

# Quantification of Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) in the detection of Prostate cancer.

Published: 01-02-2012

Last updated: 28-04-2024

2.1 Primary objective: To improve PCa detection rate with quantification, compared with subjective CEUS interpretation and known numbers in literature. 2.2 Secondary objective: To compare quantification results with tumour differentiation grade (...)

<b>Ethical review</b>	Approved WMO
<b>Status</b>	Recruiting
<b>Health condition type</b>	Renal and urinary tract neoplasms malignant and unspecified
<b>Study type</b>	Observational invasive

## Summary

### ID

NL-OMON36092

### Source

ToetsingOnline

### Brief title

CEUS before biopsy

### Condition

- Renal and urinary tract neoplasms malignant and unspecified

### Synonym

Prostate adenocarcinoma, Prostate cancer

### Research involving

Human

### Sponsors and support

**Primary sponsor:** Academisch Medisch Centrum

**Source(s) of monetary or material Support:** Stichting Cure for Cancer

## Intervention

**Keyword:** CEUS, Prostate cancer, Quantification, TRUS

## Outcome measures

### Primary outcome

See objective

### Secondary outcome

See objective

## Study description

### Background summary

With Contrast Enhanced UltraSound (CEUS) cancer induced neovascularisation can be visualised with the potential to improve ultrasound imaging for prostate cancer detection and localisation significantly. The past years numerous studies have been performed with CEUS, all basing their results on subjective judgement of the investigator. CEUS image interpretation is difficult and requires a well-trained expert. To overcome these difficulties CEUS quantification techniques can be of use. The techniques used in this protocol have been developed by the Technical University in Eindhoven (TU/e) and BRACCO, Geneva.

### Study objective

#### 2.1 Primary objective:

To improve PCa detection rate with quantification, compared with subjective CEUS interpretation and known numbers in literature.

#### 2.2 Secondary objective:

To compare quantification results with tumour differentiation grade (Gleason score)

#### 2.3 Presentation of the question:

- What is the difference in, for malignancy suspicious, areas between CEUS quantification and subjective interpretation in relation to the histological biopsy results?
- Is there a relation between Gleason score and quantification results?
- Is there an additional value for use of CEUS quantification in clinical

practice?

## **Study design**

This study is a prospective in-vivo study in humans in which we perform a CEUS before taking systematic prostate biopsies. These patients are already scheduled for biopsy because of a raised Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) or abnormal Digital Rectal Examination (DRE). Afterwards a quantitative analysis of all CEUS data will be performed.

## **Study burden and risks**

Benefits:

Normally, if no cancer is detected by systematic biopsies, when a suspicion for prostate cancer is still raised, the biopsies are repeated. Based on the quantification results determined after the first systematic biopsies, in this second session, the systematic biopsies can be optimal targeted in for malignancy suspicious lesions. In this way, cancer detection during the repeated biopsy session could increase.

If the results of the study show a correlation between quantification and the biopsy results, in the future this could open the way for targeted biopsies based on quantification techniques and therefore could decrease the number of biopsies with a better cancer detection. Therefore, this could decrease the burden for the patient and might improve prostate cancer treatment selection.

Risk assessment:

There is a small anticipated risk for participants. After use in thousands of patients, adverse events appear to be transient, mild and rare. The side effects mostly consist of transient alteration of taste, local pain at the injection site and facial or general flush. In rare cases allergic reaction to the contrast agent is described. (see 6).

Patients will be informed of the risk during intake, and it will be described in the study information.

## **Contacts**

### **Public**

Academisch Medisch Centrum

Meibergdreef 9  
1105 AZ Amsterdam  
NL

### **Scientific**

Academisch Medisch Centrum

Meibergdreef 9  
1105 AZ Amsterdam  
NL

## Trial sites

### Listed location countries

Netherlands

## Eligibility criteria

### Age

Adults (18-64 years)

Elderly (65 years and older)

### Inclusion criteria

- planned for prostate biopsy
- over 18 years old
- signed informed consent

### Exclusion criteria

- acute prostatitis of urinary tract infection
- severe heart disease or recent onset of rhythmic disorders
- had prostate biopsy within 30 days

## Study design

### Design

**Study type:** Observational invasive

Masking: Open (masking not used)

Control: Uncontrolled

Primary purpose: Diagnostic

## Recruitment

NL  
Recruitment status: Recruiting  
Start date (anticipated): 11-11-2011  
Enrollment: 560  
Type: Actual

## Ethics review

Approved WMO  
Application type: First submission  
Review commission: METC Amsterdam UMC

## Study registrations

### Followed up by the following (possibly more current) registration

No registrations found.

### Other (possibly less up-to-date) registrations in this register

No registrations found.

## In other registers

Register	ID
CCMO	NL37231.018.11