Pi	flufolastat (18F) (Pvlclari®) †	for the diagnosis of prostate cancer								
		στη της της <u>στη της της της της της της της της της τ</u>								
	General i	nformation [1]								
Drug description		Indication								
The active substance of Pylclari® is piflufolastat (18F) - formerly known as (18F)-DCFPyL - a diagnostic radiopharmaceutical for tumour detection. Piflufolastat is a fluorine-18 labelled small- molecule prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA) inhibitor that enables positron emission tomography (PET). It binds to cells expressing PSMA, including malignant prostate cancer cells which overexpress PSMA.										
	Incidence of	prostate cancer [2]								
In Austria, in 2020, 6,126 men were newly diagnosed wit										
The age-standardised incidence rate <sup>1</sup> in 2020 was 149,9										
<ul> <li>For screening, early detection and diagnosis of prostat</li> </ul>		treatment [3] <sup>2</sup>								
<ul> <li>Early PSA testing (baseline PSA followed by ris carriers &gt;40 years.</li> <li>Testing for prostate cancer in asymptomatic m mpMRI should be carried out before prostate to A prostate cancer risk calculator and/or mpMR</li> <li>Transperineal biopsies are recommended, rath</li> </ul>	k-adapted follow-up) can be offered to then should not be done in men with a li- piopsy. I should be used to confirm the indicat ther than transrectal ultrasound-guided d evaluated using the International Soc mended: ntermediate- or high-risk as a guide to be staged for metastases using MRI or ed for metastases using CT (chest, abdo	on for biopsy in men with elevated PSA. biopsies. ciety of Urological Pathology Consensus recommendations. prognosis and therapy. CT (abdomen and pelvis) and bone scan.								
EMA [1]	Kegor	FDA [4, 5]								
Approval status for this indication: On 25 May 2023, the CHMP a recommending the granting of a marketing authorisation for Pylck UPDATE: Date of issue of marketing authorisation valid througho	ari®.	Approval status for this indication: On 27 May 2021, the FDA approved Pylarify® (piflufolastat F 18) for PET imaging of PSMA-positive lesions in men with prostate cancer with suspected metastasis who are candidates for initial definitive therapy. with suspected recurrence based on elevated serum PSA level.								
<ul> <li>The full indication is:</li> <li>Pylclari<sup>®</sup> is for diagnostic use only.</li> <li>Pylclari<sup>®</sup> is indicated for the detection of PSMA positive prostate cancer in the following clinical settings:</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>FDA granted approval to Progenics Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</li> <li>Priority review</li> <li>Other indications: none</li> </ul>								

<sup>1</sup> European Standard Population 2013. <sup>2</sup> Due to an ongoing update, currently, there is no Onkopedia Guideline available.

primary staging of patients with high-risk prostate cancer prior to initial curative therapy
 to localise recurrence of prostate cancer in patients with a suspected recurrence based on increasing serum PSA levels after primary treatment with curative intent.
 Other indications: none

 Medicine is under additional monitoring
 Manufacturer

 The applicant for Pylclari®<sup>3</sup> in Europe is Curium Pet France [1].

 The manufacturer of piflufolastat F 18 (trademark Pylarify®) is Progenics Pharmaceuticals, Inc. [5].

## Currently, there is no cost information available.

# Posology [5]

## Radiation safety – drug handling

- Pylarify<sup>®</sup> is a radioactive drug. Only authorised persons qualified by training and experience should receive, use, and administer Pylarify<sup>®</sup>.
- Handle Pylarify® with appropriate safety measures to minimise radiation exposure during administration.
- Use waterproof gloves and effective radiation shielding, including syringe shields, when preparing and handling Pylarify®.

## Recommended dose

• The recommended amount of radioactivity to be administered for PET imaging is 333 MBq (9 mCi) with an acceptable range of 296 MBq to 370 MBq (8 mCi-10 mCi) administered as a single bolus intravenous injection.

## Preparation and administration

- Use aseptic technique and radiation shielding when preparing and administering Pylarify®.
- Visually inspect the radiopharmaceutical solution. Do not use if it contains particulate matter or if it is discoloured (Pylarify® is a clear, colourless solution).
- Calculate the necessary volume to administer based on calibration time and required dose.
- Pylarify<sup>®</sup> may be diluted with 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection, USP. Assay the dose in a suitable dose calibrator prior to administration.

## Post administration instructions

- Follow the Pylarify® injection with an intravenous flush of 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection USP.
- Dispose of any unused Pylarify<sup>®</sup> in compliance with applicable regulations.

## Patient preparation

• Instruct patients to drink water to ensure adequate hydration prior to administration of Pylarify<sup>®</sup> and to continue drinking and voiding frequently for the first few hours following administration to reduce radiation exposure.

## Image acquisition

- The recommended start time for image acquisition is 60 minutes after Pylarify<sup>®</sup> injection. Starting image acquisition more than 90 minutes after injection may adversely impact imaging performance.
- Patients should void immediately prior to image acquisition.
- Position the patient supine with arms above the head.
- Image acquisition should start from mid-thigh and proceed to the skull vertex.
- Scan duration is 12 minutes to 40 minutes depending on the number of bed positions (typically 6-8) and acquisition time per bed position (typically 2-5 minutes).

# Image display and interpretation

• Pylarify<sup>®</sup> binds to PSMA. Based on the intensity of the signals, PET images obtained using Pylarify<sup>®</sup> indicate the presence of PSMA in tissues.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Piflufolastat (18F) is formerly known as (18F)-DCFPyL.

- Lesions should be considered suspicious if uptake is greater than physiologic uptake in that tissue or greater than adjacent background if no physiologic uptake is expected. Tumours that do not express PSMA will not be visualised.
- Increased uptake in tumours is not specific for prostate cancer.
- Radiation dosimetry
  - Radiation absorbed dose estimates are shown in label information for organs and tissues of adult male patients from intravenous administration of Pylarify<sup>®</sup>.
  - The radiation effective dose resulting from administration of 370 MBq (10 mCi) of Pylarify® to an adult weighing 70 kg is estimated to be 4.3 mSv.
  - The radiation doses for this administered dose to the critical organs, which are the kidneys, liver, and spleen, are 45.5 mGy, 13.7 mGy, and 10 mGy respectively.
  - When PET/CT is performed, exposure to radiation will increase by an amount dependent on the settings used in the CT acquisition.

#### Warnings and precautions [5, 6]

## Risk of image misinterpretation

- Pylarify<sup>®</sup> uptake can be seen in a variety of tumour types as well as in non-malignant processes and normal tissues.
- Image interpretation errors can occur with Pylarify<sup>®</sup> imaging.

## Hypersensitivity reactions

- Monitor patients for hypersensitivity reactions, particularly patients with a history of allergy to other drugs and foods.
- Radiation risk
  - Ensure safe drug handling to protect patients and health care workers from unintentional radiation exposure.
- Individual benefit/risk justification
  - For each patient, the radiation exposure must be justifiable by the likely benefit. The activity administered should, in every case, be as low as reasonably achievable to obtain the required diagnostic information.
- Renal impairment
  - Careful consideration of the benefit risk ratio in these patients is required since an increased radiation exposure is possible.
- Patient preparation
  - The patient should be well hydrated before the start of the examination and urged to void before the examination in order to reduce bladder activity and as often as possible during the first hours after the examination in order to reduce radiation exposure.
  - A diuretic expected to act within the uptake time period may be administered to improve interpretation of piflufolastat (18F) PET/CT as it results in less activity depositions in ureters and the bladder.
- ✤ After the procedure
  - Close contact with infants and pregnant women should be restricted during the initial 12 hours following the injection.

	Study characteristics: CONDOR trial [7]											
Trial name	n	Intervention (I)	Comparator (C)	PE		Median follow-up	Characteristics	Biomarker	Fu	unding	Publication(s)	
CONDOR NCT03739684	208	18F-DCFPyL at a dose of 9 mCi (333 MBq) administered IV 1–2 hours before PET/CT	-	correct localisation rate (CLR)4		-	prospective, multicentre, open label, single-arm, phase III study	18F- DCFPyL	Progenics Pharmaceuticals, Inc.		CONDOR trial [8]	
	Inclusion criteria				Exclusion criteria Patien					Patient	t characteristics at baseline	
	, 5								an age: 68 years (range, 43−91) ≥65 years: n=141/208 (67.8%)			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Defined as positive predictive value with an additional requirement of anatomic lesion colocalisation between 18FDCFPyL-PET/CT and a composite standard of truth (SOT). The SOT consisted of, in descending priority (i) histopathology, (ii) subsequent correlative imaging findings, or (iii) post radiation PSA response.

<ul> <li>Suspected recurrence of prostate cancer based on rising PSA after definitive therapy based on:         <ul> <li>Post-radical prostatectomy: Detectable or rising PSA that is ≥ 0.2 ng/mL with a confirmatory PSA ≥ 0.2 ng/mL</li> <li>Post-radiation therapy, cryotherapy, or brachytherapy: Increase in PSA level that is elevated by ≥ 2 ng/mL above the nadir</li> <li>Negative or equivocal findings for prostate cancer on conventional imaging performed as part of standard of care workup within 60 days prior to day 1</li> <li>Life expectancy ≥6 months as determined by the investigator</li> <li>Able and willing to provide informed consent and comply with protocol requirements</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ongoing treatment with any systemic therapy (ADT, antiandrogen, GnRH, LHRH agonist or antagonist) for prostate cancer</li> <li>Treatment with ADT in the past 3 months of da</li> <li>Receipt of investigational therapy for prostate cancer within 60 days of day 1</li> <li>Subjects with any medical condition or other circumstances that, in the opinion of the investigator, compromise the safety or complia of the subject to produce reliable data or comp the study</li> </ul>	ance diagnosis: 71 months (range, 3–356) rior prostate cancer therapies: Radical prostatectomy only: n=103/208 (49.5%) Radical prostatectomy and radical prostatectomy and radical prostatectomy n=74/208
Efficacy (I vs. C)		<b>Safety</b> <sup>5</sup> (n=208)
<ul> <li>18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT detected ≥1 lesion in 59.1% to 65.9% patients as assessed by 3 inde</li> <li>The PE of CLR was met as the lower limit of 95% CI exceeded 20% for all three readers.</li> <li>The CLR ranged from 84.8% to 87.0% among the 3 readers (the lower bound of the 99</li> <li>The performance of 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT by CLR and PPV was maintained through all ca 82.8% and 92.9%–93.3% for CLR and PPV, respectively; correlative imaging (n=100): 86 respectively; and PSA response (n=1): 100% for both CLR and PPV.</li> <li>Further analyses of the correlative imaging results showed CLR remained high across th PET/CT (n=71): 86.8%–90.9%; (ii) MRI (n=23): 80.0%–86.7%; and (iii) CT (n=6): 80.0%–100</li> <li>The CLRs for each reader also were maintained across prior treatment regimens and inc standardised uptake value of lesions identified on 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>AEs: 6.7%</li> <li>E.g., headache: 1.9%</li> <li>E.g., fatigue: 1.0%</li> <li>E.g., hypertension: 1.0%</li> <li>Serious grade 3 AEs (hypersensitivity, headache, paraesthesia): 0.5%</li> <li>Grade 4 AEs or deaths: 0</li> </ul>	

<sup>5</sup> Safety assessments included monitoring for the incidence of treatment-emergent adverse events (AE) from the time of 18F-DCFPyL dosing up to 7 ± 3 days post-dose.



<ul> <li>In patients with baseline PSA levels on gripmit, the median CLB war 23.3<sup>th</sup> While patients with a PSA of 29 ng/mL<sup>1</sup> to 95.7<sup>k</sup> (&lt;5.9 ng/mL<sup>1</sup>).</li> <li>The detection rate rose with increasing PSA levels ranging from 36.2<sup>kl</sup> (&lt;6.9 ng/mL<sup>1</sup>) to 95.7<sup>kl</sup> (&lt;5.9 ng/mL<sup>1</sup>).</li> <li>PPV of 345<sup>cl</sup> CCPPL<sup>1</sup>, PETCT was determined in detection of recurrent disease by anatomic regions (prostate/prostate bed, pelviPS and control and composite ST in potents with at least one 4P<sup>1</sup> DCPPL<sup>1</sup>, poster lesson.</li> <li>The FPV in the prostation regions in the random state to the orthopotic regions (prostate/prostate bed, pelviPS and control and c</li></ul>												
<ul> <li>The detection rate rose with increasing PSA levels ranging from 36.246 (co. 5 ng/mL). by 56,968 (co. 5 ng/mL).</li> <li>PV or just and the composet SDT patters with a test one 18F.DCFP/L-patter levels at least one 18F.DCFP/L-patter levels at l</li></ul>		dian CLR was 7	3.3% while patient	ts with a PSA of ≥5 ng/r	nL had a median CLR of							
PPV by natomic region: <ul> <li>PPV of set OCPPL-PPT(CT was determined in detection of recurrent disease by natomic regions (prostate/prostate bed, pelvi PPS and set of pelvi PPS was consistently high across all anatomic regions.</li> <li>The PPV was consistently high across all and across of pelvic pelvic</li></ul>	5 1	ing from 36.2%	(<0.5 ng/mL) to 9	6.7% (≥5 ng/mL).								
• PV of 38 <sup>2</sup> DCFP4_PETCT was determined in detection of recurrent disease by anatomic regions.       • The PPV was consistently high across all anatomic regions.       • The PPV was consistently high across all anatomic regions.       • The PPV was consistently high across all anatomic regions.       • The PPV was consistently high across all anatomic regions.       • The PPV mas consistently high across all anatomic regions.       • The PPV mas consistently high across all anatomic regions.       • For pelvic hymph nodes, the PPV was between 57, sha and 58, sha among the three independent readers.       • For pelvic hymph nodes, the PPV was between 57, sha and 78, sha and rapps of 0.5 (gly GL, 0.54–0.73), a 0.5 (gly GV, 0.54–0.73), a 0.5 (gly	5 5		ی بین ریک	·····								
<ul> <li>The PPV was consistently high across all natomic regions.</li> <li>The PPV was consistently high across all natomic regions.</li> <li>For pelvic lymph nodes, the PPV was between 57,9% and 83,3% and ya the three independent readers.</li> <li>For pelvic lymph nodes, the PPV was between 67,2% and FUESK kappa of 0.5 (g.5% Cl, 0.5~0.73), 0.55 (g.5% Cl, 0.5~0.93) for the three readers.</li> <li>Change inplaned medical management time readers as acconstruction of 31 (g.5% Cl, 0.5~0.93) for the three readers.</li> <li>Change inplaned medical management time readers as acconstruction of a (g.5% Cl, 0.5~0.93) for the three readers.</li> <li>Change inplaned medical management plan.</li> <li>Of the sage aspect to the start the table DEPVL PETI/CT medical management plan.</li> <li>Of the sage applements of a positive 38F-DCPVL PETI/CT medical disease management plan.</li> <li>Of the sage applement to apple the sage to the start the table DEPVL PETI/CT medical banagement plan.</li> <li>Of the sage applement to apple the sage associated with positive 18F-DCPVL PETI/CT medical banagement plan.</li> <li>Of the sage applement to apple the sage applement to apple the sage sociated with an equiption of patients septented uccomes is not provide.</li> <li>Verte replaced by systemic therapy (m-sg, 2.5%), observation to initiating therapy (m-sg, 2.3%), systemic therapy to salvage local therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (m-sg, 2.3%), systemic therapy to salvage local therapy (m-sg, 2.3%), systemic therapy (m-sg, 2.3%), systemic therapy to salvage local therapy (m-sg, 2.3%)</li></ul>	PPV of 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT was determined in detection				ostate bed, pelvi PFS and							
<ul> <li>The PPV in the prostatic region ranged between y<sub>2</sub>/s and y<sub>2</sub>-y<sub>4</sub> and for three integendent readers.</li> <li>For petive (tymph nodes, the PPV was between f<sub>2</sub>-x<sub>4</sub> and y<sub>2</sub>-y<sub>4</sub> and y<sub>4</sub> and y<sub>2</sub> -y<sub>4</sub> and y<sub>4</sub> and y<sub>2</sub> -y<sub>4</sub> and y<sub>4</sub> and y<sub>4</sub></li></ul>												
<ul> <li>For pelvic lymph nodes, the PPV was between 67, 2% and for the extrapelvic regions, it ranged from 67, 2% 69, 8%. Inter-reader angreement had a concordance of 75% and Fleiss' kappa of 0.55 (95% Cl, 0.59~0.73).</li> <li>A greement between the cartal and local readers had concordances of 83, 2% 83, 7% and kappas of 0.65 (95% Cl, 0.59~0.73).</li> <li>A greement between the data spaps of 0.9, 69, 8%. Inter-reader agreement had a concordance of 75% and Fleiss' kappa of 0.55 (95% Cl, 0.59~0.73).</li> <li>A greement between the data spaps of 0.9, 69, 8%.</li> <li>Inter-reader agreement had stapps of 0.9, 8%-1.0), 1.0 and 0.81 (95% Cl, 0.6%-0.99) for the three readers. Change in planed medical management is Nearly two-thirds (n=33; 63, 9%) of these patients had a change in intended deases management plan. Of thes 12; patients, 120 (76.5%) were associated with positive 3F-DCFPyL-PET/CT findings, and 82 (2, 4%) were associated with nearly the findings. Of the 12; patients that had a positive 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT findings, and 82 (2, 2, 4%) were associated with nearly the sate three findings. Of the 12; patients that had a positive 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT findings and 82 (2, 2, 4%), systemic therapy that was either spip (n=43; 2, 1.6%), and planet treaturent to observation (n=4; 4, 4).</li> </ul>												
Inter-reader agreement: <ul> <li>Inter-reader agreement bad a concordance of 75% and Files's kappa of 6.65 (95% CL, 0.5%-0.73).</li> <li>Agreement between the central and local readers had concordances of 83.2% 83,7% and kappas of 0.62 (95% CL, 0.5%-0.73). 0.65 (95% CL, 0.5%-0.73).</li> <li>Agreement between the central and local readers had concordances of 83.2% 83,7% and kappas of 0.52 (95% CL, 0.5%-0.73). 0.65 (95% CL, 0.5%-0.73).</li> <li>Intra-reader agreement had kappas of 0.94 (95% CL, 0.5%-0.10, 1.0 and 0.83 (95% CL, 0.5%-0.98) for the three readers.</li> <li>Change in planned medical management:</li> <li>Nearly two-thirds (n=33, 63,9%) of these patients had a change in interded disease management plan.</li> <li>Of the say patients, 100 (72,5%) had a recommended change in management. The most frequent changes to treatment management plans after the sPF-DCFPV_LETT/CT medical management (n=34, 23, 9%), system: therapy (n=43, 23, 2%), system: therapy (n=43, 23, 2\%), system: therapy (n=43, 23</li></ul>					506 F- 006							
<ul> <li>Inter-reader agreement had a concordance of 57 (95% (1, o. 58– 72).</li> <li>Agreement between the central and local readers had concordances of 83,29% 83,7% and kappas of o.52 (95% (1, o. 50– 0.73), o.65 (95% (1, o. 54– 0.75), and o.64 (95% (2, o. 52– 0.74), or and o.81 (95% (2, o. 54– 0.96) for the three readers.</li> <li>Intra-reader agreement had kappas of o.24 (95% (2, o. 52– 0.74), on and o.81 (95% (2, o. 54– 0.96) for the three readers.</li> <li>Change in planned medical management agreement had kappas of o.24 (95% (2, o. 54– 0.96) for the three readers.</li> <li>Change in planned medical management plants had a change in intended disease management plan.</li> <li>Of these 333 patients, 303 (26.8%) were associated with one stative findings.</li> <li>Of the 34, patients that had a positive 38F-DCFPyL-PET/CT findings, and 38 (21.4%) were associated with negative findings.</li> <li>Of the 34, patients that had a positive 38F-DCFPyL-SET/CT findings, and 38 (21.4%) were associated with negative findings.</li> <li>Of the 34, patients that had a positive 38F-DCFPyL scan, 303 (72.5%) had a recommended change in management than.</li> <li>Of the 34, patients that had a positive 38F-DCFPyL scan, 303 (72.5%) had a recommended change in management than.</li> <li>Di the 34, patients that had a positive 38F-DCFPyL scan, 303 (72.5%) had a recommended change in management. The most frequent changes to treatment management plants.</li> <li>The UNDR trial, the evaluation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided.</li> <li>The CNDR trial, the evaluation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided.</li> <li>Were relevant outcomes are other sources are oth</li></ul>		10 /2./%), and it	I the extrapervici	egions, it ranged nom	0/.3%0-09.0%0.							
<ul> <li>Agreement between the central and local readers had concordances of 83 3% 83 7% and kappas of 0.62 (g5% Cl, 0.5,0-0.73), 0.65 (g5% Cl, 0.5,0-0.73), 0.55 (g5\% Cl, 0.5,0-0.</li></ul>		Fleiss' kappa of	0 65 (05% CL 0.58	R=0 72)								
<ul> <li>cs_4-o.75), and o.64 (g5% C1, o.83-o.74) for the three readers.</li> <li>Intra-reader agreement had kapas of o.49 (g5% C1, o.84-o.98) for the three readers.</li> <li>Change in planned medical management.</li> <li>The treating physicians completed pre- and post-18F-DCFPyLPET/CT medical management plan.</li> <li>Of these 333 patients, 303 (78.6%) were associated with positive 8F-DCFPyL scan, 303 (72.5%) had a recommended change in management. The most frequent changes to reatment management plans after the 18F-DCFPyL scan, 303 (72.5%) had a recommended change in intended disease emaragement. The most frequent changes to reatment management plans after the 18F-DCFPyL scan, 303 (72.5%) had a recommended change in intended disease emaragement. The most frequent changes to reatment management plans.</li> <li>Of the 34,4 patients that had a positive s8F-DCFPyL scan, 303 (72.5%) had a recommended change in intended disavage local therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=43; 23.9%), systemic therapy to salvage local therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to observation (n=3; 4.4%).</li> </ul>					l. 0.50–0.73), 0.65 (95% Cl							
<ul> <li>Intra-reader agreement had kappas of 0, 94, (95% Cl, 0.82-1.0), 1.0 and 0.81 (95% Cl, 0.64-0.98) for the three readers.</li> <li>Change in planned medical management:</li> <li>The treating physicians completed pre- and post 18F-DCFPyLPET/CT medical management questionnaire for 205 patients.</li> <li>Nearly two-thirds (n=33, 163, 95%) of these patients had a change in intended disease management plan.</li> <li>Of these 13p hoters to 130 (76.6%) were associated with positive 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT imaging results included salvage local therapy that was either supplemented or repatient beta? (n=35, 23.9%) obstruction to initiating therapy (n=35, 23.9%), systemic therapy (n</li></ul>			, ,			/						
Change in planned medical management: <ul> <li>The treating physicians completed pre- and post-s8F-DCFPyLPET/CT medical management questionnaire for 205 patients.</li> <li>Nearly two-thirds (n=331, 63.9%) of these patients had a change in intended disease management plan.</li> <li>Of the set as patients, 103 (76.6%) were associated with positive 38F-DCFPyL-PET/CT indings, and s8 (21.4%) were associated with negative findings.</li> <li>Of the set as patients, 103 (76.6%) were associated with positive 38F-DCFPyL-PET/CT inaging results included salvage local therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=43, 23.0%), systemic therap (n=43, 21.0%).</li> </ul> <ul> <li>A.</li>         &lt;</ul>			0.81 (95% Cl, 0.64	–0.98) for the three rea	iders.							
<ul> <li>The treating physicians completed pre- and post-387-DCFP/LPET/CT medical management plan.</li> <li>No thearly two-thirds (n=31, 63, 98) of these patients had a change in intended disease management plan.</li> <li>Of these saja patients, 103 (76, 58) were associated with positive 187-DCFP/L-SET/CT findings, and a8 (21,4%) were associated with negative findings.</li> <li>Of these saja patients that had a positive 187-DCFP/L scan, 103 (72, 5%) had a recommended change in management. The most frequent changes to treatment thans agreent plans after the 187-DCFP/L-FET/CT maging results included salvage local therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=43; 21,0%), and planned treatment to observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 23,0%), bystemic therap (n=43; 21,0%), and planned treatment to observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 23,0%), bystemic therap (n=43; 21,0%), and planned treatment to observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 21,0%), and planned treatment to observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 21,0%), and planned treatment to observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 21,0%), and planned treatment to observation to patients-reported outcomes is not provided.</li> </ul> Were the valuation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided. Were the valuation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided. Were the hypothesis/aim/ objective of the study clearly stated? Were the explanation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided. Were the logibility consecutively. Were the explanation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided. Were the study at similar point in the observation. Were the logibility consecutively. Were the eligibility consecutively. Were the relevent outcomes measured using appropriate objectivel. <p< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>·•• · ·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></p<>			·•• · ·									
<ul> <li>Nearly two-thirds (n=33, 63, 96%) of these patients had a change in intended disease management plan.</li> <li>Of these 133 patients, 103 (78, 65%) were associated with positive 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT findings, and 28 (21, 4%) were associated with negative findings.</li> <li>Of the 14, patients that had a positive 18F-DCFPyL scan, 103 (72, 5%) had a recommended change in management. The most frequent changes to treatment management plans after the 18F-DCFPyL PCT/CT imaging results included salayse local therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=49; 23, 9%), observation to initiating therapy (n=49; 23, 9%), systemic therapy to salwage local therapy to salwage local therapy (n=43; 21, 0%), and planned treatment to observation (n=9; 4.4%).</li> <li>Patient-reported outcomes is not provided.</li> <li>TONDOR trial, the evaluation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided.</li> <li>Name of the subjective of the study clearly stated?</li> <li>A.</li> <li>B.</li> <li>More the eligibility or entire in the study clearly stated?</li> <li>Nee the heighbility crean (inclusion and no ecentre?</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Ye</li></ul>	<ul> <li>The treating physicians completed pre- and post-18F-D</li> </ul>				o5 patients.							
negative findings.       Of the 344 patients that had a positive 18F-DCFPyL scan, 103 (72.5%) had a recommended change in management. The most frequent changes to treatment management plans after the 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT imaging results included salvage local therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=58, 28.3%), observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to observation (n=9; 4.4%).       Patient-reported outcomes         Vertext colspan="2">Vertext colspan="2"         Vertext colspan= total         Verext colsp												
• Of the 144 patients that had a positive 18F-DCFPyL scan, 103 (72, 5%) had a recommended change in management. The most frequent changes to treatment management plans after the 18F-DCFPyL-PETI/CT imaging results included salvage local therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 23.0%), systemic therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to observation to initiating therapy (n=43; 23.0%), systemic therapy to salvage       >		positive 18F-D	CFPyL-PET/CT fin	dings, and 28 (21.4%) v	vere associated with							
changes to treatment management plans after the 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT imaging results included salvage local therapy that was either supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=43; 23.9%), observation to initiating therapy (n=49; 23.9%), systemic therapy to salvage local therapy to salvage local therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to initiating therapy (n=49; 23.9%), systemic therapy to salvage local therapy therapy there the eligibility there the statist at the test of the study to the study to there there there and there and there there there there eligibility of the study to the study dearly state? The there there and there and the salvage local therapy there there there there there there there eligibility outcome there eligibility to there there sa												
supplemented or replaced by systemic therapy (n=58; 28.3%), observation to initiating therapy (n=49; 3.3.9%), systemic therapy to salvage local therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to observation (n=9; 4.4%).												
local therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to observation (n=9; 4.4%).												
Patient-reported outcomes         In CONDOR trial, the evaluation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided.         Risk of bias - study level (case series) [9]         1.       2.       3.       4.       5.       6.       7.       8.       9.         Were the cases       Were the eligibility colspan="6">outcomes       Were the eligibility colspan="6">Vere the study at similar point in the disease?       Vere the study clearly stated?       Vere the study at similar point in the disease?       Vere the study clearly stated?       Vere the study at similar point in the disease?       Vere the study clearly stated?       Vere th				nerapy (n=49; 23.9%), s	ystemic therapy to salvag	e						
In CONDOR trial, the evaluation of patients-reported outcomes is not provided.         Risk of bias - study level (case series) [9]         1       2.       3.       4.       5.       6.       7.       8.       9.         Was the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly stated?       Were the cases collected in more than one centre?       Were patients recruited consecutivel?       Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?       Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?       Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?       Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Was the loss co follow-up reported?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were the study at similar point in the disease?       Were th	local therapy (n=43; 21.0%), and planned treatment to c	observation (n=										
Risk of bias - study level (case series) [9]1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.Ware the cases collected in more than one centre?Were patients recruited collected in more than one centre?Were patients recruited collected in more than one centre?Were patients recruited collected in more than one centre?Were patients recruited collected in more than one centre?Were patients recruited 												
1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.Were the cases collected in more ethan on centre?Were the casesWere patients recruited consecutively?Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and on centre?Did participants enter the study at similar point intervention clearly described?Were relevant outcome measures established a priori?Were vere outcome measures the relevant outcome established a priori?Were the esclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and entry into the study clearly stated?G.7.8.9.YesyesWere patients recuited consecutively?Did participants enter the study at similar point intervention clearly described?Were relevant outcome measures established a priori?Were were the intervention that patients received?YesyesyesyesyesyesyesyesyesWere the relevant outcomes measured before and after11.12.13.14.15.16.17.18.Were the relevant outcomes measured before and afterWere the statistical tests outcomes anominate?Was the length of follow-up reported?Was the loss to follow-up reported?Were adverse events reported?Were the study supported support diverse support for the study16.17.18.Were the relevant outcomes measured afterWere the follow-up reported?<		In CONDOR	•			J.						
Was the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly stated?Were the cases collected in more than one centre?Were patients recruited consecutively?Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?Was the bid participants enter the study at similar point in the disease?Was the intervention clearly described?Were relevant outcome assessors bilinded to the the study at similar point in the disease?Was the intervention clearly described?Were relevant outcome assessors bilinded to the the study at similar point in the disease?Were the studical and priori?Were relevant outcome assessors bilinded to the the study at similar point in the disease?Was the intervention clearly described?Were relevant outcome assessors bilinded to the the study at similar point in the disease?Was the intervention clearly described?Were relevant outcome assessors bilinded to the the study at similar point in the disease?Was the in the study at similar point in the disease?Was the in the study at similar point in the disease?Was the intervention clearly described?Were relevant outcome the study support the study supported?Were the study at similar point intervention the study at similar point in the disease?Were the study at similar point in the disease?Were the 			Risk of bias	- study level (case	series) [9]		I	I				
Was the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly stated?Were the cases collected in more than one centre?Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?Did participants enter the study at similar point in the disease?Were relevant additional interventions (co- interventions) clearly described?Were relevant outcome measuresoutcome assessors blinded to the intervention clearly described?Were relevant additional interventions (co- interventions) clearly described?Were relevant outcome measuresoutcome assessorsoutcome assessorsYesYesYesYesYesYesYesWere the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?YesYesYesWere the statistical tests the relevant outcomes follow-up reported?Was the longth of relevant outcomes reported?Were the eligibility the statistical tests the relevant outcomes follow-up reported?Was the longth of relevant reported?Were the study stands the study standsWere the study standsWere the study standsWere the study standsWere the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?YesYesWas the length of follow-up reported?Was the longth of reported?Were the study standsWere the <b< td=""><td>1.</td><td>2.</td><td>3.</td><td>4.</td><td>5.</td><td>6.</td><td>7.</td><td>8.</td><td></td></b<>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.				
Was the hypothesis/ aim/ objective of the study clearly stated?Were the cases collected in more than one centre?Were patients recruited consecutively?Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?Did participants enter the study at similar point in the disease?Was the intervention clearly described?additional intervention outcome the study at similar point interventionWere relevant outcome assessors blinded to the intervention clearly stated?Were the entry into the study clearly stated?Did participants enter the study at similar point in the disease?Was the intervention clearly described?Were relevant outcome assestors clearly described?Were relevant outcome the statistical tests used to assess the relevant outcomes measured before and afterWere the statistical tests used to assessWere the statistical tests used to assessWere the statistical tests used to assessWas the length of follow-up reported?Was the length of relevantWas the length of relevantWas the length of relevantWas the length of relevantWere the study supported?Were the study supp							Were					
Was the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly stated?Were patients collected in more than one centre?Were patients recruited consecutively?Were patients recruited exclusion criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?Did participants enter the study at similar point intervention clearly described?Was the intervention clearly described?interventions outcome established a priori?blinded to the intervention the intervention the study at similar point in the disease?Was the interventions clearly described?interventions clearly described?blinded to the intervention the stateints treceived?YesyesyesyesyesyesyesWere the relevant subjective methods?yesyesyesyesyesWere the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?Were the relevant outcomesWere the relevant outcomesWas the length of follow-up reported?Was the loss to follow-up reported?Did the study provide estimates of random variability in the data analysis of relevantWere the study support for support for support for support for support for support for support forWere the support for support for support for support for support for support for support for support for support forWas the leavant provide estimatesWas the leavant provide estimates reported?Were the subjective the studyWere the support for support for support for support for support for </td <td></td> <td>Were the</td> <td></td> <td>Were the eligibility</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Were relevant</td> <td></td>		Were the		Were the eligibility				Were relevant				
Was the hypothesis/aim/ objective of the study clearly stated?collected in more than one centre?recruited consecutively?exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?the study at similar point in the disease?intervention clearly described?(co- intervention) clearly described?measures established a priori?the intervention that patients received?Yesyesyesyespartial6yesyesyesyes10.11.12.13.14.15.16.17.18.Were the relevant outcomes subjective methods?Were the relevant outcomes dafterWere the relevant outcomes the relevant outcomes dafterWere the relevant outcomes the relevant outcomesWas the length of follow-up reported?Did the study provide estimates or fandom variability in the data analysis of reported?Were adverse vers variability in the data analysis of reported?Were the study supported by results?Were the study support for the study		cases				Was the	interventions	outcome				
more than one centre?consecutively? clearly stated?entry into the study clearly stated?in the disease?clearly described?interventions) clearly described?established a priori?intervention that patients received?yesyesyesyespartial <sup>6</sup> yesyesyesyes10.11.12.13.14.15.16.17.18.Were the relevant subjective methods?Were the relevant afterWere the relevant outcomes afterWere the relevant outcomesWas the length of follow-up reported?Did the study provide estimates of random variability in the data analysis of relevantWere the study supported support for the study	Was the hypothesis/ aim/ objective of the study clearly stated?											
Mere the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?Were the relevantWas the length of follow-up reported?Was the length of follow-up reported?Was the length of relevantDid the study provide estimates of random variability in the data analysis of relevantWere the study supported support for the study			consecutively?	1 / /	in the disease?	clearly described?	· · ·					
AccessAcces		one centre?		clearly stated?				priori?	that patients			
10.11.12.13.14.15.16.17.18.Were the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?Were the relevant outcomes afterWere the statistical tests used to assess the relevant outcomesWas the length of follow-up reported?Was the loss to follow-up reported?Did the study provide estimates of random variability in the data analysis of relevantWere the study supported study reported?Were dwerse events reported?Were the conclusions of the study supported by results?Were the study supported by results?Were the conclusions of the study supported by results?Were the conclusions of the study supported by results?							described:		received?			
Were the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?Were the relevant outcomes measured before and afterWere the subjective methods?Were the relevant outcomes the relevant outcomes reported?Did the study provide estimates of random reported?Were adverse of random variability in the data analysis of relevantWere adverse events reported?Were the conclusions of the study supported by results?Were both competing interest and source of support for the study	yes yes yes partial <sup>6</sup> yes yes yes yes											
Were the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?relevant outcomes measured before and afterWere the statistical tests used to assessWas the length of follow-up reported?Was the loss to follow-up reported?provide estimates of random variability in the data analysis of relevantWere the conclusions of the study supported by results?competing interest and source of support for the study	10.		12.	13.	14.		16.	17.				
Were the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?       outcomes measured before and after       statistical tests used to assess       Was the length of follow-up reported?       Was the loss to follow-up reported?       Of random variability in the data analysis of relevant       Were adverse events reported?       Were the conclusions of the study supported by results?       interest and source of the study			Were the			1						
Were the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?       measured before and after       used to assess before and after       Was the length of the relevant       Was the length of follow-up reported?       was the loss to follow-up reported?       variability in the data analysis of relevant       events reported?       conclusions of the study supported by results?       source of support for the study							Were adverse					
subjective methods? before and after appropriate? before and after appropriate? appropriate? reported? reported? data analysis of reported? by results? support for the study su												
after appropriate? relevant ' the study	subjective methods?			follow-up reported?	reported?	/						
intervention? oppropriate outcomes? reported?								by results?				
		intervention?	appropriate.			outcomes?			reported?			

		yes		yes	yes	unclear <sup>7</sup>	no	8	yes	yes	yes	yes	
				<u> </u>		Overall risk of bias: moderate							
Study characteristics: OSPREY trial [10, 11								]					
Trial name	n	Intervention (l)	Comparator (C)	PE	Mediar follow-u	(haracteristics	Biomarker	F	unding		Publication(s)		
OSPREY NCT02981368	385 <sup>9</sup>	single dose of 9 mCi (333 MBq) 18F- DCFPyL via intravenous injection, followed by PET/CT 1 to 2 hours thereafter (both cohorts)	-	specificity of 18F-DC PET/CT imaging determine the abser metastatic prostate cancer with pelvic lymph nod relative to histopath + sensitivity of 18 DCFPyL PET/CT ima to determine the pre of metastatic prostate cancer with pelvic lymph nod relative to histopath	to ince of lin the les ology BF- aging isence lin the les	prospective, multicentre, multi-reader, open-label, phase 2/3 study	18F-DCFPyL	Progenics Pharmaceuticals, Inc.		OSPREY trial [10]			
	Inclusion criteria			Exclusion criteria				Patient characteristics at baseline High-risk disease (cohort A)/ Recurrent or metastatic disease (cohort B)					
<ul> <li>All cohorts:         <ul> <li>Adults ≥18 years; signed informed consent</li> <li>Histologically confirmed adenocarcinoma of the prostate</li> </ul> </li> <li>Cohort A only:         <ul> <li>At least high-risk prostate cancer defined by NCCN Guidelines Version 3.2016 (clinical stage ≥T3a or PSA &gt;20 ng/mL or Gleason score ≥8)</li> <li>Scheduled or will be scheduled to undergo radical prostatectomy with PLND</li> </ul> </li> <li>Cohort B only:         <ul> <li>Radiologic evidence of local recurrence or new or progressive metastatic disease demonstrated on anatomical imaging (CT, MRI, or ultrasound), whole-body bone scan (99mTc-MDP or Na18F) within 4 weeks of day 1</li> <li>If prior treatment with radiation or ablative therapy, evidence of recurrence outside the confines of prior treated site(s)</li> <li>Scheduled or will be scheduled for percutaneous biopsy of at least one amenable lesion</li> </ul></li></ul>		a 3.2016 PLND tic disease -body bone rence outside amenable	<ul> <li>All cohorts:</li> <li>Subjects administered any high energy (&gt;300 KeV) gamma-emitting radioisotope within 5 physical half-lives, or any IV iodinated contrast medium within 24 hours, or any high-density oral contrast medium (oral water contrast is acceptable) within 5 days, prior to study drug injection.</li> <li>Subjects with any medical condition or other circumstances that, in the opinion of the investigator, compromise obtaining reliable data, achieving study objectives, or completion.</li> <li>Cohort A only:</li> <li>Patients with prior ADT or any investigational neoadjuvant agent or intervention.</li> </ul>			physical half- um within 24 medium in 5 days, other e iable data, on.	<ul> <li>Median a years</li> <li>Median n staging e</li> <li>AJCC prir</li> <li>AJCC reg</li> </ul>	of patients: $268^{10}/1$ : ge at informed com- nonths since last pro- valuation: $1.7/31.1$ mary tumour (T) sta TX ( $3.0/10.3$ %); T1 T1b ( $0.7/0.9$ %); T1 T2 ( $2.6/2.6$ %); T2a T2b ( $11.2/6.0$ %); T1 T3 ( $1.1/2.6$ %); T3a T3b ( $5.2/14.5$ %); T Missing ( $0/4.3$ %) ional lymph node (1 NX ( $38.4/33.3$ %); N %); N1 ( $3.4/23.1$ %) %)	Age: age: a (0.4/0 %); a (16.8/8.5 %); f 2c (5.2/8.5 %); (20.9/20.5 %); f 4 (0.4/7.7 %); N) stage: N0 (58.2/39.3				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>132 patients had a lesion follow-up, but the point in time is unclear.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Loss to follow-up rate was not reported.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Two patient populations underwent 18F-DCFPyL-positron PET/CT. Cohort A (n=252) enrolled men with high-risk prostate cancer undergoing radical prostatectomy with pelvic lymphadenectomy. Cohort B (n=93) enrolled patients with suspected recurrent/metastatic prostate cancer on conventional imaging.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Cohort A: Of 268 patients who underwent Pyl PET/CT, 16 patients did not undergo RP-PLND and 252 patients underwent surgery and have PLN pathology results.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Cohort B: of 117 patients who underwent Pyl PET/CT, 93 patients had extra-prostatic biopsies.

	<ul> <li>Prior radiation or ablative therapy to intended of biopsy, if within the prostate bed.</li> <li>Initiation of new systemic therapy for recurrand/or progressive metastatic disease since radiographic documentation of recurrence/progression</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MX (17.9/ 0.9 %); Mo (80.6/ 58.1 %); M1 (0.4/28.2 %); M1a (0/5.1 %); M1b (0.4/3.4 %); M1c (0/0)</li> <li>Gleason grade:         <ul> <li>6 (1.1/3.4 %); 7 (18.3/33.3 %); 8 (44.8/27.3 %); 9 (34.3/31.6 %); 10 (1.5/0.9 %); Missing (0/3.4 %)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Median PSA (ng/ml, range): 9.7 (1.2-125.3)/ 7.1 (0.03-596.9)</li> <li>Prior prostate ctomy: 0/47.1 %</li> <li>Prior prostate radiation therapy: 0.4/58.1 %</li> <li>Prior systemic therapy: 1.5/63.2 %</li> <li>Median18F-DCFPyL dosing and uptake time (mCi/MBq administered: 9.14/338</li> <li>Median minutes from injection to imaging (range): 74 (25—194)</li> </ul>
Efficacy (I vs. C)		Safety (I vs. C)
<ul> <li>Cohort A</li> <li>The specificity co-primary endpoint was met, as the lower limits of the 95% CIs for all r threshold.</li> <li>Of the 75.4% of patients with pathologically negative pelvic lymph nodes, specificity a limits of the 95% CI, 93.6%-96.0%).</li> <li>The sensitivity endpoint was not met, as the lower bounds of the 95% CI (19.2%-29.7%</li> <li>Of 24.6% of patients with at least 1 pathologically proven pelvic nodal metastasis, sensitivits for PPV and NPV were 78.1%-90.5% (lower bounds of 95% CI, 63.8-69.9) and 8 respectively.</li> <li>Primary tumour in the prostate gland was identified on 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT by the blinits in a post hoc sensitivity analysis, we evaluated PET/CT for detection of nodal metastasis smaller tumour deposits are below PET detection limits.</li> <li>After exclusion of the 27 patients whose largest nodal metastasis was ≤5 mm, sensitivit high PPV and NPV results were preserved.</li> <li>The median results of the 3 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT readers for detecting pelvic lymph no DCFPyL-PET/CT demonstrated threefold higher PPV (86.7% vs. 28.3%), higher specific vs. 7.7%), and similar sensitivity (40.3% vs. 42.6%).</li> <li>At least 1 reader detected extra pelvic lesions by 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT in 12.3% (33/268 from clinical Mo to M1 disease.</li> <li>Median sensitivity was 95.8% (95% CI, 87.8%-99.0%) and median PPV was 81.9% (95%</li> <li>Across the readers, false-negative results ranged from 1.4%-7.1% and false-positive results (22/92) had negative histopathology for prostate cancer on biopsy.</li> <li>Sensitivities and PPVs for detection of prostate cancer within different anatomical regional period period</li></ul>	across all 3 readers ranged from $96.3\%$ to $98.9\%$ (lower b) did not reach the success threshold of $40\%$ . sitivity for the 3 readers ranged from $30.6\%-41.9\%$ . 81.4%-83.8% (lower bounds of $95%$ Cl, $76.4%-78.9%$ ), anded readers in $95.2\%-99.3\%$ of cases. See >5 mm in diameter based on the assumption that ty, and specificity both met the success criteria, and ode metastases were compared with CT or MRI; $18F$ - city ( $97.9\%$ vs. $65.1\%$ ) and slightly higher NPV ( $83.2\%$ B) of high-risk patients, potentially up staging them 6 Cl, $73.7%-90.2%$ ). sults from $12.2\%-18.8\%$ . castatic disease on conventional imaging, $23.9\%$ of	Patients who experienced <b>at least 1 AE</b> : n=51/385 patients (13.2%) <b>Most frequent AEs</b> : dysgeusia (2.6%), headache (2.3%), and fatigue (1.3%) Patients who experienced <b>a serious AE</b> : n=7/385 (1.8%); none was considered related to 18F-DCFPyL

**E** 

<ul> <li>All 93 evaluable patients underwent extra prostatic biop (47.3%) had osseous lesions and 10 (10.8%) had distant</li> <li>18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT demonstrated &gt;88% sensitivity an</li> </ul>	visceral/soft tiss	sue lesions.						
<ul> <li>I8F-DCFPyL-PET/CT demonstrated &gt;88% sensitivity an disease spread at the region level.</li> </ul>	a ≥75% PPV in a	confirming prosta	te cancer within all site	s of disease and extent o				
<ul> <li>Sensitivities and PPVs of 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT across di</li> </ul>	ifforant bacaling	PCA lovals word						
<ul> <li>In men with low PSA (&lt;2 ng/ml), sensitivity ranged from</li> </ul>								
<ul> <li>Relative to conventional imaging (CT/MRI, bone scintig</li> </ul>				ant motactacic was likely	in			
<ul> <li>relative to conventional maging (C1/MR), bone scintiging (21/MR), bone scintiging (</li></ul>		10F-DCFPyL-PET		ant metastasis was likely				
19/33 patients (57.0%) and officery in 10/02 patients (22	.090).	Dation	nt-reported outco	~ ~ ~				
				nes outcomes is not provide	4			
	IN USPRET	,	- study level (case		J.			
1.	2.				6.	7	8.	0
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	0.	7.	0.	9. Were
Was the hypothesis/ aim/ objective of the study clearly stated?	Were the cases collected in more than one centre?	Were patients recruited consecutively?	Were the eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria) for entry into the study clearly stated?	Did participants enter the study at similar point in the disease?	Was the intervention clearly described?	Were additional interventions (co- interventions) clearly described?	Were relevant outcome measures established a priori?	outcom assessor blinded the intervent that patie received
yes	yes	yes	yes	partial <sup>12</sup>	yes	yes	yes	yes
10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.
Were the relevant outcomes measured using appropriate objective/ subjective methods?	Were the relevantWere the statistical testsWas the length of follow-up reported?Wasoutcomes measuredused to assessWas the length of follow-up reported?Wasbefore and after intervention?outcomes appropriate?follow-up reported?			Was the loss to follow-up reported?	Did the study provide estimates of random variability in the data analysis of relevant outcomes?	Were adverse events reported?	Were the conclusions of the study supported by results?	Were bo competin interest a source c support f the stud reported
yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	ye
			Overall risk of bias: low					
		0	ngoing trials [12]					
NCT number/trial name		Descrip			Estimate	d study completi	on date	
NCT03824275	2/3 trial.		h prostate cancer, a ph			12/2023		
NCT03594760 PSMA-PET: Deep radiomic biomarkers of progression and response prediction in prostate cancer, a phase 3 study.								
NCT03459820	as proposed b		cancer patient manage ts before and after 18F al.			06/2027		
		Ava	ilable assessment	S				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Baseline characteristics were heterogenous.

There were no further assessments identified via NICE, G-BA, ICER and NIHR.

## Other aspects and conclusions

- In May 2023, the CHMP adopted a positive opinion, recommending the granting of a marketing authorisation for Pylclari<sup>®</sup>. It is indicated for the detection of PSMA-positive lesions with PET in adults with prostate cancer for the primary staging of patients with high-risk prostate cancer prior to initial curative therapy, and to localise recurrence of prostate cancer in patients with a suspected recurrence based on increasing serum PSA levels after primary treatment with curative intent. In May 2021, the FDA approved Pylarify<sup>®</sup> for PET imaging of PSMA-positive lesions in men with prostate cancer with suspected recurrence based on elevated serum PSA level.
- CONDOR (NCT03739684) is a phase III, prospective, multicentre, open-label, single-arm study evaluating the diagnostic performance and safety of 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT in 208 patients with suspected recurrent or metastatic prostate cancer. Men ≥18 years with biochemically recurrent adenocarcinoma of the prostate treated with radical prostatectomy or radiotherapy were included. Exclusion criteria included administration of any high-energy gamma-emitting radioisotope within 5 physical half-lives prior to 18F-DCFPyL injection, and ADT within 3 months of imaging, or investigational therapy for prostate cancer within 60 days of imaging:
  - CLR, the PE, was 84.8%–87.0% (lower bound of 95% Cl, 77.8–80.4).
  - Patients-reported outcomes were not provided.
  - The ESMO-MCBS was not applicable because the primary endpoint could not be assessed.
  - Since baseline characteristics were heterogenous and it remained unclear when lesion follow-up was performed, the risk of bias was considered moderate.
- OSPREY (NCT02981368) is a prospective, multicentre, multi-reader, open-label, phase 2/3 study assessing the diagnostic performance of 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT for detecting sites of metastatic prostate cancer in 385 patients, assigned to 2 cohorts. Patients ≥18 years of age with histologically confirmed prostate adenocarcinoma were eligible. Cohort A included patients with high-risk PCa (clinical stage ≥T3a or PSA >20 ng/ml or Gleason score ≥8) who were planned for radical prostatectomy with PLND. Patients with prior ADT were excluded. Cohort B included patients with radiological evidence of local recurrence or metastatic disease on anatomical imaging or whole-body bone scintigraphy and in whom lesion(s) were amenable to biopsy:
  - In cohort A, 18F- DCFPyL-PET/CT had median specificity of 97.9% (95% Cl, 94.5%-99.4%) and median sensitivity of 40.3% (28.1%-52.5%, not meeting prespecified endpoint). In cohort B, median sensitivity was 95.8% (87.8%-99.0%).
  - Patients-reported outcomes were not provided.
  - The ESMO-MCBS was not applicable because the primary endpoint could not be assessed.
  - Although baseline characteristics were heterogenous, the overall risk of bias was considered low.
- ◆ 3 ongoing phase 2/3 trials, evaluating 18F-DCFPyL PET/CT in prostate cancer diagnosis, were identified.
- According to EMA, the benefit of piflufolastat is supported by 3 clinical studies [1] which were not specified. Beside CONDOR and OSPREY trial, the third trial may be PYTHON (NCT04734184), a prospective phase 3 study on 18F-DCFPyL PET/CT imaging in biochemical recurrence of prostate cancer. Although the estimated study completion date has passed [14], there is no data available for this trial.
- In conclusion, further phase 3 data is required to substantiate the role of piflufolastat for the detection of PSMA-positive lesions with PET in adults with prostate cancer.

First published: 06/2023 Last updated: 09/2023

Abbreviations: ADT=androgen deprivation therapy, AE=adverse event, AJ=adjustment, AJCC=American Joint Committee on Cancer, C=comparator, CADTH=Canada's Drug and Health Technology Agency, CHMP=Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use, CI=confidence interval, CLR= correct localization rate, CT=computerized tomography; EMA=European Medicines Agency, ESMO-MCBS= European Society of Medical Oncology – Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale, FDA=Food and Drug Administration, FM=final magnitude of clinical benefit grade, G-BA=Gemeinsamer Bundesausschuss, GnRH=gonadotropin-releasing hormone, HR=hazard ratio, I=intervention, ICER=Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, Int.=intention, LHRH=luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone, MG=median gain, mpMRI=multi-parametric magnetic resonance imaging, MRI=magnetic resonance imaging; n=number of patients, NCCN=National Comprehensive Cancer Network, NICE=National Institute for Health Care Excellence, NPV=negative predictive value, OS=overall survival, PE=primary endpoint, PET=positron emission tomography, PFS=progression-free survival, PLND=pelvic lymph node dissection, PM=preliminary grade, PPV=positive predictive value, PSA=prostate specific antigen, PSMA=prostate specific membrane antigen, QoL=quality of life, SAE=serious adverse event, SOT=standard of truth, ST=standard treatment

# **References:**

- 1. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Medicines. Pylclari. [Available from: <u>https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/summaries-opinion/pylclari</u>].
- 2. Statistik Austria. Krebserkrankungen. Ausgewählte Krebslokalisationen nach Inzidenz. [Available from: <u>https://www.statistik.at/statistik.at/statistiken/bevoelkerung-und-soziales/gesundheit/krebserkrankungen</u>].
- 3. Parker C, Castro E, Fizazi K, et al., on behalf of the ESMO Guidelines Committee. Prostate cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and followup. Ann Oncol VOLUME 31, ISSUE 9, P1119-1134, SEPTEMBER 2020.

- 4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA approves second PSMA-targeted PET imaging drug for men with prostate cancer. [Available from: <a href="https://www.fda.gov/drugs/news-events-human-drugs/fda-approves-second-psma-targeted-pet-imaging-drug-men-prostate-cancer">https://www.fda.gov/drugs/news-events-human-drugs/fda-approves-second-psma-targeted-pet-imaging-drug-men-prostate-cancer</a>].
- 5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Pylarify. Label Information. [Available from: <a href="https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\_docs/label/2021/214793s000lbl.pdf">https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\_docs/label/2021/214793s000lbl.pdf</a>].
- 6. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Pylclari: EPAR Product Information. [Available from: <u>https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/pylclari-epar-product-information\_en.pdf</u>].
- 7. U.S. National Library of Medicine, ClinicalTrials.gov. Study of 18F-DCFPyL PET/CT Imaging in Patients With Suspected Recurrence of Prostate Cancer (CONDOR). [Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/results/NCT03739684].
- 8. Morris MJ, Rowe SP, Gorin MA, et al., and CONDOR Study Group. Diagnostic Performance of 18F-DCFPyL-PET/CT in Men with Biochemically Recurrent Prostate Cancer: Results from the CONDOR Phase III, Multicenter Study. Clin Cancer Res 2021;27:3674–82.
- 9. Institute of Health Economics (IHE). Quality Appraisal of Case Series Studies Checklist. Edmonton (AB): Institute of Health Economics; 2014. [Available from: <a href="http://www.ihe.ca/research-programs/rmd/cssqac-about">http://www.ihe.ca/research-programs/rmd/cssqac-about</a>].
- 10. Pienta KJ, Gorin MA, Rowe AP, et al., OSPREY Study Group. A Phase 2/3 Prospective Multicenter Study of the Diagnostic Accuracy of Prostate Specific Membrane Antigen PET/CT with 18F-DCFPyL in Prostate Cancer Patients (OSPREY). J Urol 2021 July ; 206(1): 52–61.
- 11. U.S. National Library of Medicine, ClinicalTrials.gov. Study of 18F-DCFPyL PET/CT Imaging in Patients With Prostate Cancer (OSPREY). [Available from: <a href="https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02981368">https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02981368</a>].
- 12. U.S. National Library of Medicine, ClinicalTrials.gov. [Available from: <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/home</u>].
- 13.
   Canada's Drug and Health Technology Agency (CADTH). PET Diagnostic Imaging with Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen for Prostate Cancer: A Review of Clinical Utility, Cost-Effectiveness,
   Diagnostic
   Accuracy,
   and
   Guidelines.
   [Available
   from:

   https://www.cadth.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/htis/2020/RC1321%20PSMA%20for%20Prostate%20Cancer%20Final.pdf ].
   From the state of the sta
- 14. U.S. National Library of Medicine, ClinicalTrials.gov. A Prospective Study on 18F-DCFPyL PET/CT Imaging in Biochemical Recurrence of Prostate Cancer (Python). [Available from: <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04734184</u>].