

Literaturverzeichnis

Hamburger Ärzteblatt 01 | 2022

Seite 1

Weidestr. 122 b
22083 Hamburg
Redaktion

E-Mail: verlag@aekhh.de

Tel.: (040) 20 22 99 – 205

Fax: (040) 20 22 99 – 400

S. 12 – 16: Moderne Diagnostik des klinisch lokalisierten Prostatakarzinoms.

Von Prof. Dr. Lars Budäus, Dr. Mykyta Kachanov, Fabian Falkenbach, PD Dr. Dirk Beyersdorff, Prof. Dr. Markus Graefen

1. Ferlay J, Colombet M, Soerjomataram I, Dyba T, Randi G, Bettio M et al. Cancer incidence and mortality patterns in Europe: Estimates for 40 countries and 25 major cancers in 2018. *European journal of cancer (Oxford, England : 1990)*. 2018;103:356-87.
2. Bell KJ, Del Mar C, Wright G, Dickinson J, Glasziou P. Prevalence of incidental prostate cancer: A systematic review of autopsy studies. *International journal of cancer*. 2015;137(7):1749-57.
3. Bill-Axelson A, Holmberg L, Garmo H, Taari K, Busch C, Nordling S et al. Radical Prostatectomy or Watchful Waiting in Prostate Cancer - 29-Year Follow-up. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(24):2319-29.
4. Jeldres C, Suardi N, Walz J, Saad F, Hutterer GC, Bhojani N et al. Poor overall survival in septa- and octogenarian patients after radical prostatectomy and radiotherapy for prostate cancer: a population-based study of 6183 men. *Eur Urol*. 2008;54(1):107-16.
5. Deutsche Krebsgesellschaft DK, AWMF. Leitlinienprogramm Onkologie (Deutsche Krebsgesellschaft, Deutsche Krebshilfe, AWMF): S3-Leitlinie Prostatakarzinom, Langversion 6.0, 2021, AWMF Registernummer: 043/022OL, <http://www.leitlinienprogramm-onkologie.de/leitlinien/prostatakarzinom/> (abgerufen am: 28.05.2021). 2021.
6. Kratochwil C, Fendler WP, Eiber M, Baum R, Bozkurt MF, Czernin J, Delgado Bolton RC, Ezziddin S, Forrer F, Hicks RJ, Hope TA, Kabasakal L, Konijnenberg M, Kopka K, Lassmann M, Mottaghy FM, Oyen W, Rahbar K, Schöder H, Virgolini I, Wester HJ, Bodei L, Fanti S, Haberkorn U, Herrmann K. EANM procedure guidelines for radionuclide therapy with ¹⁷⁷Lu-labelled PSMA-ligands (¹⁷⁷Lu-PSMA-RLT). *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2019 Nov;46(12):2536-2544. doi: 10.1007/s00259-019-04485-3. Epub 2019 Aug 22. PMID: 31440799.
7. Ahmed HU, El-Shater Bosaily A, Brown LC, Gabe R, Kaplan R, Parmar MK, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of multi-parametric MRI and TRUS biopsy in prostate cancer (PROMIS): a paired validating confirmatory study. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2017;389(10071):815-22.
8. Kasisvanathan V, Rannikko AS, Borghi M, Panebianco V, Mynderse LA, Vaarala MH et al. MRI-Targeted or Standard Biopsy for Prostate-Cancer Diagnosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(19):1767-77.
9. Gandaglia G, Ploussard G, Valerio M, Mattei A, Fiori C, Fossati N et al. A Novel Nomogram to Identify Candidates for Extended Pelvic Lymph Node Dissection Among Patients with Clinically Localized Prostate Cancer Diagnosed with Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted and Systematic Biopsies. *Eur Urol*. 2019;75(3):506-14.
10. Leyh-Bannurah SR, Kachanov M, Karakiewicz PI, Beyersdorff D, Pompe RS, Oh-Hohenhorst SJ et al. Combined systematic versus stand-alone multiparametric MRI-guided targeted fusion biopsy: nomogram prediction of non-organ-confined prostate cancer. *World J Urol*. 2020.
11. Mottet N, Conford P, van den Bergh RCN, Briers E, De Santis M, Gillessen S et al. EAU - EANM - ESTRO - ESUR - ISUP - SIOG Guidelines on Prostate Cancer 2021. EAU Guidelines Edn presented at the EAU Annual Congress Milan 2021. Arnhem, The Netherlands: European Association of Urology Guidelines Office; 2021.
12. Wegelin O, van Melick HHE, Hooft L, Bosch JLHR, Reitsma HB, Barentsz JO, Somford DM. Comparing Three Different Techniques for Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted Prostate Biopsies: A Systematic Review of In-bore versus Magnetic Resonance Imaging-transrectal Ultrasound fusion versus Cognitive Registration. Is There a Preferred Technique? *Eur Urol*. 2017 Apr;71(4):517-531. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2016.07.041. Epub 2016 Aug 25. PMID: 27568655.
13. Panebianco V, Barchetti G, Simone G, Del Monte M, Ciardi A, Grompone MD et al. Negative Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Prostate Cancer: What's Next? *Eur Urol*. 2018;74(1):48-54.

Literaturverzeichnis

Hamburger Ärzteblatt 01 | 2022

Seite 2

Weidestr. 122 b
22083 Hamburg
Redaktion

E-Mail: verlag@aekhh.de

Tel.: (040) 20 22 99 – 205

Fax: (040) 20 22 99 – 400

14. Krüger-Stokke B, Bertilsson H, Langørgen S, Sjøbakk TAE, Bathen TF, Selnæs KM. Multiparametric Prostate MRI in Biopsy-Naïve Men: A Prospective Evaluation of Performance and Biopsy Strategies. *Front Oncol.* 2021 Oct 14;11:745657. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.745657. PMID: 34722302; PMCID: PMC8552019.
15. Porter KK, King A, Galgano SJ, Sherrer RL, Gordetsky JB, Rais-Bahrami S. Financial implications of biparametric prostate MRI. *Prostate cancer and prostatic diseases.* 2020;23(1):88-93.
16. Alabousi M, Salameh J-P, Gusenbauer K, Samoiloov L, Jafri A, Yu H et al. Biparametric vs multiparametric prostate magnetic resonance imaging for the detection of prostate cancer in treatment-naïve patients: a diagnostic test accuracy systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bju International.* 2019;124(2):209-20.
17. Kang Z, Min X, Weinreb J, Li Q, Feng Z, Wang L. Abbreviated Biparametric Versus Standard Multiparametric MRI for Diagnosis of Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2019;212(2):357-65.
18. Liang Z, Hu R, Yang Y, An N, Duo X, Liu Z, Shi S, Liu X. Is dynamic contrast enhancement still necessary in multiparametric magnetic resonance for diagnosis of prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Transl Androl Urol.* 2020 Apr;9(2):553-573. doi: 10.21037/tau.2020.02.03. PMID: 32420161; PMCID: PMC7215029.
19. Leyh-Bannurah SR, Kachanov M, Beyersdorff D, Preisser F, Tilki D, Fisch M, et al. Anterior Localization of Prostate Cancer Suspicious Lesions in 1,161 Patients Undergoing Magnetic Resonance Imaging/Ultrasound Fusion Guided Targeted Biopsies. *J Urol.* 2018;200(5):1035-40.
20. Kenigsberg AP, Tamada T, Rosenkrantz AB, Llukani E, Deng FM, Melamed J, et al. Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging identifies significant apical prostate cancers. *BJU Int.* 2018;121(2):239-43.
21. Radtke JP, Boxler S, Kuru TH, Wolf MB, Alt CD, Popeneciu IV, et al. Improved detection of anterior fibromuscular stroma and transition zone prostate cancer using biparametric and multiparametric MRI with MRI-targeted biopsy and MRI-US fusion guidance. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis.* 2015;18:288.
22. Barnett CL, Davenport MS, Montgomery JS, Wei JT, Montie JE, Denton BT. Cost-effectiveness of magnetic resonance imaging and targeted fusion biopsy for early detection of prostate cancer. *BJU Int.* 2018 Jul;122(1):50-58. doi: 10.1111/bju.14151. Epub 2018 Mar 8. PMID: 29388388.
23. Borghesi M, Ahmed H, Nam R, Schaeffer E, Schiavina R, Taneja S et al. Complications after systematic, random, and image-guided prostate biopsy. *Eur Urol.* 2017;71:353-65. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2016.08.004.
24. Loeb S, Vellekoop A, Ahmed HU, Catto J, Emberton M, Nam R et al. Systematic Review of Complications of Prostate Biopsy. *European Urology.* 2013;64(6):876-92.
25. Wagenlehner FM, van Oostrum E, Tenke P, Tandogdu Z, Çek M, Grabe M et al. Infective complications after prostate biopsy: outcome of the Global Prevalence Study of Infections in Urology (GPIU) 2010 and 2011, a prospective multinational multicentre prostate biopsy study. *Eur Urol.* 2013;63(3):521-7.
26. Roberts MJ, Bennett HY, Harris PN, Holmes M, Grummet J, Naber K et al. Prostate Biopsy-related Infection: A Systematic Review of Risk Factors, Prevention Strategies, and Management Approaches. *Urology.* 2017;104:11-21.
27. Williamson DA, Barrett LK, Rogers BA, Freeman JT, Hadway P, Paterson DL. Infectious complications following transrectal ultrasound-guided prostate biopsy: new challenges in the era of multidrug-resistant *Escherichia coli*. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2013;57(2):267-74.
28. Hossack T, Patel MI, Huo A, Brenner P, Yuen C, Spornat D et al. Location and pathological characteristics of cancers in radical prostatectomy specimens identified by transperineal biopsy compared to transrectal biopsy. *J Urol.* 2012;188:781-5. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2012.05.006. Leyh-Bannurah S-R, Karakiewicz PI, Dell'Oglio P, Briganti A, Schiffmann J, Pompe RS, et al. Comparison of 11 Active Surveillance Protocols in Contemporary European Men Treated With Radical Prostatectomy. *Clinical genitourinary cancer.* 2018;16(1):e141-e9.

Literaturverzeichnis

Hamburger Ärzteblatt 01 | 2022

Seite 3

Weidestr. 122 b

22083 Hamburg

Redaktion

E-Mail: verlag@aekhh.de

Tel.: (040) 20 22 99 – 205

Fax: (040) 20 22 99 – 400

29. Liu JL, Patel HD, Haney NM, Epstein JI, Partin AW. Advances in the selection of patients with prostate cancer for active surveillance. *Nature Reviews Urology*. 2021;18(4):197-208.
30. Stamatakis L, Siddiqui MM, Nix JW, Logan J, Rais-Bahrami S, Walton-Diaz A et al. Accuracy of multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging in confirming eligibility for active surveillance for men with prostate cancer. *Cancer*. 2013;119(18):3359-66.
31. Ouzzane A, Renard-Penna R, Marliere F, Mozer P, Olivier J, Barkatz J, et al. Magnetic Resonance Imaging Targeted Biopsy Improves Selection of Patients Considered for Active Surveillance for Clinically Low Risk Prostate Cancer Based on Systematic Biopsies. *J Urol*. 2015;194(2):350-6.
32. Bryant RJ, Yang B, Philippou Y, Lam K, Obiakor M, Ayers J et al. Does the introduction of prostate multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging into the active surveillance protocol for localized prostate cancer improve patient re-classification? *BJU Int*. 2018;122(5):794-800.
33. Schoots IG, Nieboer D, Giganti F, Moore CM, Bangma CH, Roobol MJ. Is magnetic resonance imaging-targeted biopsy a useful addition to systematic confirmatory biopsy in men on active surveillance for low-risk prostate cancer? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJU Int*. 2018.
34. Chang E, Jones TA, Natarajan S, Sharma D, Simopoulos D, Margolis DJ, et al. Value of Tracking Biopsy in Men Undergoing Active Surveillance of Prostate Cancer. *J Urol*. 2018;199(1):98-105.
35. Cantiello F, Russo GI, Kaufmann S, Cacciamani G, Crocero F, Ferro M, et al. Role of multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging for patients under active surveillance for prostate cancer: a systematic review with diagnostic meta-analysis. *Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases*. 2018.
36. Tran GN, Leapman MS, Nguyen HG, Cowan JE, Shinohara K, Westphalen AC, et al. Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Ultrasound Fusion Biopsy During Prostate Cancer Active Surveillance. *Eur Urol*. 2017;72(2):275-81.
37. Nassiri N, Margolis DJ, Natarajan S, Sharma DS, Huang J, Dorey FJ, et al. Targeted Biopsy to Detect Gleason Score Upgrading during Active Surveillance for Men with Low versus Intermediate Risk Prostate Cancer. *J Urol*. 2017;197(3 Pt 1):632-9.
38. Amin A, Scheltema MJ, Shnier R, Blazeviski A, Moses D, Cusick T, et al. The Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Active Surveillance (MRIAS) Trial: Use of Baseline Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Saturation Biopsy to Reduce the Frequency of Surveillance Prostate Biopsies. *J Urol*. 2020;203(5):910-7.
39. Klotz L, Pond G, Loblaw A, Sugar L, Moussa M, Berman D, et al. Randomized Study of Systematic Biopsy Versus Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Targeted and Systematic Biopsy in Men on Active.

Angaben zu möglichen Interessenkonflikten: vorhanden

Prof. Dr. Lars Budäus:

Fortbildungsvorträge Samsung Healthcare

Beratertätigkeit Siemens Healthineers

PD Dr. Dirk Beyersdorff:

Bezahlte Gutachtertätigkeit

Bezahlte Gutachtertätigkeit und Vortragstätigkeit jeweils für Bayer AG

(Kein direkter Zusammenhang zu diesem Artikel)

Literaturverzeichnis

Hamburger Ärzteblatt 01 | 2022

Seite 4

Weidestr. 122 b

22083 Hamburg

Redaktion

E-Mail: verlag@aekhh.de

Tel.: (040) 20 22 99 – 205

Fax: (040) 20 22 99 – 400

S. 28 – 30: Bandscheibenvorfälle endoskopisch operieren.

Von Prof. Dr. Karsten Schöller, Dr. Christina Gibbert

1. Koes BW, van Tulder MW, Peul WC. Diagnosis and treatment of sciatica. *BMJ Br. Med. J.* 2007;334: 1313.
2. Weinstein J N et al. Surgical vs Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Disk Herniation: The Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT): A Randomized Trial. *JAMA* 2006; 296: 2441.
3. Peul WC. Surgery versus Prolonged Conservative Treatment for Sciatica. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2007;687–696.
4. Qin R, Liu B, Hao J, Zhou P, Yao Y, Zhang F, Chen X. Percutaneous Endoscopic Lumbar Discectomy Versus Posterior Open Lumbar Microdiscectomy for the Treatment of Symptomatic Lumbar Disc Herniation: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis. *World Neurosurg.* 2018;120:352–362.
5. Gadjaradj PS, Harhangi BS, Amelink J, van Susante J, Kamper S et al. Percutaneous Transforaminal Endoscopic Discectomy Versus Open Microdiscectomy for Lumbar Disc Herniation: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Spine (Phila. Pa. 1976).* 2021;46:538–549.
6. Jasper GP, Francisco GM, Telfeian AE. Clinical success of transforaminal endoscopic discectomy with foraminotomy: A retrospective evaluation. *Clin. Neurol. Neurosurg.* 2013;115:1961–1965.
7. Wang YP et al. Evaluation of transforaminal endoscopic discectomy in treatment of obese patients with lumbar disc herniation. *Med. Sci. Monit.* 2016;22: 2513–2519.
8. Markovic M, Zivkovic N, Ruetten S, Ozdemir S, Goethel D. Full-Endoscopic Interlaminar Versus Microsurgical Operations in Lumbar Compressive Lesions Surgery: Prospective Randomized Trial of Overall 570 Patients. *J. Pain Reli.* 06, (2017).
9. Ruetten S, Komp M, Merk H, Godolias G. Full-endoscopic interlaminar and transforaminal lumbar discectomy versus conventional microsurgical technique: A prospective, randomized, controlled study. *Spine (Phila. Pa. 1976).* 2008;33:931–939.
10. Ahn Y, Lee S, Son S, Kim H, Eun Kim J. Learning Curve for Transforaminal Percutaneous Endoscopic Lumbar Discectomy: A Systematic Review. *World Neurosurg.* 2020;143:471–479.
11. Ahn Y, Lee S, Son S, Kim H. Learning Curve for Interlaminar Endoscopic Lumbar Discectomy: A Systematic Review. *World Neurosurg.* 2021;150:93–100.

Angaben zu möglichen Interessenkonflikten: vorhanden

Prof. Dr. Karsten Schöller:

Einmaliges Honorar für Vortragstätigkeit / Übernahme Reiskosten Firma Joimax GmbH, 2019

S. 34 – 35: Hamburger Mammografie-Studie Meilenstein der Krebsbekämpfung.

Von Prof. Dr. Hans-Joachim Frischbier

1. Frischbier H-J, Lohbeck HU. Frühdiagnostik des Mammakarzinoms. Thieme Verlag Stuttgart, 1977.
2. Frischbier H-J. Die Erkrankungen der weiblichen Brustdrüse. Thieme Verlag Stuttgart, 1982
3. Frischbier H-J, Hoeffken W, Robra RP. Mammografie in der Krebsfrüherkennung. Qualitätssicherung und Akzeptanz. Ergebnisse der Deutschen Mammografie-Studie. Enke Verlag Stuttgart 1994.
4. Geburtshilfe Frauenheilkunde 2018;927-948.