Assessing Radiotherapy Responses in Low-Risk Prostate Cancer: A Longitudinal Analysis of T2 Relaxation Times

Pavla Hanzlikova^{a,b}, Dominik Vilimek^{c,*}, Radana Vilimkova Kahankova^c, Martina Ladrova^c, Valeria Skopelidou^{d,e}, Zuzana Ruzickova^{f,g}, Radek Martinek^c, Jakub Cvek^{f,g}

^aDepartment of Radiology, University Hospital Ostrava, Czech Republic ^bDepartment of Imaging Methods, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ostrava, Ostrava, Czech Republic

^cDepartment of Cybernetics and Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, VSB - Technical University of Ostrava, 17. listopadu 15, Ostrava -Poruba, 708 00, Czech Republic

^dInstitute of Molecular and Clinical Pathology and Medical Genetics, University Hospital Ostrava, 70852, Ostrava, Czech Republic

^eInstitute of Molecular and Clinical Pathology and Medical Genetics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ostrava, 70300, Ostrava, Czech Republic

^fFaculty of Medicine, University of Ostrava, 70300 Ostrava, Czech Republic

^gDepartment of Oncology, University Hospital Ostrava, 70852 Ostrava, Czech Republic

Abstract

Rationale and Objectives: To evaluate short and long-term changes in T_2 relaxation as a response to radiotherapy in patients with low and intermediate risk localized prostate cancer.

Materials and Methods: A total of 24 patients were selected for this retrospective study. Each participant underwent 1.5T magnetic resonance imaging on seven separate occasions: initially after the implantation of gold fiducials, the required step for Cyberknife therapy guidance, followed by MRI scans two weeks post-therapy and monthly thereafter. As part of each MRI scan, the prostate region was manually delineated, and the T_2 relaxation times were calculated for quantitative analysis. The T_2 relaxation times between individual

dominik.vilimek@vsb.cz (Dominik Vilimek), radana.vilimkova.kahankova@vsb.cz (Radana Vilimkova Kahankova), martina.ladrova@vsb.cz (Martina Ladrova),

valeria.skopelidou@fno.cz (Valeria Skopelidou), zuzana.ruzickova@fno.cz (Zuzana Ruzickova), radek.martinek@vsb.cz (Radek Martinek), jakub.cvek@fno.cz (Jakub Cvek)

Preprint submitted to Academic Radiology

June 30, 2023

^{*}Corresponding author

Email addresses: pavla.hanzlikova@fno.cz (Pavla Hanzlikova),

follow-ups were analyzed using Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance.

Results: Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (RM-ANOVA) revealed a significant difference across all measurements (F (6, 120) = 0.611, p << 0.001). A Bonferroni post hoc test revealed significant differences in median T_2 values between the baseline and subsequent measurements, particularly between pre-therapy (M_0) and two weeks post-therapy (M_1) , as well as during the monthly interval checks $(M_2 - M_6)$. Some cases showed a delayed decrease in relaxation times, indicating the prolonged effects of therapy.

Conclusion: The changes in T_2 values during the course of radiotherapy can help in monitoring radiotherapy response in unconfirmed patients, quantifying the scarring process, and recognizing the therapy failure. *Keywords:* prostate cancer; radiation therapy; quantitative MRI; T2 relaxation times; treatment response.

Introduction

Prostate cancer (PCa) is one of the most common malignant tumors in middle-aged and elderly men [1]. There is a clearly increasing incidence of this disease, which threatens not only the physical but also the psychological health of these patients [2]. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) plays a vital role in the PCa detection, as it enables to quantitatively objectify the state of the tissue. The standardly used screening methods using prostate-specific antigen (PSA) does not provide reliable information about the presence of PCa and there are many factors influencing the results [3]. Examinations using MRI reported higher sensitivity and specificity compared to other methods, such as positive prostate antigen blood test or transrectal ultrasound biopsy (TRUS) [4], which is, moreover, invasive and it is hard to decide the necessity of such examination to not harm a patient [3]. On the other hand, MR is a non-invasive technique providing high soft-tissue contrast and resolution, and

¹⁵ is free of radiation compared to widely used computed tomography (CT) [3]. However, diagnosis using MRI is time consuming and demands a substantial

> expertise, as large number of 3D images needs to be read [4] and human image analysis is prone to errors in interpretation caused by observer limitations and complexity of clinical cases [5].

- ²⁰ More accurate disease detection can be achieved by using multiparametric MRI (mpMRI) examinations. As the name implies, mpMRI is based on the use of multiple parameters, for example T_2 weighting, diffusion-weighted image (DWI), and dynamic postcontrast examination (DCE - dynamic contrast enhancement) along with using Prostate Imaging and Data Reporting System
- (PLRADS) v2.1 [6]. The main function of the mpMRI is to quantitatively objectify the state of the tissue. An effective way how to objectively describe changes in the tissue behavior is relaxometry, which allows to reflect tissue properties and histological changes by the measurement of tissue relaxation times, such as T_1 , T_2 , and T_2^* , with the possibility to differentiate grades of PCa, especially
- ³⁰ in combination with mapping of Apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC). Previous studies showed that T_2 and T_2^* are shortened in more aggressive cancers compared to low-grade cancers [7]. The most common and easiest method is to perform T_2 relaxometry, which uses transverse relaxation time description from different tissues [8]. Interpretation of the imaging data can be simpli-
- fied by separating these independent sources by directly calculating the proton density and spin relaxation times. T_2 map acquisition can facilitate improved tissue characterization, increase image tissue contrast, and provide a more direct link between observed signal changes and microanatomical ones. Furthermore, the quantitative nature of the data enables easy comparisons across longitudi-
- ⁴⁰ nal time points [9]. The benefit of T_2 relaxometry is that it is a non-contrast technique, so could potentially decrease the risks and costs of contrast administration [7] and uses scanning at multiple echo times without the need for image normalization. These metrics describe the internal structure and heterogeneity within tumors and give more information about the disease than traditional ⁴⁵ whole-tumor assessments.

The aim of this paper is to investigate whether the MRI T_2 mapping analysis can quantitatively represent PCAa intratumor heterogeneity and provide

sensitive and robust insight into response to radiotherapy.

Material and Methods

50

The purpose of this paper is to explore the T_2 relaxation times in patients undergoing radiotherapy. The study provides an in-depth analysis of the changes in these times as well as their potential correlation with therapeutic outcomes. For a simplified overview of the study, please refer to Figure 1, which presents a diagrammatic representation of the study setup.



Figure 1: A simplified study workflow - A visual summary of the research design and methodology employed in the study, detailing patient selection, therapy application, MR examinations and MR data analysis.

55 Patients Characteristics

A total of 24 patients (mean (standard deviation) age: 72.96 (6.29) years, age range: 61-85 years) who underwent radiotherapy using Cyberknife for low-risk prostate cancer were selected (Gleason score 3+3 and 3+4, staging T1, N0 or T2aN0). All participants included in the study did not undergo any other

- ⁶⁰ treatment for prostate cancer and were patients of the Oncology Clinic of the University Hospital in 2020-2022. All patients underwent implantation of gold fiducials for navigation for the Cyberknife (fiducials are not a contraindication for MR imaging and radiotherapy according to studies [10, 11]). Patients with previous chemotherapy, radiotherapy or hormone replacement therapy were ex-
- ⁶⁵ cluded. Informed consent form was obtained from all subjects and this study was approved by the institutional review board by University Hospital (RVO-FNOs/2020).

Therapy

Treatment was started within 5-6 weeks from diagnosis. The gold fiducials were introduced for the navigation of robotic radiotherapy 3 or 4 days prior the actual irradiation. Radiation treatment was then carried out in five sessions with a total dose of 36.25 Gy, individual sessions with a dose of 7.25 Gy, 3 sessions per week.

Magnetic Resonance Examinations

⁷⁵ MR image acquisition was performed using a 1.5T MRI (Magnetom Avanto, Siemens, Erlangen, Germany). Patients were in the supine position and were examined using a 4-channel body coil placed over the pelvic region. The MRI protocol consisted of axial T_2 weighted, axial diffusion weighted imaging (DWI) and multiecho T_2 weighted images for quantitative T_2 mapping. The imaging parameters are listed in Table 1.

The initial MRI measurement (M_0) was planned prior to commencing the radiation therapy. The procedure was performed after the placement of gold fiducial markers within the prostate for the purpose of aligning the image and providing a guidance throughout the treatment process, ensuring precise tar-

geting, and minimizing potential side effects. The follow-up MRI measurement (M_1) was planned for two weeks after radiation therapy ended. This provided adequate time for the treatment effects to manifest and be accurately evaluated.

Sequence Type	FoV	TE	\mathbf{TR}	Matrix	Voxel size	Flip Angle	
Sequence Type	(mm)	(ms)	(ms)	size	(mm)	(°)	
Axial T2w TSE	200	89	3440	256×205	1.0 x 0.8 x 3.0	150	
DWI EPI	221	92	400	160 x 112	2.3 x 1.6 x 3.0	90	
T2maps SE	230	22,44,66,,352	3000	256×197	1.2 x 0.9 x 5.0	180	

Table 1: The parameters of the MR sequences used in this study.

Note: TSE – turbo spin echo, T2W – T2-weighted, DWI – diffusion weighted imaging, EPI – echo-planar imaging, SE – spin echo, FoV – field of view, TE – echo time (in T2 maps starting echo 22 with step of 22 up to 352 ms), TR – repetition time.

After the post-therapy MRI scan, five additional check-ups were arranged $(M_2 - M_6)$, each occurring at monthly intervals to closely monitor any changes or progress. These regular, month-long intervals provided a comprehensive and systematic overview of the patient's condition, allowing healthcare professionals to track the treatment's efficacy and adjust their approach as needed. This consistent monitoring was essential to ensuring the most effective possible outcome for the patient. It provided valuable insights into the effectiveness of radiation therapy.

MR Data Analysis

A comprehensive analysis of the MR images of all 24 patients was conducted under the direction of a radiological expert, P.H., who has more than 20 years of experience in the field. As a first step, the MRI images were loaded into ITK-SNAP, a widely used medical image analysis software program [12], wherein the lesions indicative of prostate cancer (PCa) were meticulously identified and demarcated manually on an initial measurement (M_0) prior to radiation therapy. In order to ensure continuity and consistency of the analysis, the manually created annotations from the initial measurement were replicated on subsequent

¹⁰⁵ image sets. These annotations were then manually modified by MR physicists to account for any discernible deformations or displacements in the prostate gland or lesions. Each set of images belonging to each patient was meticulously

reviewed and adapted.

Additionally, a trained medical student V.S. manually segmented the entire prostate gland. In accordance with the procedure used for the segmentation of PCa lesions, the segmentation process was rigorously verified by the radiologist, P.H. By implementing this meticulous process, we ensured that the segmentation and annotation process would be accurate and reliable, thereby providing a robust foundation for analysis of the data. The regions of interest (ROIs) iden-

- tified in each patient were subjected to an in-depth quantitative assessment. The T_2 relaxation times were determined by analyzing T_2 -weighted multiecho scans. To provide a comprehensive representation of tissue properties, a total of sixteen echos were incorporated into this study. It is worth noting that the first echo was systematically omitted from the analysis. The removal of the
- ¹²⁰ first echo is a common technique in quantitative MRI since it often contains significant system imperfections, allowing for a more robust and reliable fitting of the T_2 relaxation times [13]. The fitting process of T_2 relaxation curve was carried out using an in-house MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, MA), on a voxelby-voxel basis. The fitted T_2 relaxation times were then used as the basis for further analysis. By using this approach, we were able to extract detailed and
- clinically relevant information from the T_2 -weighted multi-echo scans allowing better understanding of the radiotherapy impact [14].

Statistical Analysis

For each of the 24 subjects included in the study, T_2 median values were calculated for the entire prostate. Nevertheless, three subjects were excluded from the statistical analysis as a result of MR artifacts or missed appointments, resulting in a final total of 21 subjects being included. The data were first assessed for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk tests. This test showed that the data were not normally distributed, and hence, a log transformation was applied

to correct this. After applying the log transformation [15], data with p-values
 less than 0.05 were considered to indicate a statistically significant difference.
 Then, we performed a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (RM-ANOVA)

> to examine the significance of differences in T_2 median values between the seven measurements. This analysis controls subject-level variability and is appropriate

¹⁴⁰ for our study design where the same subjects were measured repeatedly. The RM-ANOVA was followed by post-hoc pairwise t-tests to understand where these differences lay. Considering the large number of pairwise comparisons, the Bonferroni correction was applied. A p-value (after Bonferroni correction) less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

145 **Results**

150

Our findings demonstrated a significant association between T_2 relaxation times and an aspect of treatment response. Specifically, The RM-ANOVA demonstrated a statistically significant difference in the T_2 median values across the seven measurements (F (6, 120) = 0.611, p << 0.001, $\eta^2 = 0.305$). This suggests that there is a significant effect of measurement time point on T_2 me-

- dian values. The MRI measurements are denoted as $M_0 M_6$, where M_0 is the initial measurement prior the radiotherapy and $M_1 - M_6$ are the follow-up measurements (M_1 - two weeks after radiotherapy, $M_2 - M_6$ monthly interval check-ups).
- The Bonferroni post hoc tests revealed that T_2 median values were significantly different at baseline (M_0) as well as at all other measurement points $(M_1 - M_6)$. Specifically, a statistically significant difference was found between M_0 and M_1 (T (20) = 4.97, p = 0.0016). This difference continued to increase over time with T_2 median values from M_0 significantly differing from M_2 (T (20) =
- 10.23, p < 0.001), M_3 (T (20) = 12.56, p < 0.001), M4 (T (20) = 11.61, p < 0.001), M5 (T (20) = 10.49, p < 0.001), and M6 (T (20) = 12.33, p < 0.001). Interestingly, a significant difference in T_2 median values was also observed between M_1 and the following time points: M_3 (T (20) = 3.94, p = 0.017), M_4 (T (20) = 3.68, p = 0.031), M_5 (T (20) = 3.53, p = 0.044), and M_6 (T (20) = 3.42,
- p = 0.057). However, there was no significant difference observed between M_1 and M_2 after Bonferroni correction (T (20) = 3.01, p = 0.146). These results

> suggest a consistent decrease in T_2 median values from baseline (M_0) through the various stages of radiotherapy, with the exception of M_1 to M_2 where the changes were not statistically significant.

Figure 2 illustrates the variation in T_2 median relaxation times across different measurements. For most patients (denoted using the letters A – X), the most substantial change occurs between baseline (M_0) and the first follow-up measurement (M_1) . However, it should be noted that some patients (e.g. patients C, G, and M) exhibit a delayed response, with the greatest change occurring between M0 and the second follow-up (M_2) . This emphasizes the inter-individual variability in response to radiotherapy and highlights the importance of longi-

tudinal monitoring to adequately capture this heterogeneity.



Figure 2: Longitudinal changes in T_2 median relaxation times across all patients (A – X) and measurements. Measurement 0 – initial scan before radiotherapy (M_0). Measurement 1 – first check up two weeks after radiation therapy ended (M_1) and Measurement 2 – 6 monthly intervals check up ($M_2 - M_6$).

Furthermore, we visualized the changes in T_2 median relaxation time using a heatmap, as shown in Figure 3, where each row corresponds to a specific patient (A – X), and each column represents an individual measurement time point (M_0 – M_6). Each cell in the heatmap is colored according to its median T_2 , with

> darker colors indicating higher values. It provides a comprehensive, color-coded overview of the shifts in T_2 values across the patient cohort and measurement points, allowing for an at-a-glance comparison of therapeutic responses.

								T2 Median Relaxation	times (ms)
∢ -		122.00	117.61	124.83	119.27	118.83	117.16		
ω-	142.92	119.02	125.05	131.61	127.39	129.17	122.12		
U -	129.70	125.83	109.70	110.58	113.22	111.48	109.49	- 180	
Ω-	131.46	129.88	111.12	109.84	106.39	107.05	110.55		
ш-	125.82	99.37	100.24	99.80	98.43	98.64	104.79	- 170	
ш-	122.76	114.00	105.86	107.17	105.07	105.02	108.87		
ს -	127.03	117.79	124.02	114.22	119.77	127.06	121.82		
т-	148.76	133.10	124.87	123.63	122.28	119.95	115.51	- 160	
	134.67	105.41	110.87	109.61	113.31	109.83	112.89		
	138.62	137.89	121.46	118.86	119.61	124.07	123.42		
⊻ -	123.75	114.52	114.56	106.19	111.99	108.03	105.96	- 150	
	172.43	138.45	141.45	125.39	128.52	128.10	130.08		
- Z	164.80	144.29	137.89	140.00	146.34	144.84	149.85	- 140	
- N Pat		137.16	131.69	115.92	117.42	117.95	117.87	110	
o -	154.95	157.29	115.73	120.31	121.73	124.98	126.99		
₽ -	131.90	118.72	107.80	110.42	107.70	110.56	108.25	- 130	
σ-	146.69	133.73	109.21	114.92	108.89	108.90	109.69		
∝ -	117.11	113.60	114.05		120.39	123.28	114.82		
ω -	133.28	131.54	117.00	111.80	118.91	112.96	108.25	- 120	
⊢ -	187.88	125.05	131.40	132.68	133.81	135.10	137.50		
⊃ -	146.25	125.74	122.82	115.94	114.36	108.89	115.74	- 110	
> -	117.43	111.70	108.53	104.56	101.09	101.32	100.79	110	
≥ -	126.74	115.32	110.38	114.90	110.32	115.72	114.02		
× -	134.44	131.14	119.80	111.53	111.41	109.68	109.42	- 100	
	Ó	1	2	3 Measuremen	4 t	5	6		

Figure 3: Heatmap of T_2 Median Relaxation Times. Each row represents a patient, and each column represents a distinct measurement time point. Darker colors indicate higher T_2 median values, highlighting the pattern of change over time. Note that the absence of data in some cells is a result of either missed appointments or the occurrence of image artifacts.

185

Case studies of two patients (Figure 4) offer more detailed insights into these differing therapeutic responses. Patient A exhibited a delayed decrease in T_2 relaxation times, notable in the later measurement time points of the T_2 maps. Despite this initial delay, both diffusion restriction, as seen in the DWI, and a decrease in PSA levels indicate an effective, although prolonged, therapeutic response. Conversely, patient P, who had higher baseline T, median values.

response. Conversely, patient B, who had higher baseline T_2 median values, demonstrated a remarkable therapy response. The 33.44% change in T_2 median values between the baseline (M_0) and first follow-up (M_1) was visually apparent in the T_2 maps and marked one of the most significant responses in our study cohort. This implies that T_2 relaxometry techniques could be a valuable tool in



¹⁹⁵ the monitoring of radiotherapy for low-risk prostate cancer patients.

Figure 4: Comparative T_2 maps of two patients with contrasting responses to radiotherapy. Each row represents a distinct measurement time point for each patient, with corresponding T_2 maps overlayed. A) Patient M demonstrates a delayed decrease in T_2 relaxation times, confirmed with weak RT response, visible in later measurement time points. B) Patient T, starting with higher baseline T_2 median values, exhibits a dramatic response to the therapy with a 33.44% change in T_2 median values between baseline (M_0) and the first follow-up (M_1) . The T_2 maps visually reflect this marked difference, underscoring the therapeutic impact.

Discussion

The results of both the statistical analysis and imaging visualizations demonstrate distinct patterns of therapeutic response among patients. As evidenced by the line graph in Figure 2, the most substantial changes in T_2 median relaxation times typically occur between the M_0 and M_1 , with the exceptions in some patients where the most significant changes occurred between M_0 and M_2 . This is further highlighted using the heatmap of T_2 median values (Figure 3) which provides at-a-glance comparison of therapeutic responses suitable for clinical practice usage.

205

 T_2 relaxometry is a method providing insights into water content of the examined tissue. However, one must keep in mind that a prostate tumor is not the only pathology that can be present in the prostate examined [16]. It can be expected that the subjects involved in this study also suffered from prostatitis: acute or chronic. Acute prostatitis is associated with a higher proportion of

> water whereas chronic one is linked with higher proportion of fibrosis leading to reduction of T_2 relaxation times [17]. Another factor playing an important role is the proportion of stromal and glandular hyperplasia, which has more water than hypertrophic stroma [18]. These proportions are variable and cannot be generalized. Therefore, it can be expected that the output for each individual (its range and baseline) will differ as shown in our results.

Another aspect that could affect the results of the start scan was the fact that it was always measured after the implantation of gold fiducials into the prostate, used for navigation of subsequent radiotherapy using the CyberKnife. This application may have been a cause of acute prostatitis in the given patient. In addition, prostatitis is also activated after radiotherapy itself, when some

²²⁰ In addition, prostatitis is also activated after radiotherapy itself, when some patients develop so-called post-radiation prostatitis, leading to PSA elevations and decreases in the period up to several weeks after radiotherapy.

The prostatitis and its share in the stromal and acinar part greatly changes the resulting relaxation times. For such a limited cohort, it is not possible to correlate individual times, but it is possible to compare their trend, as showed by Foltz et al. [19]. In Foltz's study, the measurements were carried bi-weekly throughout eight weeks of radiotherapy and the results proved that T_2 can serve as a useful biomarker to detect early response to radiotherapy even in patients with low and intermediate risk localized prostate cancer.

A delayed decrease in relaxation times is evident in one patient (M). In this case, a long-term restriction in diffusion was demonstrated in this patient when examined using the DWI, which indicates that the effect of the therapy was prolonged. However, there was a decrease in PSA, which correlates with biochemical markers of therapy effectiveness according to oncological procedures, so this case was not evaluated as a therapy failure.

Finally, the study presented herein offered some valuable insights but also faced several limitations, for example, the absence of a control group or reference from histopathological evaluation. The main reason for not obtaining a detailed histopathological evaluation and a deeper specification of the tumor tissue distribution was not performed, because the radical surgical procedure

> was found unnecessary in these patients due to low grade staging. Therefore, the entire prostate volume was not processed. Because of low staging, only a needle biopsy was performed and radiotherapy was initiated. As a result of the collection of biopsy samples, it is not possible to describe in detail the distribu-

tion and specification of tumor cells within the tumor mass, but only to provide a rough estimate of the patient's prognosis based on a risk stratification. The reason for this is that samples are taken from different parts of the prostate, which (despite the large number of samples taken) does not cover the entire organ and does not represent the tumor tissue, as it would if the entire prostate was removed [20, 21].

Furthermore, instead of selecting the ROI (the tumor) whole prostate was analyzed, which may lead to bias due to other mechanisms and pathologies taking place in the affected organ. However, since the focus of the study was on low-grade tumors, the determination of the ROI is complicated and hardly reproducible for repeated measurements. Additionally, the use of an endorectal coil could significantly enhance the image quality and allow magnetic resonance spectroscopy, however, because of the many repeated measurements, its use has been prohibited.

Conclusion

- In this study, we used 16 echo times to determine the T_2 . This type of calculation is considered very precise. Moreover, the cohort selected consisted of 24 elderly patients with low grade carcinoma, which can be considered as unique cohort. The patients were scanned 7 times, once before radiotherapy and then monthly, which provides more reasonable window to monitor the radiotherapy effect. The main contributions can be summarized as follows:
 - 1. Quantification of scarring description of the scarring process in the tumor in well-responsive tumors.
 - 2. Recognition of therapy failure the results of this study showed a demonstrable reduction in the relaxation times in a patient with a prolonged

> lesion. It is especially important during the period of post-radiation prostatitis, when extreme PSA elevation does not mean therapy failure.

3. Radiotherapy response monitoring in unconfirmed patients – in the cases when a less risky part of the tumor was removed during the prostate biopsy, the determined Gleason score does not correspond to the real risks and prescribed treatment (e.g. cases of misdiagnosed multifocal carcinoma [22]). T_2 relaxometry is a promising tool to monitor the response to radiotherapy even in unconfirmed, but still at-risk patients for moderate or high-risk cancers (Gleason score above 4 + 3 to 5 + 5).

The changes in T_2 values during the course of radiotherapy can help in uncovering alterations in cancer and prostate tissue more sensitively than other parameters, if monitored and visualized appropriately.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by Ministry of Health, Czech Republic - conceptual development of research organization (FNOs/2020) and by the Ministry of Education of Czech Republic under Project SP2023/042.

References

 A. K. Miyahira, A. Sharp, L. Ellis, J. Jones, S. Kaochar, H. B. Larman, D. A. Quigley, H. Ye, J. W. Simons, K. J. Pienta, H. R. Soule, Prostate cancer research: The next generation; report from the 2019 Coffey-Holden Prostate Cancer Academy Meeting, The Prostate 80 (2) (2020) 113–132.

290

270

275

- [2] C. Ritch, M. Cookson, Recent trends in the management of advanced prostate cancer, F1000Research 7 (2018) 1513. doi:10.12688/
 - f1000research.15382.1.

doi:10.1002/pros.23934.

- [3] Z. Khan, N. Yahya, K. Alsaih, M. I. Al-Hiyali, F. Meriaudeau, Recent Automatic Segmentation Algorithms of MRI Prostate Regions: A Review, IEEE Access 9 (2021) 97878–97905. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3090825.
 - [4] G. Litjens, O. Debats, J. Barentsz, N. Karssemeijer, H. Huisman, Computer-Aided Detection of Prostate Cancer in MRI, IEEE Transactions

300

- on Medical Imaging 33 (5) (2014) 1083-1092. doi:10.1109/TMI.2014. 2303821.
- [5] G. Lemaître, R. Martí, J. Freixenet, J. C. Vilanova, P. M. Walker, F. Meriaudeau, Computer-Aided Detection and diagnosis for prostate cancer based on mono and multi-parametric MRI: A review, Computers in Biology and Medicine 60 (2015) 8–31. doi:10.1016/j.compbiomed.2015.02.009.
- [6] B. Turkbey, A. B. Rosenkrantz, M. A. Haider, A. R. Padhani, G. Villeirs, K. J. Macura, C. M. Tempany, P. L. Choyke, F. Cornud, D. J. Margolis, H. C. Thoeny, S. Verma, J. Barentsz, J. C. Weinreb, Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System Version 2.1: 2019 Update of Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System Version 2, European Urology 76 (3) (2019) 340–351. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2019.02.033.
- [7] A. Panda, V. Gulani, Quantitative Imaging of Prostate: Scope and Future Directions, in: A. Panda, V. Gulani, L. Ponsky (Eds.), Reading MRI of the Prostate, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 97–108. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-99357-7_10.
- [8] S. C. Deoni, Quantitative Relaxometry of the Brain, Topics in Magnetic Resonance Imaging 21 (2) (2010) 101–113. doi:10.1097/RMR.
 0b013e31821e56d8.
- [9] A. A. O. Carneiro, G. R. Vilela, D. B. D. Araujo, O. Baffa, MRI relaxometry: Methods and applications, Brazilian Journal of Physics 36 (1a) (Mar. 2006). doi:10.1590/S0103-97332006000100005.

310

305

315

320

> [10] S. Schneider, R. I. Jølck, E. G. C. Troost, A. L. Hoffmann, Quantification of MRI visibility and artifacts at 3T of liquid fiducial marker in a pancreas tissue-mimicking phantom, Medical Physics 45 (1) (2018) 37-47. doi: 10.1002/mp.12670.

340

- [11] L. Knybel, J. Cvek, T. Blazek, A. Binarova, T. Parackova, K. Resova, Prostate deformation during hypofractionated radiotherapy: An analysis of implanted fiducial marker displacement, Radiation Oncology 16 (1) (2021) 235. doi:10.1186/s13014-021-01958-4.
- [12] P. A. Yushkevich, Y. Gao, G. Gerig, ITK-SNAP: An interactive tool for semi-automatic segmentation of multi-modality biomedical images, in: 2016 38th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC), IEEE, Orlando, FL, USA, 2016, pp. 3342–3345. doi:10.1109/EMBC.2016.7591443.
- J. Milford, N. Rosbach, M. Bendszus, S. Heiland, Mono-Exponential Fitting in T2-Relaxometry: Relevance of Offset and First Echo, PLOS ONE 10 (12) (2015) e0145255. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0145255.
 - [14] A. Chatterjee, A. Devaraj, M. Mathew, T. Szasz, T. Antic, G. S. Karczmar,
 A. Oto, Performance of T2 Maps in the Detection of Prostate Cancer,
 Academic Radiology 26 (1) (2019) 15-21. doi:10.1016/j.acra.2018.04.
 005.
 - [15] J. Osborne, Notes on the use of data transformations, Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation 8 (6). doi:10.7275/4VNG-5608.
 - [16] A. Stabile, F. Giganti, A. B. Rosenkrantz, S. S. Taneja, G. Villeirs,
- I. S. Gill, C. Allen, M. Emberton, C. M. Moore, V. Kasivisvanathan, Multiparametric MRI for prostate cancer diagnosis: Current status and future directions, Nature Reviews Urology 17 (1) (2020) 41–61. doi: 10.1038/s41585-019-0212-4.

³²⁵

- [17] A. B. Rosenkrantz, S. S. Taneja, Radiologist, Be Aware: Ten Pitfalls That
- Confound the Interpretation of Multiparametric Prostate MRI, American Journal of Roentgenology 202 (1) (2014) 109–120. doi:10.2214/AJR.13. 10699.
- [18] J. C. Weinreb, J. O. Barentsz, P. L. Choyke, F. Cornud, M. A. Haider, K. J. Macura, D. Margolis, M. D. Schnall, F. Shtern, C. M. Tempany,
- 355

365

370

350

H. C. Thoeny, S. Verma, PI-RADS Prostate Imaging – Reporting and Data System: 2015, Version 2, European Urology 69 (1) (2016) 16-40.
doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2015.08.052.

[19] W. D. Foltz, A. Wu, P. Chung, C. Catton, A. Bayley, M. Milosevic, R. Bristow, P. Warde, A. Simeonov, D. A. Jaffray, M. A. Haider, C. Ménard,

 Changes in apparent diffusion coefficient and T₂ relaxation during radiotherapy for prostate cancer, Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging 37 (4) (2013) 909–916. doi:10.1002/jmri.23885.

- [20] D. G. Bostwick, Evaluating prostate needle biopsy: Therapeutic and prognostic importance, CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians 47 (5) (1997) 297– 319. doi:10.3322/canjclin.47.5.297.
- [21] E. Short, A. Y. Warren, M. Varma, Gleason grading of prostate cancer: A pragmatic approach, Diagnostic Histopathology 25 (10) (2019) 371–378. doi:10.1016/j.mpdhp.2019.07.001.
- [22] A. Ali, A. Du Feu, P. Oliveira, A. Choudhury, R. G. Bristow, E. Baena,
- Prostate zones and cancer: Lost in transition?, Nature Reviews Urology 19 (2) (2022) 101–115. doi:10.1038/s41585-021-00524-7.

17