

BÖLÜM 2

Prostat Kanserinde Evreleme

Sedat YILDIRIM ¹

GİRİŞ

Dünyada erkeklerde en çok karşılaşılan ikinci kanser olan prostat kanseri (PCa) ülkemizde ise en sık görülen kanser konumundadır. Akciğer kanserinden sonra mortalitede ikinci sırada bulunmaktadır (1). Tedavisi planlanırken, kanserin hangi aşamada olduğunun tespit edilmesi gerekir. Bu amaçla kanser evreleme sistemi kullanılır. Kanser evrelemesinde temel amaç ortak klinik özellikleri olan hastaları belli kuralları ışığında homojen klinik ve patolojik özelliklere sahip hasta grupları oluşturmak ve böylece bu grupların prognozunu ve tedaviye verdikleri yanıtları test etmeyi kolaylaştırmaktır. Ayrıca farklı grupların klinik çalışma sonuçlarının karşılaştırılabilir olmasına olanak sağladığı gibi farklı grupların uluslararası platformlarda standardizasyonu da sağlanmış olur.

PROSTAT KANSERİNDE EVRELEME SİSTEMİNDE KULLANILAN PARAMETRELER

TNM Sistemi

Prostat kanseri teşhisi konulduktan sonra, uygun tedavi seçeneklerini belirlemek için bilinen risk faktörlerini içeren ileri değerlendirmeler yapmak gerekir. Fizik muayene (dijital rektal muayene (DRE) dahil), görüntüleme (Manyetik Rezonans Görüntüleme [MRI], Galyum 68 (Ga-68) izotopuyla işaretli PSMA (prostat spesifik membran antijeni) kombine edilen Pozitron Emisyon Tomografisi Bilgisa-

¹ Uzm. Dr., Kartal Dr. Lütfi Kırdar Şehir Hastanesi Tıbbi Onkoloji Kliniği, rezansedat@hotmail.com, ORCID iD:0000-0002-2423-6902

KAYNAKLAR

1. GLOBOCAN. 2020 kanser istatistikleri. (21/07/2023 tarihinde <https://gco.iarc.fr/today/online-analysis> adresinden ulaşılmıştır.)
2. Ploussard, G., et al. Decreased accuracy of the prostate cancer EAU risk group classification in the era of imaging-guided diagnostic pathway: proposal for a new classification based on MRI-targeted biopsies and early on oncologic outcomes after surgery. *World J Urol*, 2020. 38: 2493.
3. UPTODATE. Yeni tanı almış prostat kanseri hastalarının başlangıç evrelemesi ve değerlendirilmesi 2023. (21/07/2023 tarihinde <https://www.uptodate.com/contents/initial-staging-and-evaluation-of-males-with-newly-diagnosed-prostate-cancer> adresinden ulaşılmıştır.)
4. Brierley, J.D., et al., TNM classification of malignant tumors. UICC International Union Against Cancer. 8th edition 2017.
5. Buyyounouski MK, Choyke PL, Kattan MW, et al. Prostate. In: AJCC Cancer Staging Manual, 8th ed, Amin MB (Ed), Springer, New York 2017. p.715. Corrected at 4th printing, 2018.
6. Mottet N, van den Bergh RCN, Briers E, et al. EAU-EANM-ESTRO-ESUR-SIOG Guidelines on Prostate Cancer-2020 Update. Part 1: Screening, Diagnosis, and Local Treatment with Curative Intent. *Eur Urol* 2021; 79:243.
7. Cooperberg, M.R., et al. The University of California, San Francisco Cancer of the Prostate Risk Assessment score: a straightforward and reliable preoperative predictor of disease recurrence after radical prostatectomy. *J Urol*, 2005. 173: 1938.
8. Ceci, F., et al. E-PSMA: the EANM standardized reporting guidelines v1.0 for PSMA-PET. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*, 2021. 48: 1626
9. Van den Bergh, R.C.N., et al. Re: Andrew Vickers, Sigrid V. Carlsson, Matthew Cooperberg. Routine Use of Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Early Detection of Prostate Cancer Is Not Justified by the Clinical Trial Evidence. *Eur Urol* 2020;78:304-6: Prebiopsy MRI: Through the Looking Glass. *Eur Urol*, 2020. 78: 310.
10. Epstein, J.I., et al. The 2005 International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) Consensus Conference on Gleason Grading of Prostatic Carcinoma. *Am J Surg Pathol*, 2005. 29: 1228.
11. Epstein, J.I., et al. The 2014 International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) Consensus Conference on Gleason Grading of Prostatic Carcinoma: Definition of Grading Patterns and Proposal for a New Grading System. *Am J Surg Pathol*, 2016. 40: 244.
12. Van leenders, G., et al. The 2019 International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) Consensus Conference on Grading of Prostatic Carcinoma. *Am J Surg Pathol*, 2020. 44: e87.
13. Epstein, J.I., et al. A Contemporary Prostate Cancer Grading System: A Validated Alternative to the Gleason Score. *Eur Urol*, 2016. 69: 428.
14. Bell, K.J., et al. Prevalence of incidental prostate cancer: A systematic review of autopsy studies. *Int J Cancer*, 2015. 137: 1749
15. Moyer, V.A. Screening for prostate cancer: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *Ann Intern Med*, 2012. 157: 120.
16. Sauter, G., et al. Integrating Tertiary Gleason 5 Patterns into Quantitative Gleason Grading in Prostate Biopsies and Prostatectomy Specimens. *Eur Urol*, 2018. 73: 674.
17. Anderson, B.B., et al. Extraprostatic Extension Is Extremely Rare for Contemporary Gleason Score 6 Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol*, 2017. 72: 455
18. Ross, H.M., et al. Do adenocarcinomas of the prostate with Gleason score (GS) < 6 have the potential to metastasize to lymph nodes? *Am J Surg Pathol*, 2012. 36: 1346.
19. Alberts, A.R., et al. Biopsy undergrading in men with Gleason score 6 and fatal prostate cancer in the European Randomized study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Rotterdam. *Int J Urol*, 2017. 24: 281.
20. Zareba, P., et al. The impact of the 2005 International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) consensus on Gleason grading in contemporary practice. *Histopathology*, 2009. 55: 384.

21. Goel, S., et al. ConcordanceBetweenBiopsyandRadicalProstatectomyPathology in theEra of TargetedBiopsy: A SystematicReviewand Meta-analysis. *Eur UrolOncol*, 2020. 3: 10.
22. Inoue, L.Y., et al. Modelinggradeprogression in an activesurveillancestudy. *Stat Med*, 2014. 33: 930.
23. Van der Kwast, T.H., et al. Definingthethresholdforsignificantversusinsignificantprostatecancer. *NatRevUrol*, 2013. 10: 473.
24. Preisser, F., et al. Intermediate-risk ProstateCancer: Stratificationand Management. *Eur Uro-I Oncol*, 2020. 3: 270
25. Overland, M.R., et al. Active surveillanceforintermediate-risk prostatecancer: yes, but forwhom? *CurrOpinUrol*, 2019. 29: 605.
26. NCCN. Prostat kanserinde klinik uygulama kılavuzu 2023. (21/07/2023tarihindehttps://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf adresinden ulaşılmıştır.
27. Bekelman JE, Rumble RB, Chen RC, Pisansky TM, Finelli A, Feifer A, Nguyen PL, LoblawDA,-Tagawa ST, Gillessen S, Morgan TM, Liu G, Vapiwala N, Haluschak JJ, Stephenson A, Touijer K, Kungel T, Freedland SJ *J ClinOncol*. 2018;36(32):3251. Epub 2018 Sep 5
28. Sanda MG, Cadeddu JA, Kirkby E, Chen RC, Crispino T, Fontanarosa J, Freedland SJ, Greene K, Klotz LH, Makarov DV, Nelson JB, Rodrigues G, Sandler HM, Taplin ME, Treadwell JR *J Urol*. 2018;199(4):990. Epub 2018 Jan 10.
29. Sanda MG, Cadeddu JA, Kirkby E, Chen RC, Crispino T, Fontanarosa J, Freedland SJ, Greene K, Klotz LH, Makarov DV, Nelson JB, RodriguesG, Sandler HM, Taplin ME, Treadwell JR *J Urol*. 2018;199(3):683. Epub 2017 Dec 15.
30. Parker C, Castro E, Fizazi K, Heidenreich A, Ost P, Procopio G, Tombal B, Gillessen S, ESMO GuidelinesCommittee. Electronic address: clinicalguidelines@esmo.org *Ann Oncol*. 2020;31(9):1119. Epub 2020 Jun 25.
31. Mottet N, van den Bergh RCN, Briers E, Van den Broeck T, Cumberbatch MG, De Santis M, Fanti S, Fossati N, Gandaglia G, Gillessen S, Grivas N, Grummet J, Henry AM, van der Kwast TH, Lam TB, Lardas M, Liew M, Mason MD, Moris L, Oprea-LagerDE, van der Poel HG, Rouvière O, Schoots IG, Tilki D, Wiegel T, Willemse PM, Cornford P *Eur Urol*. 2021;79(2):243. Epub 2020 Nov 7.