DOI:10.31557/APJCN.1840.20250520

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Determine the Diagnostic Yield of Ultrasound Guided Biopsy of Prostatic Lesions, Keeping Histopathology as Reference Standard, at a Tertiary Care Hospital

Fatima Wazir Ali, Waseem Mirza, Ayesha Hassan

Department of Radiology, Agha Khan University Hospital, Karachi, Pakistan.

Abstract

Objective: To determine the diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided biopsy of prostatic lesions, keeping histopathology as reference standard at a tertiary care hospital. **Methods:** All male patients above 55 years who were referred to the Radiology department of Aga Khan University Hospital, Karachi with ultrasound/MRI finding of prostate malignancy constituted the population. After taking informed written consent and history all patients underwent transrectal ultrasound. Prostate was visualized using a transrectal biplanar ultrasound probe. Subsequently, 12 core biopsies were performed by an interventional radiologist with minimum 5 years of experience and diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided biopsy of prostatic lesions was checked keeping histopathology as reference standard. **Result:** Total of 116 patients with ultrasound/ MRI finding of prostatic malignancy who underwent ultrasound guided prostatic biopsy constituted the population. The mean age was 67.732+7.907 years. The diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided biopsy of prostatic lesions was 70.7%, keeping histopathology as reference standard. **Conclusion:** The diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided biopsy of prostatic lesions was significantly high, keeping histopathology as reference standard. The diagnostic yield increases with the increase in age and BMI.

Keywords: Diagnostic yield- ultrasound guided biopsy- prostatic lesions- histopathology

Asian Pac J Cancer Nursing, 71-75

Submission Date: 02/22/2025 Acceptance Date: 04/26/2025

Introduction

Prostate cancer is the most common form of cancer experienced by men in the United States with 164,690 new cases predicted for 2018 being the second leading cause of cancer death in US men with 29,430 deaths predicted for 2018 [1]. It constitutes a diverse spectrum of disease with clinical behavior ranging from well-differentiated noninvasive tumors to high-grade metastatic cancers with significant morbidity and mortality. Prostate biopsy is the cornerstone of establishing the diagnosis of prostate cancer. Recent advances in imaging technology have led to improvements in the early detection of prostate cancer.

Prostate cancer is the most frequently diagnosed form of noncutaneous cancer in men [2]. Incidence increased dramatically after the introduction of the prostate-specific antigen (PSA) test [2, 3]. Unfortunately, urologists face the dilemma of patients with elevated and/or rising PSA levels and negative biopsy results because the serum PSA level, used for early diagnosis of prostate cancer, is a very sensitive but unspecific test. Transrectal ultrasound (TRUS) was introduced in 1968 as a means for diagnostic imaging of prostate cancer [4]. The sensitivity of this technique for prostate cancer detection is low (20–30%) [5] because more than 40% of prostate tumors are isoechoic and only the peripheral zone can be accurately detected [6, 7]. TRUS Doppler and application of contrast agents increased the detection rate of prostate cancer to 74–98% [8-12].

Over 1.2 million prostate needle biopsies are executed every year in the United States [13]. Systematic TRUS-guided biopsy (TRUSBx) is the gold standard for detecting prostate cancer. This systematic approach is characterized by low sensitivity (39–52%) and high specificity

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Ayesha Hassan
Department of Radiology, Agha Khan University Hospital, Karachi, Pakistan.
Email: ayeshassan1050@gmail.com

(81–82%) [14]. In case of doubt, additional biopsy sessions are performed. In some cases, the systematic protocol is extended with additional biopsies targeting hypoechoic regions detected by TRUS, which increases the detection rate slightly [4].

Biopsy is the most successful diagnostic approach [15]. -guided biopsy provides uniform sampling of the entire prostate and a relatively high probability of clinical diagnosis [16]. However, the search for an improved biopsy technique, which includes a better diagnosis with relatively few complications, is ongoing [17]. Biopsy techniques that optimize the number of cores that are sampled, as well as their locations within the prostate gland, may be considered [18]. In this prospective analysis, we estimated the diagnostic yield of different biopsy schemes, analyzed the locations within the prostate of the carcinoma-positive cores identified during TPUS-guided extended biopsy, and evaluated the efficacy of TPUS-guided extended biopsy for detecting disease in various locations within the prostate gland.

Prostatic carcinoma is the second most common solid tumor in men and fifth most common cause of cancer mortality with an incidence of approximately 1.41 million worldwide. However, it varies with race and ethnicity [19]. Risk factors mostly include old age, overweight and obesity, smoking, alcohol consumption and genetic variability [20]. Although no recent study has been performed in Pakistan for the incidence of prostate malignancy, a study conducted in Lahore, Pakistan from 2010 to 2015 showed an incidence rate of 95/100,000 in Pakistani male population [21]. Mean age of the patient with prostatic carcinoma is 68.9 with the majority of the cases occurring in the eighth decade of life [22]. Transrectal ultrasound guided prostate biopsy has been the standard diagnostic investigation for men at risk for prostate cancer [23]. According to international guidelines, systematic 12 core biopsy is recommended in biopsy naive men with PSA serum levels of >3 ng/ml [24].

Although, sufficient number of international studies is available on this critical issue, there is a lack of rigorously carried out analytical data and reviews in this region. The main objective of this research is to estimate the diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided transrectal prostate biopsy among men in Pakistan, keeping histopathology as reference standard.

Materials and Methods

Study design and inclusion criteria

This study was conducted at the Diagnostic Radiology Department,Agha Khan University Hospital,Karachi,Pakistan. This cross sectional study was approved by the institutional review board and informed consent was waived. Total of 116 males above the age of 55 who were referred to the Radiology Department of Agha Khan University Hospital , from 14 September 2023 to 14 march 2024 with the ultrasound /MRI findings of prostate malignancy and undergoing prostate biopsy and subsequent histological examination were considered. Patients with prostatic infection, bleeding diasthesis, low platelet count or raised INR were excluded from the study as these conditions could cause complications during biopsy.

Data collection

The day before biopsy all patients were given a 5-day course of antibiotic therapy with an oral fluoroquinolone (250 mg ciprofloxacin twice daily) or an appropriate alternative antibiotic in case of fluoroquinolone allergy. In addition, every patient was given a cleansing enema a night before biopsy. All patients underwent pre-procedure blood tests to ensure there was no bleeding tendency. Patients using antiplatelet or anticoagulant treatment were required to discontinue drugs prior to undergoing biopsy

For biopsy, patients were requested to assume the left lateral position. Perianal skin was prepared and disinfected. Local anesthesia was administered rectally in the form of Xylocaine gel.

Prostate was visualized using a transrectal biplanar ultrasound probe. Subsequently, 12 core biopsies were performed by an interventional radiologist with minimum 5 years of experience: six cores were taken from each side of the prostate at the base, mid, apex, upper lateral, and lower lateral regions.

Data was collected by using a pre-developed proforma. Brief history regarding demographic variables such as age, place of living, education level, smoking history, family history, employment status, PSA levels, urine frequency and urgency and histopathological results were collected and recorded.

Proforma

Diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided transrectal prostate biopsy with histopathology as reference standard.

MR No: _____
Name: _____
1. Age in years: ____
2. Height _____(cm).
3. Weight ____(kg).
4. BMI_____(kg/m^2).
5. Smoking history:
o Yes
o No
6. PSA level:_____
7. Histopathology result (Diagnostic yield):
o Conclusive
o Inconclusive

Data Analysis

Collected data was analyzed through computer software SPSS version 26. Normality assessment was done using Shapiro Wilk test for all the quantitative variables i.e., age, PSA levels. Mean and standard deviation was calculated and reported for all normally distributed quantitative variables. Median (IQR) was calculated and reported for all non-normally distributed quantitative variables. Frequency and percentages were calculated for all qualitative variables i.e., education level, place of living, smoking history, family history, employment status, urine urgency etc. Diagnostic yield was calculated

by calculating the cancer detection rate considering the histopathology result. Effect modifiers such as age, smoking history and family history were controlled through stratification. Post-stratification chi-square/ fisher exact test was applied. P-value of <0.05 was to be considered significant.

Results

A total of 116 males constituted the study population. The mean age was 67.732+7.907 years, the mean height was 165.293+8.342 cm & the mean weight was 73.784+11.321 kg. The mean BMI was 16.172+2.166 kg/m^2 & the mean PSA level was 86.323+236.520. Smoking history was seen in 66 (56.9%) patients.

In our study histopathology result (diagnostic yield) was conclusive in 82 (70.7%) & inconclusive in 34 (29.3%) patients. the diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided biopsy of prostatic lesions was 70.7%, keeping histopathology as reference standard.

The frequencies of age groups (years), BMI, smoking history & PSA level were calculated according to histopathology result (diagnostic yield). The results are presented in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3.

Discussion

Although ultrasound is a useful tool to biopsy the prostatic lesions but one of the controversial issues is whether it is necessary to take samples from a TRUS visible lesion area in addition to systematic biopsies or simply to add more biopsies to the standardized biopsy scheme in order to increase the detection rate of prostate cancer. Hypoechoic prostatic lesions are more than twice as likely to have cancer on biopsy as isoechoic prostatic tissue [25] and the average biopsy yield of a peripheral zone hypoechoic lesion is 30–50 [26].

On the contrary, hypoechoic lesions in the transition zone are less specific in terms of prostatic cancer owing to the fact that benign prostatic hyperplasia nodules may normally appear hypoechoic [27].

Earlier ultrasonic categorization of prostatic cancer (CaP) described these tumors as more hypoechoic than normal prostate However, when they enlarged, invaded other structures and developed calcifications, they became either hyperechoic, isoechoic, hypoechoic or mixed [28]. Nevertheless, in an era when tumors were notoriously larger, ultrasonographic evaluation of small cancers revealed that up to 40% were from isoechoic area [29, 30]. Ellis et al evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of PSA, DRE and TRUS for the diagnosis of CaP [30]. Although they found hypoechoic sectors more than twice as likely as isoechoic sectors of the prostate to contain malignancy on biopsy, 38% of the cancers detected in their series were from isoechoic areas. Overall, only 17% of all hypoechoic sectors contained carcinoma on biopsy and if only those lesions were sampled they would have missed the diagnosis in 25% of the cases.

In our study diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided biopsy of prostatic lesions was 70.7%, keeping histopathology as reference standard as compare to Jayarajah et al [31] study conducted in Sri Lanka where the sensitivity of ultrasound guided transrectal prostate biopsy was calculated to be 57.7%, with detection rates highest at PSA levels of 40 ng/ml.

Dyke et al studied whether there was a staging

Table 1. Histopathology Result (Diagnostic yield) According to Age (years) (n=116)

	Histopathology result (Diagnostic yield)		Total	P-value
Age (years)	Yes	No		
30-55 years	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)	8	0.033
56-80 years	79 (73.1%)	29 (26.9%)	108	
Total	82	34	116	

Chi-square-test was applied. P-value ≤ 0.05 considered as significant. Significant at 0.05 level

Table 2. Histopathology Result (Diagnostic yield) According to BMI (kg/m^2) (n=116)

	Histopathology result (Diagnostic yield)		Total	P-value
BMI (kg/m^2)	Yes	No		
18-25	24 (75%)	8 (25%)	32	0.529
25.1-32	58 (69%)	26 (31%)	84	
Total	82	34	116	

Chi-square-test was applied, P-value ≤ 0.05 considered as significant. Not significant at 0.05 level

Table 3. Histopathology Result (Diagnostic yield) According to PSA Level (n=116)

	Histopathology result (Diagnostic yield)			P-value
PSA level	Yes	No	Total	
1-1058	80 (70.2%)	34 (29.8%)	114	0.358
1059-2116	2 (100%)	0 (%)	2	
Total	82	34	116	

Chi-square-test was applied, P-value ≤ 0.05 considered as significant. Not significant at 0.05 level

difference between hypoechoic nodule directed and randomly taken TRUS guided biopsies, and noted that random biopsy results did not alter staging [32]. In addition, random biopsy was responsible for an increased cancer yield of just 3%. Their conclusion stressed that lower grade tumors were not sensitive to TRUS unlike high grade lesions. Ohori et al examined 986 consecutive patients, and in 51% of their 241 cancer cases an ultrasonographic lesion was observed [33]. However, for impalpable cancers ultrasound results provided no additional information regarding prognosis or pathological stage.

In general, prostates with hypoechoic lesions tend to have cancers but the lesion itself may not contain the tumor. Analysis of the 4 different compartments of the prostate revealed similar cancer detection rates. Therefore, from a given area, adjacent isoechoic zones should always be sampled, because if only hypoechoic lesions are sampled, significant disease could be missed.

To improve the diagnostic sensitivity of TRUS in early detection of prostate cancer, the use of different thresholds and PSA ranges has been recommended Onur et al study evaluated the rate of positive biopsy results of isoechoic or hypoechoic regions at different PSA levels. Although cancer detection rate improved with increasing levels of PSA, sensitivity of isoechoic or hypoechoic lesions to detect cancer was not different. Ito et al reported a positive predictive value and a negative predictive value for hypoechoic regions of 86% and 67%, respectively, in patients with serum PSA greater than 10 ng/ml [34]. However, when PSA was 4.0 ng/ml or less positive and negative predictive values for such lesions ware 9.1% and 97.6%, respectively.

The limitation of our study was single center study, smaller sample size. Further studies with larger sample sizes are required.

In conclusion, the diagnostic yield of ultrasound guided biopsy of prostatic lesions was significantly high, keeping histopathology as reference standard. The diagnostic yield increases with the increase in age and BMI.

Edict clinical outcome. The results of this study indicate that both the category and grade affect the outcome independently, and the higher the grade of subcategory, the greater the chance that the ulcer will persist or that death will occur. The most important finding of this study is that the simple PEDIS score system can also predict the outcome and may be more accurate than the more widely used system the AUC value to confirm the diagnostic accuracy of the PEDIS score system to predict the outcome of DFUs. The results of this study indicate that the PEDIS score system also has excellent capacity to predict the outcome. In addition, our study shows that the PEDIS category scores can be summed into an aggregate PEDIS score, with a score of 7 or more being associated with a significantly greater probability of difficulties in healing. We believe that the PEDIS score system should be applied widely in clinical.

References

1. American Cancer Society. Cancer facts & figures 2018. Atlanta, GA: American Cancer Society. 2018.
2. Frankel S, Smith GD, Donovan J, Neal D. Screening for prostate cancer. Lancet (London, England). 2003 03 29;361(9363):1122-1128. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(03)12890-5
3. Darson MF, Pacelli A, Roche P, Rittenhouse HG, Wolfert RL, Young CY, Klee GG, Tindall DJ, Bostwick DG. Human glandular kallikrein 2 (hK2) expression in prostatic intraepithelial neoplasia and adenocarcinoma: a novel prostate cancer marker. Urology. 1997 06;49(6):857-862. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-4295(97)00108-8
4. Brawn PN, Foster DM, Jay DW, Kuhl D, Speights VO, Johnson EH, Coffield KS, et al. Characteristics of prostatic infarcts and their effect on serum prostate-specific antigen and prostatic acid phosphatase. Urology. 1994 07;44(1):71-75. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-4295(94)80012-x
5. Lowe FC, Trauzzi SJ. Prostatic acid phosphatase in 1993. Its limited clinical utility. The Urologic Clinics of North America. 1993 Nov;20(4):589-595.
6. Cookson MS, Fleshner NE, Soloway SM, Fair WR. Correlation between Gleason score of needle biopsy and radical prostatectomy specimen: accuracy and clinical implications. The Journal of Urology. 1997 02;157(2):559-562.
7. Kojima M, Troncoso P, Babaian RJ. Use of prostate-specific antigen and tumor volume in predicting needle biopsy grading error. Urology. 1995 05;45(5):807-812. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-4295(99)80088-0
8. Gleason DF. Histologic grading of prostate cancer: a perspective. Human Pathology. 1992 03;23(3):273-279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0046-8177(92)90108-f
9. Terris MK, Pham TQ, Issa MM, Kabalin JN. Routine transition zone and seminal vesicle biopsies in all patients undergoing transrectal ultrasound guided prostate biopsies are not indicated. The Journal of Urology. 1997 01;157(1):204-206.
10. Bazinet M, Karakiewicz PI, Aprikian AG, Trudel C, Aronson S, Nachabé M, Péloquin F, et al. Value of systematic transition zone biopsies in the early detection of prostate cancer. The Journal of Urology. 1996 02;155(2):605-606.
11. Keetch DW, Catalona WJ. Prostatic transition zone biopsies in men with previous negative biopsies and persistently elevated serum prostate specific antigen values. The Journal of Urology. 1995 Nov;154(5):1795-1797.
12. Allepuz Losa CA, Sanz Velez JI, Gil Sanz MJ, Mas LP, Rioja Sanz LA. Seminal vesicle biopsy in prostate cancer staging. The Journal of Urology. 1995 Oct;154(4):1407-1411.
13. Cupp MR, Bostwick DG, Myers RP, Oesterling JE. The volume of prostate cancer in the biopsy specimen cannot reliably predict the quantity of cancer in the radical prostatectomy specimen on an individual basis. The Journal of Urology. 1995 05;153(5):1543-1548.
14. Daneshgari F, Taylor GD, Miller GJ, Crawford ED. Computer simulation of the probability of detecting low volume carcinoma of the prostate with six random systematic core biopsies. Urology. 1995 04;45(4):604-609. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-4295(99)80051-X
15. Van der Kwast T, Bubendorf L, Mazerolles C, Raspollini MR, Van Leenders GJ, Pihl C, Kujala P. Guidelines on processing and reporting of prostate biopsies: the 2013 update of the pathology committee of the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC). Virchows Archiv: An International Journal of Pathology. 2013 09;463(3):367-377. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-013-1466-5

16. Humphrey PA, Andriole GL. Prostate cancer diagnosis. Missouri Medicine. 2010;107(2):107-112.
17. Scattoni V, Raber M, Abdollah F, Roscigno M, Dehò F, Angiolilli D, Maccagnano C, et al. Biopsy schemes with the fewest cores for detecting 95% of the prostate cancers detected by a 24-core biopsy. European Urology. 2010 01;57(1):1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2009.08.011
18. Scattoni V, Raber M, Capitanio U, Abdollah F, Roscigno M, Angiolilli D, Maccagnano C, et al. The optimal rebiopsy prostatic scheme depends on patient clinical characteristics: results of a recursive partitioning analysis based on a 24-core systematic scheme. European Urology. 2011 Oct;60(4):834-841. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2011.07.036
19. Gandaglia G, Leni R, Bray F, Fleshner N, Freedland SJ, Kibel A, Stattin P, Van Poppel H, La Vecchia C. Epidemiology and Prevention of Prostate Cancer. European Urology Oncology. 2021 Dec;4(6):877-892. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euo.2021.09.006
20. Ha Chung B, Horie S, Chiong E. The incidence, mortality, and risk factors of prostate cancer in Asian men. Prostate International. 2019 03;7(1):1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prnil.2018.11.001
21. Bukhari U, George A, Shafique Y, Bukhari A. Prostatic Carcinoma: Frequency, Pattern and Evaluation of Gleason Grading in Prostate Biopsies. Pakistan Journal of Medical Research. 2020 09 04;59(2):55-59.
22. Klemann N, Røder MA, Helgstrand JT, Brasso K, Toft BG, Vainer B, Iversen P. Risk of prostate cancer diagnosis and mortality in men with a benign initial transrectal ultrasound-guided biopsy set: a population-based study. The Lancet. Oncology. 2017 02;18(2):221-229. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30025-6
23. Wolf AMD, Wender RC, Etzioni RB, Thompson IM, D'Amico AV, Volk RJ, Brooks DD, et al. American Cancer Society guideline for the early detection of prostate cancer: update 2010. CA: a cancer journal for clinicians. 2010;60(2):70-98. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.20066
24. Hong CW, Amalou H, Xu S, Turkbey B, Yan P, Kruecker J, Pinto PA, Choyke PL, Wood BJ. Prostate biopsy for the interventional radiologist. Journal of vascular and interventional radiology: JVIR. 2014 05;25(5):675-684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvir.2013.12.568
25. Melchior SW, Brawer MK. Role of transrectal ultrasound and prostate biopsy. Journal of clinical ultrasound: JCU. 1996 Oct;24(8):463-471. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0096(199610)24:8<463::AID-JCU6>3.0.CO;2-I
26. Langer JE. The current role of transrectal ultrasonography in the evaluation of prostate carcinoma. Seminars in Roentgenology. 1999 Oct;34(4):284-294. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0037-198x(99)80006-6
27. Stamey TA. Making the most out of six systematic sextant biopsies. Urology. 1995 01;45(1):2-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-4295(95)96168-2
28. Muldoon L, Resnick MI. Results of ultrasonography of the prostate. The Urologic Clinics of North America. 1989 Nov;16(4):693-702.
29. Dähnert WF, Hamper UM, Eggleston JC, Walsh PC, Sanders RC. Prostatic evaluation by transrectal sonography with histopathologic correlation: the echopenic appearance of early carcinoma. Radiology. 1986 01;158(1):97-102. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiology.158.1.3510032
30. Shinohara K, Wheeler TM, Scardino PT. The appearance of prostate cancer on transrectal ultrasonography: correlation of imaging and pathological examinations. The Journal of Urology. 1989 07;142(1):76-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-5347(17)38666-4
31. Jayarajah U, Vidanapathirana S, Mahadewa S, Wijayagunawardena S, Senthan V, Edirisinghe K, Ambegoda M, Abeygunasekera AM. Diagnostic yield and outcome of transrectal ultrasound-guided prostate biopsy in Sri Lanka. The Ceylon Medical Journal. 2021 Dec 31;66(4):162-167. https://doi.org/10.4038/cmj.v66i4.9506
32. Dyke CH, Toi A, Sweet JM. Value of random US-guided transrectal prostate biopsy. Radiology. 1990 08;176(2):345-349. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiology.176.2.2195588
33. Ohori M, Kattan MW, Utsunomiya T, Suyama K, Scardino PT, Wheeler TM. Do impalpable stage T1c prostate cancers visible on ultrasound differ from those not visible?. The Journal of Urology. 2003 03;169(3):964-968. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ju.0000049963.28489.ab
34. Ito K, Ichinose Y, Kubota Y, Imai K, Yamanaka H. Clinicopathological features of prostate cancer detected by transrectal ultrasonography-guided systematic six-sextant biopsy. International Journal of Urology: Official Journal of the Japanese Urological Association. 1997 09;4(5):474-479. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-2042.1997.tb00288.x