**Local Experience of Endorectal Magnetic Resonance Imaging of Prostate with Correlation to Radical Prostatectomy Specimens**

Judy SP Tan,† MBBS, FRCR, MMed (Diag Radiol), Choon Hua Thng,‡ MBBS, FCR(C), FAMS, Puay Hoon Tan,§ MBBS, FRCP(A), Christopher WS Cheng,†† FRCS (Edin), FRCS (Glas), MMed (Surg), Weber KO Lau,¶ MBBS, FRCS (Edin), FCR(ty Glas), Terence WK Tan,∥ MBBS, FCR(C), FAMS, Juliana TS Ho,‡ MBBS, FRCR, Boon Chye Ching,∥∥ MBBS, FCR(C), MMed (Diag Radiol)

---

**Introduction**

Prostate cancer ranks among the top 10 cancers in Singapore.1 The incidence of prostate cancer has risen by 5% to 118% in most Asian countries.2 In the evaluation of patients with prostate cancer, the most important factor affecting a patient’s prognosis and choice of treatment regime is disease stage at the time of diagnosis.3 Tumour, nodes, metastasis (TNM) staging of prostate cancer depends on the presence or absence of extraprostatic extension on histopathology. Current clinical staging of prostate cancer is based on Partin’s nomogram4,5 and predicts the pathological stage based on the 3 variables of prostate-specific antigen (PSA), Gleason’s score and digital rectal examination for extraprostatic extension. These 3 clinical variables have been used to develop treatment risk groups6,7 and pre-treatment nomograms to predict treatment failure after radical prostatectomy or radiation therapy.8,9 Although magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is the best modality for visualising local extension, it has poor sensitivity for the detection of microscopic spread and only has a role in patients with intermediate risk based on Partin’s nomogram.

It is therefore important for magnetic resonance (MR) staging of prostate cancer to achieve high specificity even at the expense of a decreased sensitivity, in order to avoid denying patients potentially curative radical prostatectomies.10 We have previously reported our experience with pelvic phased array MR prostate and had achieved a relatively high specificity.11 We now undertake this study to evaluate our experience with endorectal coil MR of prostate.

---

**Materials and Methods**

This is a retrospective study. Between 1 January 2001 and 30 June 2005, 139 patients underwent endorectal MR prostate studies. Out of these 139 patients, 32 patients eventually underwent radical prostatectomy. These 32 patients form the study population from whose medical records, clinical and MR imaging data were obtained.
The MR examinations were performed with a 1.5-T whole-body MRI system (GE Medical systems, GE Signa LX). The examination was performed with the patients in a supine position. Patients were examined using the body coil for excitation and a pelvic phased-array coil in combination with a commercially available balloon-covered expandable endorectal coil for signal reception. The sequences employed using the pelvic phased-array coil and endorectal coil are detailed in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

All but 1 patient had their MR images interpreted by a single radiologist with subspecialty body imaging experience using criteria from Yu et al’s study. Diagnostic criteria used for extracapsular extension (ECE) included irregular capsular bulge, asymmetry and thickening of neurovascular bundle at mid gland, obliteration of rectoprostatic angle and periprostatic fat infiltration. Sensitivity, specificity and accuracy of MR in evaluation of ECE were determined. While 95% confidence interval was calculated using the method of Agresti and Coull. True positive was defined as MR finding of locally advanced disease confirmed pathologically based on histopathological reports. No direct correlation to whole-mount specimens was made.

Results

The mean age of the 32 patients was 61 years (range, 33 to 71). The average time interval between the MR examination and radical prostatectomy was 59.3 days (range, 2 to 181). At histopathologic analysis, 18 patients had stage pT2 disease while 14 patients had stage pT3 disease. We correctly reported 17 cases of organ-confined disease and 2 cases of locally advanced disease. One case of organ-confined disease was reported as having ECE due to the presence of left capsular bulge. This case was reviewed by both the radiologist and pathologist. On histologic examination, there was an organ-confined focal bulge with a 2-mm rim of capsule (Fig. 1).

In the evaluation of ECE, endorectal MR achieved a high specificity of 94.4%, low sensitivity of 14.3%, moderate accuracy of 59.4%, positive predictive value of 66.7% and negative predictive value of 58.6% (Table 3).

Discussion

Accurate local staging of prostate cancer is important for treatment planning. It has recently been shown that radical prostatectomy for organ-confined disease reduces disease-specific mortality, overall mortality, risks of metastasis and local progression. Patient selection is important as radical prostatectomy is a major operation with attendant risks of urinary and sexual dysfunction.
of PSA, clinical stage and Gleason score remains the norm for predicting the pathological stage of localised prostate cancer. MRI has a complementary role in improving the accuracy of local staging in patients with intermediate risk based on Partin’s nomograms.7,17 The definition of intermediate risks includes: 1) PSA 10 ng/mL or less, biopsy Gleason score 6 or less, 1992 American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) clinical stage T1c or T2a and greater than 50% positive prostate biopsies; 2) greater than 10 to 20 ng/mL, score 7 or stage T2b and 34% to 50%; or 3) greater than 20 ng/mL, score 8 to 10 or stage T2c disease and less than 34%.7 In patients with intermediate risks based on Partin’s nomogram, the presence or absence of extraprostatic extension on MRI stratifies the 5-year biochemical failure into 2 distinct groups. Hence, surgery should be considered in the intermediate risk patient if MR does not demonstrate extraprostatic extension.

In recent years, endorectal MRI appears to be the most accurate imaging test available for local staging of prostate cancer, replacing phased array MRI of the prostate due to higher spatial and contrast resolution translating to a better image quality.18,19 Reported accuracy rates of endorectal MR in staging of prostate cancer vary from 51% to 82.6%.12,17,20,21 Wang et al17 demonstrated that endorectal MR prostate imaging findings are an independent predictor of ECE, yielding additional value to clinical variables (e.g., serum PSA, Gleason score, clinical stage of tumour, greatest percentage of cancer in all core biopsy specimens, etc).

A wide range of specificities and sensitivities of endorectal MR in the assessment of ECE have been reported in the literature, varying from 68% to 95.4% and 17% to 84% respectively.12,17,18,20,22 This is due to a combination of factors including differences in radiologists’ experience and subspecialty training22,23 as well as a lack of standardised diagnostic criteria.12,24 High diagnostic specificity indicates low false-positives and thus helps to ensure that few patients will be deprived of potentially curative surgery. It is accepted that high specificity, even if accompanied by low sensitivity, is a more cost-effective approach for patients being considered for surgery.10 In our institution, we are able to achieve a high specificity rate of 94.4%, comparable with international norms. Variable sensitivity remains a problem with endorectal MR prostate study, suggesting that the spatial and contrast resolution is still not optimal for the detection of microscopic invasion.7,12 One of the limitations of this retrospective study is a tendency for bias towards patients with clinically limited disease. Hence, sensitivity of endorectal coil MR prostate may potentially be lower as patients with clinically obvious extraprostatic extensions are not included in this study. Future study including all patients may eliminate this bias, thus providing a more accurate assessment of this imaging modality as a staging tool.

In conclusion, we are able to achieve a high specificity rate for ECE in our endorectal coil MR prostate examinations, in keeping with international norms, satisfying the complementary role that endorectal coil MR prostate plays in the local staging of prostate cancer in patients with intermediate risk.
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