁸ The SWOG 9916 study also showed improved survival with docetaxel when combined with estramustine compared to mitoxantrone plus prednisone.²²⁶ Docetaxel is FDA-approved for metastatic CRPC. The standard regimen is every 3 weeks. A randomized trial of 177 patients reported that a 2-weekly regimen results in a longer time to treatment failure (5.6 vs. 4.9 months; $P = .014$) and a lower incidence of severe adverse events (36% vs. 53%) compared to the 3-weekly regimen.²²⁹ This alternate schedule may be useful in certain circumstances.

Cabazitaxel

In June 2010, the FDA approved cabazitaxel, a semi-synthetic taxane derivative, for men with metastatic CRPC previously treated with a

docetaxel-containing regimen. An international randomized phase III trial²³⁰ randomized 755 men with progressive metastatic CRPC to receive cabazitaxel 25 mg/m² or mitoxantrone 12 mg/m², each with daily prednisone. A 2.4 month improvement in overall survival was demonstrated with cabazitaxel compared to mitoxantrone (HR, 0.72; $P < .0001$). The improvement in survival was balanced against a higher toxic death rate with cabazitaxel (4.9% vs. 1.9%), which was due, in large part, to differences in rates of sepsis and renal failure. Febrile neutropenia was observed in 7.5% of cabazitaxel-treated men vs. 1.3% of mitoxantrone-treated men. The incidences of severe diarrhea (6%), fatigue (5%), nausea/vomiting (2%), anemia (11%), and thrombocytopenia (4%) also were higher in cabazitaxel-treated men, which indicated the need for vigilance and treatment or prophylaxis in this setting to prevent febrile neutropenia. The survival benefit was sustained at an updated analysis with a median follow-up of 25.5 months.²³¹

Sipuleucel-T

In April 2010, sipuleucel-T became the first in a new class of cancer immunotherapeutic agents to be approved by the FDA. This autologous cancer “vaccine” involves collection of the white blood cell fraction containing antigen-presenting cells from each patient, exposure of the cells to the prostatic acid phosphatase -granulocyte macrophage colony-stimulating factor (PAP-GM-CSF recombinant fusion protein), and subsequent reinfusion of the cells. The pivotal study was a phase III, multicenter, randomized, double-blind trial (D9902B).²³² Five hundred and twelve patients with minimally symptomatic or asymptomatic metastatic CRPC were randomized 2:1 to receive sipuleucel-T or placebo. Median survival in the vaccine arm was 25.8 months compared to 21.7 months in the control arm. Sipuleucel-T treatment resulted in a 22% reduction in mortality risk (HR, 0.78; 95%

CI, 0.61-0.98; $P = .03$). Common complications included mild to moderate chills (54.1%), pyrexia (29.3%), and headache (16.0%), which were usually transient.

Agents Related to Bone Health in CRPC

In a multicenter study, 643 men with CRPC and asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic bone metastases were randomized to intravenous zoledronic acid every 3 weeks or placebo.²³³ At 15 months, fewer men in the zoledronic acid 4 mg group than men in the placebo group had SREs (33% vs. 44%; $P = .02$). An update at 24 months also revealed an increase in the median time to first SRE (488 days vs. 321 days; $P = .01$).²³⁴ No significant differences were found in overall survival. Other bisphosphonates have not been shown to be effective for prevention of disease-related skeletal complications.

Denosumab was compared to zoledronic acid in a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study in men with CRPC.²³⁵ The absolute incidence of SREs was similar in the two groups; however, the median time to first SRE was delayed by 3.6 months by denosumab compared to zoledronic acid (20.7 vs. 17.1 months; $P = .0002$ for non-inferiority, $P = .008$ for superiority). The rates of important SREs with denosumab were similar to zoledronic acid and included spinal cord compression (3% vs. 4%), need for radiation (19% vs. 21%), and pathologic fracture (14% vs. 15%).

Treatment-related toxicities reported for zoledronic acid and denosumab were similar and included hypocalcemia (more common with denosumab 13% vs. 6%), arthralgias, and osteonecrosis of the jaw (ONJ, 1%-2% incidence). Most, but not all, patients who develop ONJ have preexisting dental problems.²³⁶

NCCN Recommendations

Initial Prostate Cancer Diagnosis

Initial suspicion of prostate cancer is based on an abnormal DRE or an elevated PSA level. A separate NCCN Guidelines Panel has written guidelines for prostate cancer early detection (see [NCCN Guidelines for Prostate Cancer Early Detection](#)). Definitive diagnosis requires biopsies of the prostate, usually performed by a urologist using a needle under transrectal ultrasound (TRUS) guidance. A pathologist assigns a Gleason primary and secondary grade to the biopsy specimen. Clinical staging is based on the TNM 2009 classification from the AJCC Staging Manual, 7th edition.²³⁷ However, NCCN treatment recommendations are based on risk stratification rather than AJCC prognostic grouping.

Pathology synoptic reports (protocols) are useful for reporting results from examinations of surgical specimens; these reports assist pathologists in providing clinically useful and relevant information. The NCCN Guidelines Panel favors pathology synoptic reports from the College of American Pathologists (CAP) that comply with the Commission on Cancer requirements.²³⁸

Initial Clinical Assessment and Staging Evaluation

For patients with a life expectancy of 5 years or less and without clinical symptoms, further workup or treatment should be delayed until symptoms develop. If high-risk factors (bulky T3-T4 cancers or Gleason score 8-10) for developing hydronephrosis or metastases within 5 years are present, ADT or RT may be considered. Patients with advanced cancer may be candidates for observation if the risks and complications of therapy are judged to be greater than the benefit in terms of prolonged life or improved quality of life.

For symptomatic patients and/or those with a life expectancy of greater than 5 years, a bone scan is appropriate for patients with any of the following: 1) T1 disease with PSA over 20 ng/mL or T2 disease with PSA over 10 ng/mL;²³⁹ 2) a Gleason score of 8 or higher; 3) T3 to T4 tumors; or 4) symptomatic disease. Pelvic CT or MRI scanning is recommended if there is T3 or T4 disease, or if T1 or T2 disease and a nomogram indicate that there is greater than 10% chance of lymph node involvement, although staging studies may not be cost effective until the chance of lymph node positivity reaches 45%.²⁴⁰ Biopsy should be considered for further evaluation of suspicious nodal findings. For all other patients, no additional imaging is required for staging. NCCN panelists voiced concern about inappropriate use of PET imaging in the community setting. FDG or fluoride PET is not recommended for initial assessment.

The staging workup is used to categorize patients according to their risk of recurrence or disease progression/recurrence into those with clinically localized disease at very low, low, intermediate, or high risk, or those with locally advanced at very high risk, or those with metastatic disease.

Very Low Risk

Men with all of the following tumor characteristics are categorized in the very low-risk group: clinical stage T1c, biopsy Gleason score ≤ 6 , PSA < 10 ng/mL, presence of disease in fewer than 3 biopsy cores, $\leq 50\%$ prostate cancer involvement in any core, and PSA density < 0.15 ng/mL/g. Given the potential side effects of definitive therapy, men in this group who have an estimated life expectancy less than 10 years should undergo observation. Unlike active surveillance, observation schedules do not involve biopsies. Men with very low risk and a life expectancy of 10 to 20 years should undergo active surveillance. For

patients who meet the very low-risk criteria but who have a life expectancy of 20 years or above, the NCCN Panel agreed that active surveillance, RT or brachytherapy, or radical prostatectomy are all viable options.

Low Risk

The NCCN Guidelines define the low-risk group as patients with tumors stage T1 to T2a, low Gleason score (≤ 6), and serum PSA level below 10 ng/mL. Observation is recommended for men with low-risk prostate cancer and life expectancy less than 10 years. If the patient's life expectancy is 10 years or more, initial treatment options include: 1) active surveillance; 2) RT or brachytherapy; or 3) radical prostatectomy with or without a PLND if the predicted probability of pelvic lymph node involvement is 2% or greater. ADT as a primary treatment for localized prostate cancer does not improve survival and is not recommended by the NCCN Guidelines Panel.

At this time, cryotherapy or other local therapies are not recommended as routine primary therapy for localized prostate cancer due to lack of long-term data comparing these treatments to radiation or radical prostatectomy.

Intermediate Risk

The NCCN Guidelines define the intermediate-risk group as patients with any T2b to T2c cancer, Gleason score of 7, or PSA value of 10 to 20 ng/mL. Patients with multiple adverse factors may be shifted into the high-risk category.

Options for patients with life expectancy less than 10 years include: 1) observation; 2) RT with or without ADT (4 to 6 months), and with or without brachytherapy; 3) brachytherapy alone.

Initial treatment options for patients with an expected survival of 10 years or more include: 1) radical prostatectomy, including a PLND if the predicted probability of lymph node metastasis is 2% or greater; 2) RT with or without 4 to 6 months of ADT, and with or without brachytherapy; 3) brachytherapy alone for patients with favorable factors (cT1c, Gleason score 7, low volume). Active surveillance is not recommended for patients with a life expectancy of >10 years (category 1).

High Risk

Men with prostate cancer that is clinically localized stage T3a, Gleason score 8 to 10, or PSA level greater than 20 ng/mL are categorized by the NCCN Guidelines Panel as high risk. Patients with multiple adverse factors may be shifted into the very high-risk category. The preferred treatment is RT in conjunction with 2 to 3 years of ADT (category 1); ADT alone is insufficient. In particular, patients with low-volume, high-grade tumor warrant aggressive local radiation combined with typically 2 or 3 years of ADT. The combination of EBRT and brachytherapy, with or without ADT (typically 2 or 3 years), is another primary treatment option. However, the optimal duration of ADT in this setting remains unclear.

Radical prostatectomy with PLND remains an option as a subset of men in the high-risk group may benefit from surgery.

Very High Risk

Patients at very high risk are defined by the NCCN Guidelines as those with clinical stage T3b to T4 (locally advanced). The options for this group include: 1) RT and long-term ADT (category 1); 2) EBRT plus brachytherapy with or without long-term ADT; 3) radical prostatectomy plus PLND in selected patients with no fixation to adjacent organs; or 4) ADT for patients not eligible for definitive therapy.

Nodal and Metastatic Disease

ADT or RT of the primary tumor plus 2 or 3 years ADT are options for patients with N1 disease on presentation.

ADT is recommended for patients with M1 cancer.

Disease Monitoring

For patients who choose active surveillance, an appropriate active surveillance schedule includes a PSA determination no more often than every 6 months unless clinically indicated, a DRE no more often than every 12 months unless clinically indicated, and repeat prostate biopsy no more often than every 12 months unless clinically indicated. A repeat prostate biopsy within 6 months of diagnosis is indicated if the initial biopsy was less than 10 cores or if assessment results show discordance.

Reliable parameters of prostate cancer progression await the results of ongoing clinical trials. A change in prostate exam or increase in PSA level may prompt consideration of a repeat biopsy at the discretion of the physician. A repeat biopsy can be considered as often as annually to assess for disease progression. Repeat biopsies are not indicated when life expectancy is less than 10 years or when men are on observation. Multiparametric MRI may be considered to exclude the presence of anterior cancer if the PSA level rises and systematic prostate biopsy remains negative.³³ However, multiparametric MRI is not recommended for routine use. PSA doubling time is not considered reliable enough to be used alone to detect disease progression.²⁴¹

If the repeat biopsy shows Gleason 4 or 5 disease, or if tumor is found in a greater number of cores or in a higher percentage of a given core, cancer progression may have occurred.

For patients initially treated with intent to cure, a serum PSA level should be measured every 6 to 12 months for the first 5 years and then annually. PSA testing every 3 months may be required for men at high risk of recurrence. When prostate cancer recurred after radical prostatectomy, Pound and colleagues found that 45% of patients experienced recurrence within the first 2 years, 77% within the first 5 years, and 96% by 10 years.²⁴² Because local recurrence may result in substantial morbidity and can, in rare cases, occur in the absence of a PSA elevation, an annual DRE also is appropriate to monitor for prostate cancer recurrence as well as to detect colorectal cancer. Similarly, after RT, the monitoring of serum PSA levels is recommended every 6 months for the first 5 years and then annually and a DRE is recommended annually. The clinician may opt to omit the DRE if PSA levels remain undetectable.

The intensity of clinical monitoring for patients presenting with nodal positive or metastatic disease is determined by the response to initial ADT, radiotherapy, or both. Follow-up evaluation of these patients should include a history and physical examination, DRE, and PSA determination every 3 to 6 months based on clinical judgment.

Patients being treated with either medical or surgical ADT are at risk for having or developing osteoporosis. A baseline bone mineral density study should be considered for these patients. Supplementation is recommended using calcium (500 mg) and vitamin D (400 IU). Men who are osteopenic/osteoporotic should be considered for bisphosphonate therapy.

Patients under observation should be monitored for symptom development at 6 to 12 month intervals. PSA, renal function and red cell mass may be assessed.

Adjuvant or Salvage Therapy after Radical Prostatectomy

Adjuvant Therapy

Most patients who have undergone a radical prostatectomy are cured of prostate cancer. However, some men will suffer pathologic or biochemical failure. Selecting men appropriately for adjuvant or salvage radiation is difficult. However, recently published trials provide high-level evidence that can be used to counsel patients more appropriately. Thompson and colleagues reported the results of the SWOG 8794 trial enrolling 425 men with extraprostatic cancer treated with radical prostatectomy. Patients were randomized to receive either adjuvant RT or usual care, and follow-up has reached a median of 12.6 years.²⁴³ The initial study report revealed that adjuvant RT reduced the risk of PSA relapse and disease recurrence.²⁴⁴ An update reported improved 10-year biochemical failure-free survival for high-risk patients (seminal vesicle positive) receiving post-prostatectomy adjuvant radiation compared to observation (36% vs. 12%; $P = .001$).²⁴⁵

Another randomized trial conducted by the EORTC²⁴⁶ compared post-prostatectomy observation and adjuvant RT in 1005 patients. All patients had extraprostatic extension and/or positive surgical margins. The 5-year biochemical progression-free survival significantly improved with RT compared to observation for patients with positive surgical margins (78% vs. 49%), but benefit was not seen for patients with negative surgical margins.

A German study by Wiegel and colleagues reported results on 268 patients.²⁴⁷ All participants had pT3 disease and undetectable PSA levels after radical prostatectomy. Postoperative radiation improved 5-year biochemical progression-free survival compared to observation alone (72% vs. 54%; HR, 0.53; 95% CI, 0.37-0.79). Collectively, these trial results suggest that continued follow-up of these series of patients may show a survival advantage.

Although observation after radical prostatectomy is appropriate, adjuvant RT after recuperation from operation (usually within 1 year) is likely beneficial in men with shorter PSA doubling times (<9 months) or adverse laboratory or pathologic features, which include positive surgical margin, seminal vesicle invasion, and/or extracapsular extension. Positive surgical margins are unfavorable especially if diffuse (>10 mm margin involvement or ≥ 3 sites of positivity) or associated with persistent serum levels of PSA. The defined target volumes include the prostate bed. The pelvic lymph nodes may be irradiated, but pelvic radiation is not necessary.

Several management options should be considered if positive lymph nodes are found during or after radical prostatectomy. ADT is a category 1 option. Another option is observation, which is a category 2A recommendation for very low-risk or low-risk patients but category 2B for patients at intermediate, high, or very high risk. A third option is addition of pelvic RT to ADT (category 2B). This is based on retrospective data demonstrating improved biochemical recurrence-free survival and cancer-specific survival with post-prostatectomy RT and ADT compared to adjuvant ADT alone in 250 patients with lymph node metastases.²⁴⁸

Biochemical Recurrence

Several retrospective studies have assessed the prognostic value of various combinations of pretreatment PSA levels, Gleason scores, PSA doubling time, and the presence or absence of positive surgical margins.²⁴⁹⁻²⁵³ A large retrospective review of 501 patients who received salvage radiotherapy for detectable and increasing PSA after radical prostatectomy²⁵² showed that the predictors of progression were Gleason score 8 to 10, pre-RT PSA level greater than 2 ng/mL, seminal vesicle invasion, negative surgical margins, and PSA doubling time 10 months or less. However, separation of men into those likely to have

local recurrence versus systemic disease, and hence response to postoperative radiation, has proven not possible for individual patients using clinical and pathological criteria.²⁵⁴ Unfortunately, delivery of adjuvant or salvage RT becomes both therapeutic and diagnostic—PSA response indicates local persistence/recurrence. Delayed biochemical recurrence requires restaging and a nomogram^{11,23} may prove useful to predict response, but it has not been validated.

Men who suffer biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy fall into 3 groups: 1) those whose PSA level fails to fall to undetectable levels after radical prostatectomy (persistent disease); 2) those who achieve an undetectable PSA after radical prostatectomy with a subsequent detectable PSA level that increases on 2 or more subsequent laboratory determinations (recurrent disease); or 3) the occasional case with persistent but low PSA levels attributed to slow PSA metabolism or residual benign tissue. Consensus has not defined a threshold level of PSA below which PSA is truly “undetectable.” Group 3 does not require further evaluation until PSA rises. Since PSA elevation alone does not necessarily lead to clinical failure,²⁵⁵ the work-up for 1 and 2 must include an evaluation for distant metastases. The specific staging tests depend on the clinical history, but usually include a combination of PSA doubling time assessment, TRUS biopsy, bone scan, and prostate MRI. Other tests that may be useful include abdominal/pelvic CT/MRI and C-11 choline PET.

Bone scans are appropriate when patients develop symptoms or when PSA levels are increasing rapidly. In one study, the probability of a positive bone scan for a patient not on ADT after radical prostatectomy was less than 5% unless the PSA increased to 40 to 45 ng/mL.²⁵⁶ A TRUS biopsy may be helpful when imaging suggests local recurrence.

The patient may be observed or undergo primary salvage RT with or without ADT if distant metastases are not suspected during biochemical recurrence. Treatment is most effective when pre-treatment PSA level is below 1.0 ng/mL and PSA doubling time is slow.

ADT alone becomes the salvage treatment when there is proven or high suspicion for distant metastases. Radiation alone is not recommended but may be given to the site of metastasis or symptoms in addition to ADT in specific cases, such as to weight-bearing bone involvement. Observation remains acceptable for select patients. In all cases, the form of primary or secondary systemic therapy should be based on the hormonal status of the patient.

Post-Irradiation Recurrence

According to the 2006 Phoenix definition revised by ASTRO and the Radiation Therapy Oncology Group in Phoenix,²⁵⁷ a rise in PSA by 2 ng/mL or more above the nadir PSA (defined as the lowest PSA achieved) is the standard definition for biochemical failure after EBRT with or without neoadjuvant ADT therapy. The date of failure should be determined “at call” and not backdated. The reported date of control should be listed as 2 years short of the median follow-up to avoid the artifacts resulting from short follow-up. For example, if the median follow-up is 5 years, control rates at 3 years should be cited. Retaining a strict version of the ASTRO definition would allow comparisons with a large existing body of literature.

Further work-up is indicated in patients who are considered candidates for local therapy. These patients include those with original clinical stage T1-2, life expectancy greater than 10 years, and current PSA less than 10 ng/mL.²⁵⁸ Work-up typically includes a PSA doubling time calculation, TRUS biopsy, bone scan, and additional tests, such as an abdominal/pelvic CT/MRI, prostate MRI, and/or C-11 choline PET.

Options for primary salvage therapy for those with positive biopsy but low suspicion of metastases to distant organs include observation or salvage prostatectomy in selected cases. Other options for localized interventions include cryotherapy²⁵⁹ and brachytherapy (reviewed by Allen and colleagues²⁶⁰). Treatment, however, needs to be individualized based upon the patient's risk of progression, the likelihood of success, and the risks involved with salvage therapy.

A negative TRUS biopsy following post-radiation biochemical recurrence poses clinical uncertainties. Observation, ADT, or enrolling in clinical trials are viable options. Alternatively, the patients may undergo more aggressive work-up, such as repeat biopsy, MR spectroscopy, and/or prostate MRI.^{261,262}

Patients with positive study results indicating distant metastatic disease or patients who are not initial candidates for local therapy should be treated with ADT or observed.

Management of ADT-Naïve Advanced Disease

Options for patients with advanced disease who have not been treated with ADT include: 1) orchiectomy; 2) LHRH agonist with or without anti-androgen for at least 7 days to prevent flare; 3) LHRH antagonist; 4) CAB, or 5) observation for asymptomatic patients without metastasis.

In the setting of biochemical relapse after local therapy, one should first determine whether or not the patient is a candidate for salvage therapy. Men who opt for ADT should consider the intermittent approach. The timing of ADT initiation should be individualized according to PSA velocity, patient anxiety, and potential side effects. Patients with shorter PSA doubling time or rapid PSA velocity and long life expectancy should be encouraged to consider early ADT. Men with prolonged PSA

doubling times who are older can be excellent candidates for observation.

Metastatic patients should be queried about adverse effects related to ADT. Intermittent ADT should be used for those who experience significant side effects of ADT. Some men who have no ADT-related morbidity may find the uncertainty of intermittent ADT not worthwhile. Intermittent ADT requires close monitoring of PSA and testosterone levels especially during off-treatment periods and patients may need to switch to continuous therapy upon signs of disease progression.

CAB therapy adds to cost and side effects, and prospective randomized evidence is lacking that CAB is more efficacious than ADT.

CRPC

Patients who recur during primary ADT with CRPC should receive a laboratory assessment to assure a castrate level of testosterone. In addition, imaging tests may be indicated to monitor for signs of distant metastases. Factors affecting the frequency of imaging include individual risk, age, PSA velocity, Gleason grade, and overall patient health.

A number of options for systemic therapy should be considered based on metastasis status.

CRPC without Signs of Metastasis

Clinical trial is the preferred choice for patients without signs of distant metastasis (M0). Observation is another option especially if the PSA doubling time is 10 months or longer since these patients will have a relatively indolent disease history.²⁶³ Secondary hormone therapy is an option mainly for patients with a shorter PSA doubling time (<10 months) since the androgen receptor may remain active. Patients who

progress on CAB should have the anti-androgen discontinued to exclude an “anti-androgen withdrawal response.”^{264,265} Secondary hormone therapy can be an anti-androgen for patients who initially received medical or surgical castration, ketoconazole (adrenal enzyme inhibitor), corticosteroids, diethylstilbestrol (DES), or other estrogens.^{266,267} However, none of these strategies has yet been shown to prolong survival in randomized clinical trials in men who have not yet received docetaxel-based chemotherapy.

Small Cell Carcinoma of the Prostate

Small cell carcinoma of the prostate should be considered in patients who no longer respond to ADT and test positive for metastases. Those with initial Gleason score 9 or 10 are especially at risk. These relatively rare tumors are typically associated with low PSA levels despite large metastatic burden and visceral disease.²⁶⁸ Thus, a biopsy of accessible lesions should be considered to identify patients with small cell histomorphologic features.²⁶⁹ These cases may be managed by cytotoxic chemotherapy, such as cisplatin/etoposide, carboplatin/etoposide, or a docetaxel-based regimen.^{270,271} Participation in a clinical trial is another option. Physicians should consult the [NCCN Guidelines for Small Cell Lung Cancer](#) since the behavior of small cell carcinoma of the prostate is similar to that of small cell carcinoma of the lung. Small cell carcinomas of the prostate differ from neuroendocrine prostate cancers; the latter histology may be more common and should not alter treatment.

Prevention of Skeletal-Related Events in CRPC

Zoledronic acid every 3 to 4 weeks or denosumab 120 mg every 4 weeks is recommended for men with CRPC and bone metastases to prevent or delay disease-associated SREs (category 1 recommendation). SREs include pathologic fractures, spinal cord compression, operation, or RT to bone. The optimal duration of

zoledronic acid or denosumab in men with CRPC and bone metastases remains unclear.

Oral hygiene, baseline dental evaluation for high-risk individuals, and avoidance of invasive dental surgery during therapy are recommended to reduce the risk of ONJ.²⁷² If invasive dental surgery is necessary, therapy should be deferred until the dentist confirms that the patient has healed completely from the dental procedure. Supplemental calcium and vitamin D treatment is recommended to prevent hypocalcemia in patients receiving either denosumab or zoledronic acid.

Monitoring of creatinine clearance is required to guide dosing of zoledronic acid. Zoledronic acid should be dose reduced in men with impaired renal function (estimated creatinine clearance 30-60 mL/min), and held for creatinine clearance <30 mL/min.²⁷³ Denosumab may be administered to men with impaired renal function or even men on hemodialysis; however, the risk for severe hypocalcemia and hypophosphatemia is greater in this population, and the dose, schedule, and safety of denosumab has not yet been defined for this group. A single study of 55 patients with creatinine clearance less than 30 mL/min or on hemodialysis evaluated the use of a 60 mg dose of denosumab.²⁷⁴ Hypocalcemia should be corrected before starting denosumab, and serum calcium monitoring is required for denosumab and recommended for zoledronic acid, with appropriate repletion as needed.

Clinical research continues on the prevention or delay of disease spread to bone. A phase III randomized trial involving 1432 patients with non-metastatic CRPC at high risk of bone involvement showed that denosumab delayed bone metastasis by 4 months compared to placebo.²⁷⁵ Overall survival did not improve and the FDA did not approve this indication for denosumab.

Systemic Therapy for Metastatic CRPC

Sipuleucel-T is a category 1 recommendation for metastatic CRPC patients without symptoms for those who have good performance level (ECOG 0-1) and at least 6 months of estimated life expectancy based on phase III randomized trial evidence. Clinicians and patients should be aware that the usual markers of benefit (decline in PSA and improvement in bone or CT scans) are not usually seen, and therefore benefit to the individual patient cannot be ascertained using currently available testing. Treatment subsequent to sipuleucel-T treatment should proceed as clinically indicated, particularly in the occurrence of symptoms. Abiraterone acetate/prednisone is another category 1 option. Other secondary ADT (including enzalutamide), docetaxel, and participation in clinical trials are viable alternatives to sipuleucel-T. Docetaxel is not used commonly for asymptomatic patients, but may be considered for those who show signs of rapid progression or liver involvement (category 2A in this setting).

Every 3-week docetaxel and prednisone is the preferred first-line chemotherapy treatment for symptomatic CRPC (category 1).²²⁶⁻²²⁸ PSA rise alone does not define docetaxel failure; the patient may benefit from continued chemotherapy if clinical progression is not apparent. The addition of estramustine to docetaxel has been shown to increase side effects without enhancing efficiency and is not recommended.²⁷⁶ Radium-223 is a category 1 first-line option for patients with symptomatic bone metastases and no known visceral disease. Hematologic evaluation should be performed according to the FDA label before treatment initiation and before each subsequent dose.²⁷⁷ Radium-223 given in combination with chemotherapy (such as docetaxel) outside of a clinical trial has the potential for additive myelosuppression.²⁷⁷ Radium-223 can be used with denosumab or a bisphosphonate.

Mitoxantrone may provide palliative benefit for symptomatic patients who cannot tolerate docetaxel.^{278,279} Abiraterone acetate has not been assessed formally in symptomatic men with CRPC prior to docetaxel. Therefore, its use in these patients is a category 2A recommendation. Use of abiraterone is reasonable for men who are not candidates for docetaxel or who decline chemotherapy. Enzalutamide alone also is an appropriate option, given its survival and palliative benefit and reasonable toxicity profile. Randomized study of this agent in the pre-docetaxel setting is ongoing.²⁸⁰

The use of systemic radiotherapy with either 89Sr or 153Sm occasionally benefits patients with widely metastatic, painful, skeletal involvement that is not responding to palliative chemotherapy or systemic analgesia and who are not candidates for localized EBRT.¹⁵⁴ The risk of bone marrow suppression, which might influence the ability to provide additional systemic chemotherapy, should be considered before this therapy is initiated. Clinical trial enrollment is another option.

Second-line Systemic Therapy

No consensus exists for the best additional therapy for metastatic CRPC patients after docetaxel failure. Options include abiraterone acetate (category 1), enzalutamide (category 1), cabazitaxel (category 1), radium-223 (category 1), salvage chemotherapy, docetaxel rechallenge, mitoxantrone, secondary ADT, sipuleucel-T, and participation in clinical trials.

Both abiraterone acetate/prednisone^{219,220} and enzalutamide²²³ have independently demonstrated clinical benefit and thus represent a new standard of care after failure of docetaxel chemotherapy for metastatic CRPC (category 1), provided these agents were not used pre-docetaxel. Abiraterone acetate should be given with oral prednisone 5 mg twice daily. It should not be taken with food to abrogate signs of

mineralocorticoid excess that can result from treatment. These signs can include hypertension, hypokalemia, and peripheral edema. Serum electrolytes and blood pressure should be monitored closely during therapy. Patients receiving enzalutamide have no restrictions for food intake and concurrent prednisone is permitted but not required.²²³

The NCCN Guidelines Panel included cabazitaxel as an option for second-line therapy after docetaxel failure for patients with symptomatic metastatic CRPC. This recommendation is category 1 based on randomized phase III study data; however, extension of survival is relatively short and side effects are relatively high.²³⁰ Physicians should follow current guidelines for prophylactic white blood cell growth factor use, particularly in this heavily pre-treated, high-risk population. In addition, supportive care should include antiemetics (prophylactic antihistamines, H2 antagonists, and corticosteroids prophylaxis), and symptom-directed antidiarrheal agents. Cabazitaxel has not been tested in patients with hepatic dysfunction and therefore should not be used in these patients. Cabazitaxel should be stopped upon clinical disease progression or intolerance.

Radium-223 is a category 1 second-line treatment option for patients with symptomatic bone metastases.¹⁵² However, the agent is not recommended if visceral metastasis is detected or if the patient is receiving concurrent docetaxel rechallenge or other salvage chemotherapy. Clinicians should follow instructions in the FDA label on hematologic evaluation before each injection.

The decision to initiate therapy in the post-docetaxel CRPC setting should be based on the available high-level evidence of safety, efficacy, and tolerability of these agents and the application of this evidence to an individual patient. Prior exposures to these agents should be considered. No data informs the proper sequence for delivery of these

agents in men with metastatic CRPC, and some data suggest cross-resistance between abiraterone and enzalutamide.²⁸¹⁻²⁸³ No randomized trials have been reported that compared these agents, and no predictive models or biomarkers help to identify patients who are likely to benefit from any of these agents. Choice of therapy is based largely on clinical considerations, which include patient preferences, prior treatment, presence or absence of visceral disease, symptoms, and potential side effects. NCCN recommends that patients be monitored closely with radiological imaging (ie, CT, bone scan), PSA tests, and clinical exams for evidence of progression. Therapy should be continued until clinical progression or intolerability in cases where PSA or bone scan changes may indicate flare rather than true clinical progression.²⁸⁴ The sequential use of these agents is reasonable in a patient who remains a candidate for further systemic therapy.

NCCN panelists agreed that docetaxel rechallenge may be useful in some patients (category 2A instead of category 1 in this setting). Some patients with metastatic CRPC may be deemed unsuitable for taxane chemotherapy; such patients could be considered for radium-223 or a second-line hormonal agent. In addition, mitoxantrone remains a palliative treatment option for men who are not candidates for taxane-based therapy based on older randomized studies that showed palliative benefit.^{278,279} Limited evidence suggests potential palliative benefits with mitoxantrone and a variety of chemotherapeutic or hormonal agents, but no randomized studies have demonstrated improved survival with these agents after docetaxel failure. Treatment with these agents could be considered after an informed discussion between the physician and an individual patient about treatment goals and risks/side effects and alternatives, which must include best supportive care.

In the phase III sipuleucel-T trial, 18.2% of patients had received prior chemotherapy, which included docetaxel, since eligibility requirements included no chemotherapy for 3 months and no steroids for 1 month prior to enrollment.²³² These men were asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic. In a subset analysis, both those who did and those who did not receive prior chemotherapy benefited from sipuleucel-T treatment. The panel included sipuleucel-T as an option after failure of chemotherapy (category 2A instead of category 1 in this setting). However, patients with rapidly progressing disease, liver metastasis, or life expectancy less than 6 months should not be considered for sipuleucel-T. Clinical trial enrollment is encouraged for all men with metastatic CRPC, given the limited improvements in outcomes seen with approved systemic options.

Summary

The intention of these guidelines is to provide a framework on which to base treatment decisions. Prostate cancer is a complex disease, with many controversial aspects of management and with a dearth of sound data to support many treatment recommendations. Several variables (including life expectancy, disease characteristics, predicted outcomes, and patient preferences) must be considered by the patient and physician to tailor prostate cancer therapy to the individual patient.

Table 1. Active Surveillance Experience in North America

Center	Toronto ⁵⁹	Johns Hopkins ^{57,60,61}	UCSF ⁵⁸
No. patients	450	769	531
Age (yr)	70	66	63
Median follow-up (mo)	82	36	43
Overall survival	68%	98%	98%
Cancer-specific survival	97%	100%	100%
Conversion to treatment	30%	33%	24%
Reason for treatment			
Gleason grade change	8%	14%	38%
PSA increase	14%*	-	26%†
Positive lymph node	1%	-	-
Anxiety	3%	9%	8%
* PSA doubling time <3 years			
† PSA velocity >0.75 ng/mL/year			

References

1. Siegel R, Ma J, Zou Z, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2014. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2014;64:9-29. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24399786>.
2. Social Security Administration. Period Life Table. 2009. Available at: <http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/STATS/table4c6.html>. Accessed March 10, 2014.
3. Howard DH. Life expectancy and the value of early detection. *J Health Econ* 2005;24:891-906. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16129128>.
4. D'Amico AV, Whittington R, Malkowicz SB, et al. Pretreatment nomogram for prostate-specific antigen recurrence after radical prostatectomy or external-beam radiation therapy for clinically localized prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:168-172. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10458230>.
5. D'Amico AV, Whittington R, Malkowicz SB, et al. Biochemical outcome after radical prostatectomy or external beam radiation therapy for patients with clinically localized prostate carcinoma in the prostate specific antigen era. *Cancer* 2002;95:281-286. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12124827>.
6. D'Amico AV, Whittington R, Malkowicz SB, et al. Biochemical outcome after radical prostatectomy, external beam radiation therapy, or interstitial radiation therapy for clinically localized prostate cancer. *JAMA* 1998;280:969-974. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9749478>.
7. Reese AC, Pierorazio PM, Han M, Partin AW. Contemporary evaluation of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network prostate cancer risk classification system. *Urology* 2012;80:1075-1079. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22995570>.
8. Johns Hopkins Medicine. The Partin Tables. Available at: <http://urology.jhu.edu/prostate/partintables.php>. Accessed March 24, 2014.
9. Makarov DV, Trock BJ, Humphreys EB, et al. Updated nomogram to predict pathologic stage of prostate cancer given prostate-specific antigen level, clinical stage, and biopsy Gleason score (Partin tables) based on cases from 2000 to 2005. *Urology* 2007;69:1095-1101. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17572194>.
10. Kattan MW, Eastham JA, Wheeler TM, et al. Counseling men with prostate cancer: a nomogram for predicting the presence of small, moderately differentiated, confined tumors. *J Urol* 2003;170:1792-1797. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14532778>.
11. Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center. Prostate Cancer Nomograms. Available at: <http://www.mskcc.org/mskcc/html/10088.cfm>. Accessed March 24, 2014.
12. Stephenson AJ, Scardino PT, Eastham JA, et al. Preoperative nomogram predicting the 10-year probability of prostate cancer recurrence after radical prostatectomy. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006;98:715-717. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16705126>.
13. Stephenson AJ, Kattan MW, Eastham JA, et al. Prostate cancer-specific mortality after radical prostatectomy for patients treated in the prostate-specific antigen era. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:4300-4305. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19636023>.
14. Graefen M, Haese A, Pichlmeier U, et al. A validated strategy for side specific prediction of organ confined prostate cancer: a tool to select for nerve sparing radical prostatectomy. *J Urol* 2001;165:857-863. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11176486>.
15. Ohori M, Kattan MW, Koh H, et al. Predicting the presence and side of extracapsular extension: a nomogram for staging prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2004;171:1844-1849; discussion 1849. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15076291>.

16. Steuber T, Graefen M, Haese A, et al. Validation of a nomogram for prediction of side specific extracapsular extension at radical prostatectomy. *J Urol* 2006;175:939-944; discussion 944. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16469587>.
17. Briganti A, Chun FK, Salonia A, et al. A nomogram for staging of exclusive nonobturator lymph node metastases in men with localized prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2007;51:112-119; discussion 119-120. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16806662>.
18. Kattan MW, Potters L, Blasko JC, et al. Pretreatment nomogram for predicting freedom from recurrence after permanent prostate brachytherapy in prostate cancer. *Urology* 2001;58:393-399. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11549487>.
19. Potters L, Morgenstern C, Calugaru E, et al. 12-year outcomes following permanent prostate brachytherapy in patients with clinically localized prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2008;179:S20-24. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18405743>.
20. Zelefsky MJ, Kattan MW, Fearn P, et al. Pretreatment nomogram predicting ten-year biochemical outcome of three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy and intensity-modulated radiotherapy for prostate cancer. *Urology* 2007;70:283-287. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17826490>.
21. Jeldres C, Suardi N, Walz J, et al. Validation of the contemporary Epstein criteria for insignificant prostate cancer in European men. *Eur Urol* 2008;54:1306-1313. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18083294>.
22. Lee SJ, Lindquist K, Segal MR, Covinsky KE. Development and validation of a prognostic index for 4-year mortality in older adults. *JAMA* 2006;295:801-808. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16478903>.
23. Stephenson AJ, Scardino PT, Kattan MW, et al. Predicting the outcome of salvage radiation therapy for recurrent prostate cancer after radical prostatectomy. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:2035-2041. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17513807>.
24. Dearnaley DP, Khoo VS, Norman AR, et al. Comparison of radiation side-effects of conformal and conventional radiotherapy in prostate cancer: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 1999;353:267-272. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9929018>.
25. Khoo VS. Radiotherapeutic techniques for prostate cancer, dose escalation and brachytherapy. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)* 2005;17:560-571. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16238144>.
26. D'Amico AV, Cote K, Loffredo M, et al. Determinants of prostate cancer-specific survival after radiation therapy for patients with clinically localized prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:4567-4573. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12454114>.
27. D'Amico AV, Moul JW, Carroll PR, et al. Surrogate end point for prostate cancer-specific mortality after radical prostatectomy or radiation therapy. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2003;95:1376-1383. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/13130113>.
28. Kane CJ, Amling CL, Johnstone PA, et al. Limited value of bone scintigraphy and computed tomography in assessing biochemical failure after radical prostatectomy. *Urology* 2003;61:607-611. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12639656>.
29. Martino P, Scattoni V, Galosi AB, et al. Role of imaging and biopsy to assess local recurrence after definitive treatment for prostate carcinoma (surgery, radiotherapy, cryotherapy, HIFU). *World J Urol* 2011;29:595-605. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21553276>.
30. Dotan ZA, Bianco FJ, Jr., Rabbani F, et al. Pattern of prostate-specific antigen (PSA) failure dictates the probability of a positive bone scan in patients with an increasing PSA after radical prostatectomy. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:1962-1968. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15774789>.

31. Shinghal R, Yemoto C, McNeal JE, Brooks JD. Biochemical recurrence without PSA progression characterizes a subset of patients after radical prostatectomy. Prostate-specific antigen. *Urology* 2003;61:380-385. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12597952>.
32. Schnall MD, Imai Y, Tomaszewski J, et al. Prostate cancer: local staging with endorectal surface coil MR imaging. *Radiology* 1991;178:797-802. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1994421>.
33. Dickinson L, Ahmed HU, Allen C, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging for the detection, localisation, and characterisation of prostate cancer: recommendations from a European consensus meeting. *Eur Urol* 2011;59:477-494. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21195536>.
34. Reske SN, Blumstein NM, Neumaier B, et al. Imaging prostate cancer with 11C-choline PET/CT. *J Nucl Med* 2006;47:1249-1254. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16883001>.
35. Umbehr MH, Muntener M, Hany T, et al. The role of 11C-choline and 18F-fluorocholine positron emission tomography (PET) and PET/CT in prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Urol* 2013;64:106-117. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23628493>.
36. Johansson JE, Holmberg L, Johansson S, et al. Fifteen-year survival in prostate cancer. A prospective, population-based study in Sweden. *JAMA* 1997;277:467-471. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9020270>.
37. van den Bergh RC, Essink-Bot ML, Roobol MJ, et al. Anxiety and distress during active surveillance for early prostate cancer. *Cancer* 2009;115:3868-3878. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19637245>.
38. Sakr WA, Grignon DJ, Crissman JD, et al. High grade prostatic intraepithelial neoplasia (HGPIN) and prostatic adenocarcinoma between the ages of 20-69: an autopsy study of 249 cases. *In Vivo* 1994;8:439-443. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7803731>.
39. Thompson IM, Pauler DK, Goodman PJ, et al. Prevalence of prostate cancer among men with a prostate-specific antigen level < or =4.0 ng per milliliter. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:2239-2246. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15163773>.
40. Schroder FH, Hugosson J, Roobol MJ, et al. Prostate-cancer mortality at 11 years of follow-up. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:981-990. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22417251>.
41. Schroder FH, Hugosson J, Roobol MJ, et al. Screening and prostate-cancer mortality in a randomized European study. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:1320-1328. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19297566>.
42. Klotz L. Active surveillance for prostate cancer: for whom? *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:8165-8169. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16278468>.
43. Andriole GL, Crawford ED, Grubb RL, 3rd, et al. Mortality results from a randomized prostate-cancer screening trial. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:1310-1319. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19297565>.
44. Andriole GL, Bostwick DG, Brawley OW, et al. Effect of dutasteride on the risk of prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1192-1202. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20357281>.
45. Andriole GL, Crawford ED, Grubb RL, 3rd, et al. Prostate cancer screening in the randomized Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial: mortality results after 13 years of follow-up. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2012;104:125-132. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22228146>.

46. Sandblom G, Varenhorst E, Rosell J, et al. Randomised prostate cancer screening trial: 20 year follow-up. *BMJ* 2011;342:d1539. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21454449>.
47. Hugosson J, Carlsson S, Aus G, et al. Mortality results from the Goteborg randomised population-based prostate-cancer screening trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2010;11:725-732. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20598634>.
48. Miller DC, Gruber SB, Hollenbeck BK, et al. Incidence of initial local therapy among men with lower-risk prostate cancer in the United States. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006;98:1134-1141. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16912266>.
49. Draisma G, Etzioni R, Tsodikov A, et al. Lead time and overdiagnosis in prostate-specific antigen screening: importance of methods and context. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2009;101:374-383. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19276453>.
50. Draisma G, Boer R, Otto SJ, et al. Lead times and overdetection due to prostate-specific antigen screening: estimates from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2003;95:868-878. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12813170>.
51. Epstein JI, Walsh PC, Carmichael M, Brendler CB. Pathologic and clinical findings to predict tumor extent of nonpalpable (stage T1c) prostate cancer. *JAMA* 1994;271:368-374. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7506797>.
52. Bastian PJ, Mangold LA, Epstein JI, Partin AW. Characteristics of insignificant clinical T1c prostate tumors. A contemporary analysis. *Cancer* 2004;101:2001-2005. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15372478>.
53. Chun FK, Haese A, Ahyai SA, et al. Critical assessment of tools to predict clinically insignificant prostate cancer at radical prostatectomy in contemporary men. *Cancer* 2008;113:701-709. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18553365>.
54. Bastian PJ, Carter BH, Bjartell A, et al. Insignificant prostate cancer and active surveillance: from definition to clinical implications. *Eur Urol* 2009;55:1321-1330. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19286302>.
55. Sanda MG, Kaplan ID. A 64-year-old man with low-risk prostate cancer: review of prostate cancer treatment. *JAMA* 2009;301:2141-2151. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19417179>.
56. Sondi D, Ross AE, Humphreys EB, et al. African American Men With Very Low-Risk Prostate Cancer Exhibit Adverse Oncologic Outcomes After Radical Prostatectomy: Should Active Surveillance Still Be an Option for Them? *J Clin Oncol* 2013. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23775960>.
57. Carter HB, Kettermann A, Warlick C, et al. Expectant management of prostate cancer with curative intent: an update of the Johns Hopkins experience. *J Urol* 2007;178:2359-2364; discussion 2364-2355. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17936806>.
58. Dall'Era MA, Konety BR, Cowan JE, et al. Active surveillance for the management of prostate cancer in a contemporary cohort. *Cancer* 2008;112:2664-2670. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18433013>.
59. Klotz L, Zhang L, Lam A, et al. Clinical results of long-term follow-up of a large, active surveillance cohort with localized prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:126-131. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19917860>.
60. Sheridan TB, Carter HB, Wang W, et al. Change in prostate cancer grade over time in men followed expectantly for stage T1c disease. *J Urol* 2008;179:901-904; discussion 904-905. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18207195>.

61. Tosoian JJ, Trock BJ, Landis P, et al. Active surveillance program for prostate cancer: an update of the Johns Hopkins experience. *J Clin Oncol* 2011;29:2185-2190. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21464416>.
62. Loblaw A, Zhang L, Lam A, et al. Comparing prostate specific antigen triggers for intervention in men with stable prostate cancer on active surveillance. *J Urol* 2010;184:1942-1946. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20846681>.
63. Ross AE, Loeb S, Landis P, et al. Prostate-specific antigen kinetics during follow-up are an unreliable trigger for intervention in a prostate cancer surveillance program. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:2810-2816. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20439642>.
64. Klotz L. Point: active surveillance for favorable risk prostate cancer. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2007;5:693-698. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17692173>.
65. Feliciano J, Teper E, Ferrandino M, et al. The incidence of fluoroquinolone resistant infections after prostate biopsy--are fluoroquinolones still effective prophylaxis? *J Urol* 2008;179:952-955; discussion 955. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18207185>.
66. Fujita K, Landis P, McNeil BK, Pavlovich CP. Serial prostate biopsies are associated with an increased risk of erectile dysfunction in men with prostate cancer on active surveillance. *J Urol* 2009;182:2664-2669. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19836757>.
67. Bill-Axelson A, Holmberg L, Ruutu M, et al. Radical prostatectomy versus watchful waiting in early prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364:1708-1717. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21542742>.
68. Pierorazio PM, Ross AE, Lin BM, et al. Preoperative characteristics of high-Gleason disease predictive of favourable pathological and clinical outcomes at radical prostatectomy. *BJU Int* 2012;110:1122-1128. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22373045>.
69. Chade DC, Eastham J, Graefen M, et al. Cancer control and functional outcomes of salvage radical prostatectomy for radiation-recurrent prostate cancer: a systematic review of the literature. *Eur Urol* 2012;61:961-971. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22280856>.
70. Shekarriz B, Upadhyay J, Pontes JE. Salvage radical prostatectomy. *Urol Clin North Am* 2001;28:545-553. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11590813>.
71. Klein EA, Bianco FJ, Serio AM, et al. Surgeon experience is strongly associated with biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy for all preoperative risk categories. *J Urol* 2008;179:2212-2216; discussion 2216-2217. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18423716>.
72. Begg CB, Riedel ER, Bach PB, et al. Variations in morbidity after radical prostatectomy. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:1138-1144. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11948274>.
73. Herrell SD, Smith JA, Jr. Robotic-assisted laparoscopic prostatectomy: what is the learning curve? *Urology* 2005;66:105-107. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16194715>.
74. Smith JA, Jr., Herrell SD. Robotic-assisted laparoscopic prostatectomy: do minimally invasive approaches offer significant advantages? *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:8170-8175. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16278469>.
75. Hu JC, Gu X, Lipsitz SR, et al. Comparative effectiveness of minimally invasive vs open radical prostatectomy. *JAMA* 2009;302:1557-1564. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19826025>.

76. Parsons JK, Bennett JL. Outcomes of retropubic, laparoscopic, and robotic-assisted prostatectomy. *Urology* 2008;72:412-416. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18267330>.
77. Ficarra V, Novara G, Rosen RC, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of studies reporting urinary continence recovery after robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2012;62:405-417. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22749852>.
78. Ficarra V, Novara G, Ahlering TE, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of studies reporting potency rates after robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2012;62:418-430. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22749850>.
79. Resnick MJ, Koyama T, Fan KH, et al. Long-term functional outcomes after treatment for localized prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:436-445. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23363497>.
80. Nam RK, Cheung P, Herschorn S, et al. Incidence of complications other than urinary incontinence or erectile dysfunction after radical prostatectomy or radiotherapy for prostate cancer: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet Oncol* 2014. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24440474>.
81. Freire MP, Weinberg AC, Lei Y, et al. Anatomic bladder neck preservation during robotic-assisted laparoscopic radical prostatectomy: description of technique and outcomes. *Eur Urol* 2009;56:972-980. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19781848>.
82. Abel EJ, Masterson TA, Warner JN, et al. Nerve-sparing prostatectomy and urinary function: a prospective analysis using validated quality-of-life measures. *Urology* 2009;73:1336-1340. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19362347>.
83. Davis JW, Chang DW, Chevray P, et al. Randomized phase II trial evaluation of erectile function after attempted unilateral cavernous nerve-sparing retropubic radical prostatectomy with versus without unilateral sural nerve grafting for clinically localized prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2009;55:1135-1143. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18783876>.
84. Cagiannos I, Karakiewicz P, Eastham JA, et al. A preoperative nomogram identifying decreased risk of positive pelvic lymph nodes in patients with prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2003;170:1798-1803. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14532779>.
85. Briganti A, Blute ML, Eastham JH, et al. Pelvic lymph node dissection in prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2009;55:1251-1265. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19297079>.
86. Heidenreich A, Ohlmann CH, Polyakov S. Anatomical extent of pelvic lymphadenectomy in patients undergoing radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2007;52:29-37. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17448592>.
87. Masterson TA, Bianco FJ, Jr., Vickers AJ, et al. The association between total and positive lymph node counts, and disease progression in clinically localized prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2006;175:1320-1324; discussion 1324-1325. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16515989>.
88. Joslyn SA, Konety BR. Impact of extent of lymphadenectomy on survival after radical prostatectomy for prostate cancer. *Urology* 2006;68:121-125. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16806432>.
89. Allaf ME, Palapattu GS, Trock BJ, et al. Anatomical extent of lymph node dissection: impact on men with clinically localized prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2004;172:1840-1844. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15540734>.
90. Bader P, Burkhard FC, Markwalder R, Studer UE. Disease progression and survival of patients with positive lymph nodes after radical prostatectomy. Is there a chance of cure? *J Urol* 2003;169:849-854. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12576797>.

91. Daneshmand S, Quek ML, Stein JP, et al. Prognosis of patients with lymph node positive prostate cancer following radical prostatectomy: long-term results. *J Urol* 2004;172:2252-2255. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15538242>.
92. Wagner M, Sokoloff M, Daneshmand S. The role of pelvic lymphadenectomy for prostate cancer--therapeutic? *J Urol* 2008;179:408-413. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18076938>.
93. Hanlon AL, Watkins Bruner D, Peter R, Hanks GE. Quality of life study in prostate cancer patients treated with three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy: comparing late bowel and bladder quality of life symptoms to that of the normal population. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2001;49:51-59. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11163497>.
94. Koper PC, Stroom JC, van Putten WL, et al. Acute morbidity reduction using 3DCRT for prostate carcinoma: a randomized study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1999;43:727-734. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10098427>.
95. Michalski JM, Bae K, Roach M, et al. Long-term toxicity following 3D conformal radiation therapy for prostate cancer from the RTOG 9406 phase I/II dose escalation study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2010;76:14-22. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19577865>.
96. Jacobs BL, Zhang Y, Schroeck FR, et al. Use of advanced treatment technologies among men at low risk of dying from prostate cancer. *JAMA* 2013;309:2587-2595. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23800935>.
97. Zelefsky MJ, Levin EJ, Hunt M, et al. Incidence of late rectal and urinary toxicities after three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy and intensity-modulated radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008;70:1124-1129. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18313526>.
98. Jani AB, Su A, Correa D, Gratzle J. Comparison of late gastrointestinal and genitourinary toxicity of prostate cancer patients undergoing intensity-modulated versus conventional radiotherapy using localized fields. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2007;10:82-86. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16983394>.
99. Jacobs BL, Zhang Y, Skolarus TA, et al. Comparative effectiveness of external-beam radiation approaches for prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2012. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22790288>.
100. Peeters ST, Heemsbergen WD, Koper PC, et al. Dose-response in radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer: results of the Dutch multicenter randomized phase III trial comparing 68 Gy of radiotherapy with 78 Gy. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:1990-1996. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16648499>.
101. Pollack A, Zagars GK, Starkschall G, et al. Prostate cancer radiation dose response: results of the M. D. Anderson phase III randomized trial. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2002;53:1097-1105. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12128107>.
102. Zietman AL, DeSilvio ML, Slater JD, et al. Comparison of conventional-dose vs high-dose conformal radiation therapy in clinically localized adenocarcinoma of the prostate: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2005;294:1233-1239. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16160131>.
103. Kuban DA, Tucker SL, Dong L, et al. Long-term results of the M. D. Anderson randomized dose-escalation trial for prostate cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008;70:67-74. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17765406>.
104. Xu N, Rossi PJ, Jani AB. Toxicity analysis of dose escalation from 75.6 gy to 81.0 gy in prostate cancer. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2011;34:11-15. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20101167>.
105. Eade TN, Hanlon AL, Horwitz EM, et al. What dose of external-beam radiation is high enough for prostate cancer? *Int J Radiat Oncol*



Biol Phys 2007;68:682-689. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17398026>.

106. Pollack A, Walker G, Horwitz EM, et al. Randomized trial of hypofractionated external-beam radiotherapy for prostate cancer. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:3860-3868. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24101042>.

107. Arcangeli S, Strigari L, Gomellini S, et al. Updated results and patterns of failure in a randomized hypofractionation trial for high-risk prostate cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2012;84:1172-1178. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22537541>.

108. Potosky AL, Davis WW, Hoffman RM, et al. Five-year outcomes after prostatectomy or radiotherapy for prostate cancer: the prostate cancer outcomes study. J Natl Cancer Inst 2004;96:1358-1367. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15367568>.

109. Sanda MG, Dunn RL, Michalski J, et al. Quality of life and satisfaction with outcome among prostate-cancer survivors. N Engl J Med 2008;358:1250-1261. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18354103>.

110. Nguyen PL, D'Amico AV, Lee AK, Suh WW. Patient selection, cancer control, and complications after salvage local therapy for postradiation prostate-specific antigen failure: a systematic review of the literature. Cancer 2007;110:1417-1428. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17694553>.

111. Critz FA, Benton JB, Shrake P, Merlin ML. 25-Year disease-free survival rate after irradiation for prostate cancer calculated with the prostate specific antigen definition of recurrence used for radical prostatectomy. J Urol 2013;189:878-883. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23103235>.

112. Bolla M, Van Tienhoven G, Warde P, et al. External irradiation with or without long-term androgen suppression for prostate cancer with high metastatic risk: 10-year results of an EORTC randomised study. Lancet

Oncol 2010;11:1066-1073. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20933466>.

113. Pilepich MV, Winter K, Lawton CA, et al. Androgen suppression adjuvant to definitive radiotherapy in prostate carcinoma--long-term results of phase III RTOG 85-31. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2005;61:1285-1290. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15817329>.

114. Warde P, Mason M, Ding K, et al. Combined androgen deprivation therapy and radiation therapy for locally advanced prostate cancer: a randomised, phase 3 trial. Lancet 2011;378:2104-2111. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22056152>.

115. Widmark A, Klepp O, Solberg A, et al. Endocrine treatment, with or without radiotherapy, in locally advanced prostate cancer (SPCG-7/SFUO-3): an open randomised phase III trial. Lancet 2009;373:301-308. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19091394>.

116. Dasu A. Is the alpha/beta value for prostate tumours low enough to be safely used in clinical trials? Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol) 2007;19:289-301. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17517328>.

117. Buyyounouski MK, Price RA, Jr., Harris EE, et al. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for primary management of early-stage, low- to intermediate-risk prostate cancer: report of the American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology Emerging Technology Committee. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2010;76:1297-1304. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20338473>.

118. Freeman DE, King CR. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for low-risk prostate cancer: five-year outcomes. Radiat Oncol 2011;6:3. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21219625>.

119. Kang JK, Cho CK, Choi CW, et al. Image-guided stereotactic body radiation therapy for localized prostate cancer. Tumori 2011;97:43-48. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21528663>.

120. Madsen BL, Hsi RA, Pham HT, et al. Stereotactic hypofractionated accurate radiotherapy of the prostate (SHARP), 33.5 Gy in five fractions for localized disease: first clinical trial results. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2007;67:1099-1105. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17336216>.
121. Chen LN, Suy S, Uhm S, et al. Stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) for clinically localized prostate cancer: the Georgetown University experience. *Radiat Oncol* 2013;8:58. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23497695>.
122. Katz AJ, Santoro M, Diblasio F, Ashley R. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer: disease control and quality of life at 6 years. *Radiat Oncol* 2013;8:118. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23668632>.
123. King CR, Freeman D, Kaplan I, et al. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer: pooled analysis from a multi-institutional consortium of prospective phase II trials. *Radiother Oncol* 2013;109:217-221. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24060175>.
124. Brachman DG, Thomas T, Hilbe J, Beyer DC. Failure-free survival following brachytherapy alone or external beam irradiation alone for T1-2 prostate tumors in 2222 patients: results from a single practice. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2000;48:111-117. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10924979>.
125. Masson S, Persad R, Bahl A. HDR brachytherapy in the management of high-risk prostate cancer. *Adv Urol* 2012;2012:980841. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22461791>.
126. Merrick GS, Butler WM, Wallner KE, et al. Permanent interstitial brachytherapy in younger patients with clinically organ-confined prostate cancer. *Urology* 2004;64:754-759. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15491715>.
127. Eade TN, Horwitz EM, Ruth K, et al. A comparison of acute and chronic toxicity for men with low-risk prostate cancer treated with intensity-modulated radiation therapy or (125)I permanent implant. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008;71:338-345. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18207665>.
128. Wong WW, Vora SA, Schild SE, et al. Radiation dose escalation for localized prostate cancer: intensity-modulated radiotherapy versus permanent transperineal brachytherapy. *Cancer* 2009;115:5596-5606. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19670452>.
129. Lee N, Wu CS, Brody R, et al. Factors predicting for postimplantation urinary retention after permanent prostate brachytherapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2000;48:1457-1460. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11121648>.
130. Henkel TO, Kahmann F. Permanent brachytherapy: prostate seed implants as an out-patient treatment. *Arch Ital Urol Androl* 2000;72:295-301. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11221059>.
131. Nag S, Bice W, DeWyngaert K, et al. The American Brachytherapy Society recommendations for permanent prostate brachytherapy postimplant dosimetric analysis. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2000;46:221-230. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10656396>.
132. Al-Salihi O, Mitra A, Payne H. Challenge of dose escalation in locally advanced unfavourable prostate cancer using HDR brachytherapy. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2006;9:370-373. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16832383>.
133. Fang FM, Wang YM, Wang CJ, et al. Comparison of the outcome and morbidity for localized or locally advanced prostate cancer treated by high-dose-rate brachytherapy plus external beam radiotherapy (EBRT) versus EBRT alone. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2008;38:474-479. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18621848>.

134. Pieters BR, van de Kamer JB, van Herten YR, et al. Comparison of biologically equivalent dose-volume parameters for the treatment of prostate cancer with concomitant boost IMRT versus IMRT combined with brachytherapy. *Radiother Oncol* 2008;88:46-52. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18378028>.
135. Soumarova R, Homola L, Perkova H, Stursa M. Three-dimensional conformal external beam radiotherapy versus the combination of external radiotherapy with high-dose rate brachytherapy in localized carcinoma of the prostate: comparison of acute toxicity. *Tumori* 2007;93:37-44. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17455870>.
136. Sathya JR, Davis IR, Julian JA, et al. Randomized trial comparing iridium implant plus external-beam radiation therapy with external-beam radiation therapy alone in node-negative locally advanced cancer of the prostate. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:1192-1199. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15718316>.
137. Hoskin PJ, Motohashi K, Bownes P, et al. High dose rate brachytherapy in combination with external beam radiotherapy in the radical treatment of prostate cancer: initial results of a randomised phase three trial. *Radiother Oncol* 2007;84:114-120. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17531335>.
138. Hoskin PJ, Rojas AM, Bownes PJ, et al. Randomised trial of external beam radiotherapy alone or combined with high-dose-rate brachytherapy boost for localised prostate cancer. *Radiother Oncol* 2012. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22341794>.
139. Shen X, Keith SW, Mishra MV, et al. The impact of brachytherapy on prostate cancer-specific mortality for definitive radiation therapy of high-grade prostate cancer: a population-based analysis. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2012;83:1154-1159. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22270175>.
140. Bittner N, Merrick GS, Butler WM, et al. Long-term outcome for very high-risk prostate cancer treated primarily with a triple modality approach to include permanent interstitial brachytherapy. *Brachytherapy* 2012. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22436516>.
141. Martinez-Monge R, Moreno M, Ciervide R, et al. External-beam radiation therapy and high-dose rate brachytherapy combined with long-term androgen deprivation therapy in high and very high prostate cancer: preliminary data on clinical outcome. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2012;82:e469-476. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22284039>.
142. D'Amico AV, Moran BJ, Braccioforte MH, et al. Risk of death from prostate cancer after brachytherapy alone or with radiation, androgen suppression therapy, or both in men with high-risk disease. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:3923-3928. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19597029>.
143. Demanes DJ, Brandt D, Schour L, Hill DR. Excellent results from high dose rate brachytherapy and external beam for prostate cancer are not improved by androgen deprivation. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2009;32:342-347. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19398902>.
144. Dattoli M, Wallner K, True L, et al. Long-term outcomes for patients with prostate cancer having intermediate and high-risk disease, treated with combination external beam irradiation and brachytherapy. *J Oncol* 2010;2010. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20847945>.
145. Hoskin P. High dose rate brachytherapy for prostate cancer. *Cancer Radiother* 2008;12:512-514. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18755623>.
146. Grills IS, Martinez AA, Hollander M, et al. High dose rate brachytherapy as prostate cancer monotherapy reduces toxicity compared to low dose rate palladium seeds. *J Urol* 2004;171:1098-1104. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14767279>.
147. Vargas C, Ghilezan M, Hollander M, et al. A new model using number of needles and androgen deprivation to predict chronic urinary

toxicity for high or low dose rate prostate brachytherapy. *J Urol* 2005;174:882-887. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16093980>.

148. Coen JJ, Zietman AL. Proton radiation for localized prostate cancer. *Nat Rev Urol* 2009;6:324-330. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19434101>.

149. Yu JB, Soulos PR, Herrin J, et al. Proton versus intensity-modulated radiotherapy for prostate cancer: patterns of care and early toxicity. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2013;105:25-32. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23243199>.

150. Coen JJ, Paly JJ, Niemierko A, et al. Long-term quality of life outcome after proton beam monotherapy for localized prostate cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2012;82:e201-209. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21621343>.

151. Allen AM, Pawlicki T, Dong L, et al. An evidence based review of proton beam therapy: the report of ASTRO's emerging technology committee. *Radiother Oncol* 2012;103:8-11. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22405807>.

152. Parker C, Nilsson S, Heinrich D, et al. Alpha emitter radium-223 and survival in metastatic prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:213-223. Available at:
<http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1213755>.

153. Janjan N, Lutz ST, Bedwinek JM, et al. Therapeutic guidelines for the treatment of bone metastasis: a report from the American College of Radiology Appropriateness Criteria Expert Panel on Radiation Oncology. *J Palliat Med* 2009;12:417-426. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19416037>.

154. Pandit-Taskar N, Batraki M, Divgi CR. Radiopharmaceutical therapy for palliation of bone pain from osseous metastases. *J Nucl Med* 2004;45:1358-1365. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15299062>.

155. Konski A, James J, Hartsell W, et al. Economic analysis of radiation therapy oncology group 97-14: multiple versus single fraction radiation treatment of patients with bone metastases. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2009;32:423-428. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19546803>.

156. Hartsell WF, Scott CB, Bruner DW, et al. Randomized trial of short-versus long-course radiotherapy for palliation of painful bone metastases. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2005;97:798-804. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15928300>.

157. Babaian RJ, Donnelly B, Bahn D, et al. Best practice statement on cryosurgery for the treatment of localized prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2008;180:1993-2004. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18817934>.

158. Bahn D, de Castro Abreu AL, Gill IS, et al. Focal cryotherapy for clinically unilateral, low-intermediate risk prostate cancer in 73 men with a median follow-up of 3.7 years. *Eur Urol* 2012;62:55-63. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22445223>.

159. Donnelly BJ, Saliken JC, Brasher PM, et al. A randomized trial of external beam radiotherapy versus cryoablation in patients with localized prostate cancer. *Cancer* 2010;116:323-330. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19937954>.

160. Robinson JW, Donnelly BJ, Siever JE, et al. A randomized trial of external beam radiotherapy versus cryoablation in patients with localized prostate cancer: quality of life outcomes. *Cancer* 2009;115:4695-4704. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19691092>.

161. Chin JL, Al-Zahrani AA, Autran-Gomez AM, et al. Extended followup oncologic outcome of randomized trial between cryoablation and external beam therapy for locally advanced prostate cancer (T2c-T3b). *J Urol* 2012;188:1170-1175. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22901586>.

162. Barret E, Ahallal Y, Sanchez-Salas R, et al. Morbidity of focal therapy in the treatment of localized prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2013;63:618-622. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23265382>.

163. Labrie F, Dupont A, Belanger A, Lachance R. Flutamide eliminates the risk of disease flare in prostatic cancer patients treated with a luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone agonist. *J Urol* 1987;138:804-806. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3309363>.

164. Schulze H, Senge T. Influence of different types of antiandrogens on luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone analogue-induced testosterone surge in patients with metastatic carcinoma of the prostate. *J Urol* 1990;144:934-941. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2144596>.

165. Loblaw DA, Virgo KS, Nam R, et al. Initial hormonal management of androgen-sensitive metastatic, recurrent, or progressive prostate cancer: 2006 update of an American Society of Clinical Oncology practice guideline. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:1596-1605. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17404365>.

166. Maximum androgen blockade in advanced prostate cancer: an overview of the randomised trials. Prostate Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group. *Lancet* 2000;355:1491-1498. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10801170>.

167. Samson DJ, Seidenfeld J, Schmitt B, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of monotherapy compared with combined androgen blockade for patients with advanced prostate carcinoma. *Cancer* 2002;95:361-376. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12124837>.

168. Laufer M, Denmeade SR, Sinibaldi VJ, et al. Complete androgen blockade for prostate cancer: what went wrong? *J Urol* 2000;164:3-9. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10840412>.

169. Lu-Yao GL, Albertsen PC, Moore DF, et al. Survival following primary androgen deprivation therapy among men with localized prostate cancer. *JAMA* 2008;300:173-181. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18612114>.

170. D'Amico AV, Chen MH, Renshaw AA, et al. Androgen suppression and radiation vs radiation alone for prostate cancer: a randomized trial. *JAMA* 2008;299:289-295. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18212313>.

171. Denham JW, Steigler A, Lamb DS, et al. Short-term neoadjuvant androgen deprivation and radiotherapy for locally advanced prostate cancer: 10-year data from the TROG 96.01 randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2011. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21440505>.

172. Jones CU, Hunt D, McGowan DG, et al. Radiotherapy and short-term androgen deprivation for localized prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:107-118. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21751904>.

173. Roach M, 3rd, Bae K, Speight J, et al. Short-term neoadjuvant androgen deprivation therapy and external-beam radiotherapy for locally advanced prostate cancer: long-term results of RTOG 8610. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:585-591. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18172188>.

174. Horwitz EM, Bae K, Hanks GE, et al. Ten-year follow-up of radiation therapy oncology group protocol 92-02: a phase III trial of the duration of elective androgen deprivation in locally advanced prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:2497-2504. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18413638>.

175. Bolla M, de Reijke TM, Van Tienhoven G, et al. Duration of androgen suppression in the treatment of prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:2516-2527. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19516032>.

176. Souhami L, Bae K, Pilepich M, Sandler H. Impact of the duration of adjuvant hormonal therapy in patients with locally advanced prostate cancer treated with radiotherapy: a secondary analysis of RTOG 85-31. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:2137-2143. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19307511>.
177. Kumar S, Shelley M, Harrison C, et al. Neo-adjuvant and adjuvant hormone therapy for localised and locally advanced prostate cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2006:CD006019. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17054269>.
178. Messing EM, Manola J, Yao J, et al. Immediate versus deferred androgen deprivation treatment in patients with node-positive prostate cancer after radical prostatectomy and pelvic lymphadenectomy. *Lancet Oncol* 2006;7:472-479. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16750497>.
179. Wong YN, Freedland S, Egleston B, et al. Role of androgen deprivation therapy for node-positive prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:100-105. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19047295>.
180. McLeod DG, Iversen P, See WA, et al. Bicalutamide 150 mg plus standard care vs standard care alone for early prostate cancer. *BJU Int* 2006;97:247-254. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16430622>.
181. McLeod DG, See WA, Klimberg I, et al. The bicalutamide 150 mg early prostate cancer program: findings of the North American trial at 7.7-year median followup. *J Urol* 2006;176:75-80. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16753373>.
182. Shaw GL, Wilson P, Cuzick J, et al. International study into the use of intermittent hormone therapy in the treatment of carcinoma of the prostate: a meta-analysis of 1446 patients. *BJU Int* 2007;99:1056-1065. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17346277>.
183. Akakura K, Bruchofsky N, Goldenberg SL, et al. Effects of intermittent androgen suppression on androgen-dependent tumors. Apoptosis and serum prostate-specific antigen. *Cancer* 1993;71:2782-2790. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7682149>.
184. Crook JM, O'Callaghan CJ, Duncan G, et al. Intermittent androgen suppression for rising PSA level after radiotherapy. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:895-903. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22931259>.
185. Schroder FH, Kurth KH, Fossa SD, et al. Early versus delayed endocrine treatment of T2-T3 pN1-3 M0 prostate cancer without local treatment of the primary tumour: final results of European Organisation for the Research and Treatment of Cancer protocol 30846 after 13 years of follow-up (a randomised controlled trial). *Eur Urol* 2009;55:14-22. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18823693>.
186. Hussain M, Tangen CM, Higano C, et al. Absolute prostate-specific antigen value after androgen deprivation is a strong independent predictor of survival in new metastatic prostate cancer: data from Southwest Oncology Group Trial 9346 (INT-0162). *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:3984-3990. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16921051>.
187. Hussain M, Tangen CM, Berry DL, et al. Intermittent versus continuous androgen deprivation in prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:1314-1325. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23550669>.
188. Ahmadi H, Daneshmand S. Androgen deprivation therapy: evidence-based management of side effects. *BJU Int* 2013;111:543-548. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23351025>.
189. Gaztanaga M, Crook J. Androgen deprivation therapy: minimizing exposure and mitigating side effects. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2012;10:1088-1095; quiz 1088, 1096. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22956808>.

190. Shahinian VB, Kuo YF, Freeman JL, Goodwin JS. Risk of fracture after androgen deprivation for prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:154-164. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15647578>.

191. Smith MR, Boyce SP, Moyneur E, et al. Risk of clinical fractures after gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist therapy for prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2006;175:136-139; discussion 139. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16406890>.

192. Smith MR, Lee WC, Brandman J, et al. Gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonists and fracture risk: a claims-based cohort study of men with nonmetastatic prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:7897-7903. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16258089>.

193. Daniell HW, Dunn SR, Ferguson DW, et al. Progressive osteoporosis during androgen deprivation therapy for prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2000;163:181-186. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10604342>.

194. Diamond T, Campbell J, Bryant C, Lynch W. The effect of combined androgen blockade on bone turnover and bone mineral densities in men treated for prostate carcinoma: longitudinal evaluation and response to intermittent cyclic etidronate therapy. *Cancer* 1998;83:1561-1566. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9781950>.

195. Maillefert JF, Sibilia J, Michel F, et al. Bone mineral density in men treated with synthetic gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonists for prostatic carcinoma. *J Urol* 1999;161:1219-1222. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10081873>.

196. Smith MR, McGovern FJ, Zietman AL, et al. Pamidronate to prevent bone loss during androgen-deprivation therapy for prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:948-955. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11575286>.

197. Smith MR, Finkelstein JS, McGovern FJ, et al. Changes in body composition during androgen deprivation therapy for prostate cancer. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2002;87:599-603. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11836291>.

198. National Osteoporosis Foundation. National Osteoporosis Foundation clinician's guide to prevention and treatment of osteoporosis. 2013. Available at: <http://www.nof.org/professionals/clinical-guidelines>. Accessed March 11, 2013.

199. World Health Organisation. WHO Fracture Risk Assessment Tool. Available at: <http://www.shef.ac.uk/FRAX/>. Accessed March 18, 2014.

200. Smith MR, Eastham J, Gleason DM, et al. Randomized controlled trial of zoledronic acid to prevent bone loss in men receiving androgen deprivation therapy for nonmetastatic prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2003;169:2008-2012. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12771706>.

201. Michaelson MD, Kaufman DS, Lee H, et al. Randomized controlled trial of annual zoledronic acid to prevent gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist-induced bone loss in men with prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:1038-1042. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17369566>.

202. Greenspan SL, Nelson JB, Trump DL, Resnick NM. Effect of once-weekly oral alendronate on bone loss in men receiving androgen deprivation therapy for prostate cancer: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2007;146:416-424. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17371886>.

203. Smith MR, Egerdie B, Hernandez Toriz N, et al. Denosumab in men receiving androgen-deprivation therapy for prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2009;361:745-755. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19671656>.

204. Keating NL, O'Malley AJ, Smith MR. Diabetes and cardiovascular disease during androgen deprivation therapy for prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:4448-4456. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16983113>.

205. D'Amico AV, Denham JW, Crook J, et al. Influence of androgen suppression therapy for prostate cancer on the frequency and timing of fatal myocardial infarctions. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:2420-2425. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17557956>.

206. Studer UE, Whelan P, Albrecht W, et al. Immediate or deferred androgen deprivation for patients with prostate cancer not suitable for local treatment with curative intent: European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) Trial 30891. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:1868-1876. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16622261>.

207. Tsai HK, D'Amico AV, Sadetsky N, et al. Androgen deprivation therapy for localized prostate cancer and the risk of cardiovascular mortality. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2007;99:1516-1524. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17925537>.

208. Efstathiou JA, Bae K, Shipley WU, et al. Cardiovascular mortality after androgen deprivation therapy for locally advanced prostate cancer: RTOG 85-31. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:92-99. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19047297>.

209. Saigal CS, Gore JL, Krupski TL, et al. Androgen deprivation therapy increases cardiovascular morbidity in men with prostate cancer. *Cancer* 2007;110:1493-1500. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17657815>.

210. Nguyen PL, Je Y, Schutz FA, et al. Association of androgen deprivation therapy with cardiovascular death in patients with prostate cancer: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. *JAMA* 2011;306:2359-2366. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22147380>.

211. Berruti A, Dogliotti L, Terrone C, et al. Changes in bone mineral density, lean body mass and fat content as measured by dual energy x-ray absorptiometry in patients with prostate cancer without apparent bone metastases given androgen deprivation therapy. *J Urol* 2002;167:2361-2367; discussion 2367. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11992038>.

212. Tayek JA, Heber D, Byerley LO, et al. Nutritional and metabolic effects of gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist treatment for prostate cancer. *Metabolism* 1990;39:1314-1319. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2123281>.

213. Dockery F, Bulpitt CJ, Agarwal S, et al. Testosterone suppression in men with prostate cancer leads to an increase in arterial stiffness and hyperinsulinaemia. *Clin Sci (Lond)* 2003;104:195-201. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12546642>.

214. Smith JC, Bennett S, Evans LM, et al. The effects of induced hypogonadism on arterial stiffness, body composition, and metabolic parameters in males with prostate cancer. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2001;86:4261-4267. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11549659>.

215. Smith MR, Lee H, Nathan DM. Insulin sensitivity during combined androgen blockade for prostate cancer. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2006;91:1305-1308. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16434464>.

216. Eri LM, Urdal P, Bechensteen AG. Effects of the luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone agonist leuprolide on lipoproteins, fibrinogen and plasminogen activator inhibitor in patients with benign prostatic hyperplasia. *J Urol* 1995;154:100-104. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7539852>.

217. Holzbeierlein J, Lal P, LaTulippe E, et al. Gene expression analysis of human prostate carcinoma during hormonal therapy identifies androgen-responsive genes and mechanisms of therapy

resistance. Am J Pathol 2004;164:217-227. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14695335>.

218. Mohler JL, Gregory CW, Ford OH, 3rd, et al. The androgen axis in recurrent prostate cancer. Clin Cancer Res 2004;10:440-448. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14760063>.

219. de Bono JS, Logothetis CJ, Molina A, et al. Abiraterone and increased survival in metastatic prostate cancer. N Engl J Med 2011;364:1995-2005. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21612468>.

220. Fizazi K, Scher HI, Molina A, et al. Abiraterone acetate for treatment of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: final overall survival analysis of the COU-AA-301 randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 study. Lancet Oncol 2012;13:983-992. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22995653>.

221. Logothetis CJ, Basch E, Molina A, et al. Effect of abiraterone acetate and prednisone compared with placebo and prednisone on pain control and skeletal-related events in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: exploratory analysis of data from the COU-AA-301 randomised trial. Lancet Oncol 2012. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23142059>.

222. Ryan CJ, Smith MR, de Bono JS, et al. Abiraterone in metastatic prostate cancer without previous chemotherapy. N Engl J Med 2013;368:138-148. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23228172>.

223. Scher HI, Fizazi K, Saad F, et al. Increased survival with enzalutamide in prostate cancer after chemotherapy. N Engl J Med 2012;367:1187-1197. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22894553>.

224. Food and Drug Administration. Enzalutamide label information. 2012. Available at:

http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2012/203415lbl.pdf. Accessed March 11, 2013.

225. Scher HI, Beer TM, Higano CS, et al. Antitumour activity of MDV3100 in castration-resistant prostate cancer: a phase 1-2 study. Lancet 2010;375:1437-1446. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20398925>.

226. Petrylak DP, Tangen CM, Hussain MH, et al. Docetaxel and estramustine compared with mitoxantrone and prednisone for advanced refractory prostate cancer. N Engl J Med 2004;351:1513-1520. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15470214>.

227. Tannock IF, de Wit R, Berry WR, et al. Docetaxel plus prednisone or mitoxantrone plus prednisone for advanced prostate cancer. N Engl J Med 2004;351:1502-1512. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15470213>.

228. Berthold DR, Pond GR, Soban F, et al. Docetaxel plus prednisone or mitoxantrone plus prednisone for advanced prostate cancer: updated survival in the TAX 327 study. J Clin Oncol 2008;26:242-245. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18182665>.

229. Kellokumpu-Lehtinen PL, Harmenberg U, Joensuu T, et al. 2-Weekly versus 3-weekly docetaxel to treat castration-resistant advanced prostate cancer: a randomised, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol 2013;14:117-124. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23294853>.

230. de Bono JS, Oudard S, Ozguroglu M, et al. Prednisone plus cabazitaxel or mitoxantrone for metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer progressing after docetaxel treatment: a randomised open-label trial. Lancet 2010;376:1147-1154. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20888992>.

231. Bahl A, Oudard S, Tombal B, et al. Impact of cabazitaxel on 2-year survival and palliation of tumour-related pain in men with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer treated in the TROPIC trial. Ann

Oncol 2013. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23723295>.

232. Kantoff PW, Higano CS, Shore ND, et al. Sipuleucel-T immunotherapy for castration-resistant prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:411-422. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20818862>.

233. Saad F, Gleason DM, Murray R, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of zoledronic acid in patients with hormone-refractory metastatic prostate carcinoma. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2002;94:1458-1468. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12359855>.

234. Saad F, Gleason DM, Murray R, et al. Long-term efficacy of zoledronic acid for the prevention of skeletal complications in patients with metastatic hormone-refractory prostate cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2004;96:879-882. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15173273>.

235. Fizazi K, Carducci M, Smith M, et al. Denosumab versus zoledronic acid for treatment of bone metastases in men with castration-resistant prostate cancer: a randomised, double-blind study. *Lancet* 2011;377:813-822. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21353695>.

236. Tarassoff P, Csermak K. Avascular necrosis of the jaws: risk factors in metastatic cancer patients. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2003;61:1238-1239. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14586868>.

237. Edge SB, Byrd DR, Compton CC, et al. *AJCC Cancer Staging Manual* (ed 7). New York: Springer-Verlag; 2009.

238. College of American Pathologists. *Prostate Protocol*. 2006.

Available at:

http://www.cap.org/apps/docs/committees/cancer/cancer_protocols/2006/prostate06_pw.pdf. Accessed March 18, 2014.

239. Briganti A, Passoni N, Ferrari M, et al. When to perform bone scan in patients with newly diagnosed prostate cancer: external validation of the currently available guidelines and proposal of a novel risk stratification tool. *Eur Urol* 2010;57:551-558. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20034730>.

240. Wolf JS, Jr., Cher M, Dall'era M, et al. The use and accuracy of cross-sectional imaging and fine needle aspiration cytology for detection of pelvic lymph node metastases before radical prostatectomy. *J Urol* 1995;153:993-999. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7853590>.

241. Dall'Era MA, Albertsen PC, Bangma C, et al. Active surveillance for prostate cancer: a systematic review of the literature. *Eur Urol* 2012;62:976-983. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22698574>.

242. Pound CR, Partin AW, Eisenberger MA, et al. Natural history of progression after PSA elevation following radical prostatectomy. *JAMA* 1999;281:1591-1597. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10235151>.

243. Thompson IM, Tangen CM, Paradelo J, et al. Adjuvant radiotherapy for pathological T3N0M0 prostate cancer significantly reduces risk of metastases and improves survival: long-term followup of a randomized clinical trial. *J Urol* 2009;181:956-962. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19167731>.

244. Thompson IM, Jr., Tangen CM, Paradelo J, et al. Adjuvant radiotherapy for pathologically advanced prostate cancer: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2006;296:2329-2335. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17105795>.

245. Swanson GP, Goldman B, Tangen CM, et al. The prognostic impact of seminal vesicle involvement found at prostatectomy and the effects of adjuvant radiation: data from Southwest Oncology Group 8794. *J Urol* 2008;180:2453-2457; discussion 2458. Available at:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18930488>.

246. Van der Kwast TH, Bolla M, Van Poppel H, et al. Identification of patients with prostate cancer who benefit from immediate postoperative radiotherapy: EORTC 22911. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4178-4186. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17878474>.

247. Wiegel T, Bottke D, Steiner U, et al. Phase III postoperative adjuvant radiotherapy after radical prostatectomy compared with radical prostatectomy alone in pT3 prostate cancer with postoperative undetectable prostate-specific antigen: ARO 96-02/AUO AP 09/95. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:2924-2930. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19433689>.

248. Da Pozzo LF, Cozzarini C, Briganti A, et al. Long-term follow-up of patients with prostate cancer and nodal metastases treated by pelvic lymphadenectomy and radical prostatectomy: the positive impact of adjuvant radiotherapy. *Eur Urol* 2009;55:1003-1011. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19211184>.

249. Cheung R, Kamat AM, de Crevoisier R, et al. Outcome of salvage radiotherapy for biochemical failure after radical prostatectomy with or without hormonal therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2005;63:134-140. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16111581>.

250. Lee AK, D'Amico AV. Utility of prostate-specific antigen kinetics in addition to clinical factors in the selection of patients for salvage local therapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:8192-8197. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16278472>.

251. Patel R, Lepor H, Thiel RP, Taneja SS. Prostate-specific antigen velocity accurately predicts response to salvage radiotherapy in men with biochemical relapse after radical prostatectomy. *Urology* 2005;65:942-946. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15882728>.

252. Stephenson AJ, Shariat SF, Zelefsky MJ, et al. Salvage radiotherapy for recurrent prostate cancer after radical prostatectomy. *JAMA* 2004;291:1325-1332. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15026399>.

253. Ward JF, Zincke H, Bergstralh EJ, et al. Prostate specific antigen doubling time subsequent to radical prostatectomy as a prognosticator of outcome following salvage radiotherapy. *J Urol* 2004;172:2244-2248. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15538240>.

254. Trock BJ, Han M, Freedland SJ, et al. Prostate cancer-specific survival following salvage radiotherapy vs observation in men with biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy. *JAMA* 2008;299:2760-2769. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18560003>.

255. Jhaveri FM, Zippe CD, Klein EA, Kupelian PA. Biochemical failure does not predict overall survival after radical prostatectomy for localized prostate cancer: 10-year results. *Urology* 1999;54:884-890. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10565752>.

256. Cher ML, Bianco FJ, Jr., Lam JS, et al. Limited role of radionuclide bone scintigraphy in patients with prostate specific antigen elevations after radical prostatectomy. *J Urol* 1998;160:1387-1391. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9751361>.

257. Roach M, 3rd, Hanks G, Thames H, Jr., et al. Defining biochemical failure following radiotherapy with or without hormonal therapy in men with clinically localized prostate cancer: recommendations of the RTOG-ASTRO Phoenix Consensus Conference. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2006;65:965-974. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16798415>.

258. Rogers E, Ohori M, Kassabian VS, et al. Salvage radical prostatectomy: outcome measured by serum prostate specific antigen levels. *J Urol* 1995;153:104-110. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7526002>.

259. Ismail M, Ahmed S, Kastner C, Davies J. Salvage cryotherapy for recurrent prostate cancer after radiation failure: a prospective case series of the first 100 patients. *BJU Int* 2007;100:760-764. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17662081>.

260. Allen GW, Howard AR, Jarrard DF, Ritter MA. Management of prostate cancer recurrences after radiation therapy-brachytherapy as a salvage option. *Cancer* 2007;110:1405-1416. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17685384>.
261. Pucar D, Shukla-Dave A, Hricak H, et al. Prostate cancer: correlation of MR imaging and MR spectroscopy with pathologic findings after radiation therapy-initial experience. *Radiology* 2005;236:545-553. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15972335>.
262. Westphalen AC, Kurhanewicz J, Cunha RM, et al. T2-Weighted endorectal magnetic resonance imaging of prostate cancer after external beam radiation therapy. *Int Braz J Urol* 2009;35:171-180; discussion 181-172. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19409121>.
263. Smith MR, Kabbinavar F, Saad F, et al. Natural history of rising serum prostate-specific antigen in men with castrate nonmetastatic prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:2918-2925. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15860850>.
264. Dupont A, Gomez JL, Cusan L, et al. Response to flutamide withdrawal in advanced prostate cancer in progression under combination therapy. *J Urol* 1993;150:908-913. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7688437>.
265. Sartor AO, Tangen CM, Hussain MH, et al. Antiandrogen withdrawal in castrate-refractory prostate cancer: a Southwest Oncology Group trial (SWOG 9426). *Cancer* 2008;112:2393-2400. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18383517>.
266. Small EJ, Halabi S, Dawson NA, et al. Antiandrogen withdrawal alone or in combination with ketoconazole in androgen-independent prostate cancer patients: a phase III trial (CALGB 9583). *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:1025-1033. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15020604>.
267. Oh WK, Kantoff PW, Weinberg V, et al. Prospective, multicenter, randomized phase II trial of the herbal supplement, PC-SPE5, and diethylstilbestrol in patients with androgen-independent prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:3705-3712. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15289492>.
268. Brennan SM, Gregory DL, Stillie A, et al. Should extrapulmonary small cell cancer be managed like small cell lung cancer? *Cancer* 2010;116:888-895. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20052730>.
269. Yao JL, Madeb R, Bourne P, et al. Small cell carcinoma of the prostate: an immunohistochemical study. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2006;30:705-712. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16723847>.
270. Sella A, Konichezky M, Flex D, et al. Low PSA metastatic androgen-independent prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2000;38:250-254. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10940696>.
271. Spiess PE, Pettaway CA, Vakar-Lopez F, et al. Treatment outcomes of small cell carcinoma of the prostate: a single-center study. *Cancer* 2007;110:1729-1737. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17786954>.
272. Coleman RE. Risks and benefits of bisphosphonates. *Br J Cancer* 2008;98:1736-1740. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18506174>.
273. Food and Drug Administration. Zometa (zoledronic acid) label information. 2011. Available at: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/021223s027lbl.pdf. Accessed March 18, 2014.
274. Food and Drug Administration. Xgeva (denosumab) label information. 2010. Available at: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/125320s14s124lbl.pdf. Accessed March 18, 2014.

275. Smith MR, Saad F, Coleman R, et al. Denosumab and bone-metastasis-free survival in men with castration-resistant prostate cancer: results of a phase 3, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2012;379:39-46. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22093187>.

276. Machiels JP, Mazzeo F, Clausse M, et al. Prospective randomized study comparing docetaxel, estramustine, and prednisone with docetaxel and prednisone in metastatic hormone-refractory prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:5261-5268. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18794543>.

277. Food and Drug Administration. Radium-223 dichloride label information. 2013. Available at: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/203971lbl.pdf. Accessed March 18, 2014.

278. Tannock IF, Osoba D, Stockler MR, et al. Chemotherapy with mitoxantrone plus prednisone or prednisone alone for symptomatic hormone-resistant prostate cancer: a Canadian randomized trial with palliative end points. *J Clin Oncol* 1996;14:1756-1764. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8656243>.

279. Kantoff PW, Halabi S, Conaway M, et al. Hydrocortisone with or without mitoxantrone in men with hormone-refractory prostate cancer: results of the cancer and leukemia group B 9182 study. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:2506-2513. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10561316>.

280. National Institutes of Health. A Safety and Efficacy Study of Oral MDV3100 in Chemotherapy-Naive Patients With Progressive Metastatic Prostate Cancer (PREVAIL). Available at: <http://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT01212991>. Accessed March 24, 2014.

281. Noonan KL, North S, Bitting RL, et al. Clinical activity of abiraterone acetate in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer progressing after enzalutamide. *Ann Oncol*

2013;24:1802-1807. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23585511>.

282. Loriot Y, Bianchini D, Ileana E, et al. Antitumour activity of abiraterone acetate against metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer progressing after docetaxel and enzalutamide (MDV3100). *Ann Oncol* 2013;24:1807-1812. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23576708>.

283. Bianchini D, Lorente D, Rodriguez-Vida A, et al. Antitumour activity of enzalutamide (MDV3100) in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (CRPC) pre-treated with docetaxel and abiraterone. *Eur J Cancer* 2014;50:78-84. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24074764>.

284. Ryan CJ, Shah S, Efstathiou E, et al. Phase II study of abiraterone acetate in chemotherapy-naive metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer displaying bone flare discordant with serologic response. *Clin Cancer Res* 2011;17:4854-4861. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21632851>.