Long-Term Erectile Dysfunction and Urinary Morbidity Following Brachytherapy

Nelson N. Stone, MD Professor Urology and Radiation Oncology The Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai New York, New York



Disclosures

3DBiopsy, Inc.
– President, CEO, Owner

Prevention

- Recognize high risk situations
 - Urinary
 - Prior prostate surgery
 - Large gland
 - Outlet obstruction
 - Patient age
 - Comorbidity

Factors Influencing Urinary Symptoms 10 Years After Permanent Prostate Seed Implantation

Nelson N. Stone,*,† Naamit Kurshan Gerber,‡ Seth Blacksburg,‡ Jonathan Stone‡ and Richard G. Stock‡

- 11,491 IPSS SHEETS
- 1932 PATIENTS (6/patient)
- IMPLANT ALONE: 749 PTS
- IMPLANT + HORMOANL THERAPY: 486 PTS
- IMPLANT AND EBRT: 697 PTS
- FOLLOW –UP: 1 MONTH 18 YEARS (MEDIAN 6.5 YEARS)

Vol. 187, 117-123, January 2012 THE JOURNAL OF UROLOGY®

The good news!





Figure 3. Change in AUASS over time by pre-implant severity category (p <0.001 for all points).

Table 3. Resolution (within 1 point of baseline) of urinarysymptoms by pre-implant severity category

Pre-Implant AUASS	Mean Score at Baseline	% Resolved at 2 Yrs	Time When Greater than 50% Resolved
0–7	3.4	39.4	5 Yrs
8–19	11.9	59.5	1 Yr
20 or Greater	24.2	83.3	6 Mos

Differences in mean score at baseline were significant (p < 0.001). By year 10 no patients with severe urinary symptoms before implantation remained in the severe (20 or greater) symptom category.



Figure 5. Mean change in AUASS from baseline by hormone vs no hormones. Differences were significant at 3 months (p = 0.003), 6 months (p < 0.001), 1 year (p < 0.001), 2 years (p < 0.001), 3 years (p < 0.001), 4 years (p = 0.021), 6 years (p = 0.014), 8 years (p = 0.048) and 9 to 10 years (p = 0.017).

Factors influencing long-term urinary symptoms following prostate brachytherapy

Variable	Mild symptoms	Moderate	Severe (n=91)	P value
	(n=1110)	(n=641)		
Age (years)	65.0 (41-84)	66.5 (39-85)	66.3 (49-84)	<0.001
Prostate Volume (cc)	38.2 (2.4-188)	43.0 (10.8-145)	39.3 (15-98.3)	<0.001
Use of NHT (%)	401/1110 (48.9)	233/641 (59.3)	60/91 (65.9)	<0.001
External Beam	410/1110 (36.1)	233/641 (36.3)	32/91 (35.2)	0.976
Boost (%)				
BED (Gy2)	196.1 <u>+</u> 30	195.7 <u>+</u> 30.6	194.2 <u>+</u> 30.2	0.834

Stone et al. BJUI revised submission



Likelihood of remaining with mild symptoms



Likelihood of remaining with mild symptoms with and without supplemental EBRT

	Sig.	Hazard Rates	95.0% CI f	or HR
			Lower	Upper
Age (years)	0.173	1.010	.996	1.024
EBRT boost	0.004	1.45	1.13	1.81
Smoker	0.622	1.06	0.84	1.33
Alcohol	0.001	1.46	1.17	1.83
Hypertension	0.006	1.37	1.10	1.72
NHT	0.817	.972	.768	1.232
BED <u>≥</u> 200Gy	0.024	1.273	1.032	1.571

Cox hazard rates for freedom from worsening urinary symptoms

Prior Prostate Surgery



Prior Prostate Surgery







Management of Large Prostate

Large gland

- Size limitation?
 - -50, 75, 100, 100+
- Adequacy of implant
- Intravesical lobe

The Effect of Brachytherapy, External Beam Irradiation and Hormonal Therapy on Prostate Volume

Nelson N. Stone* and Richard G. Stock

From the Departments of Urology and Radiation Oncology (RGS), Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, New York











Figure 6: Prostate Volume



PROSTATE BRACHYTHERAPY IN PATIENTS WITH PROSTATE VOLUMES \geq 50 cm³: DOSIMETIC ANALYSIS OF IMPLANT QUALITY

Nelson N. Stone, M.D. and Richard G. Stock, M.D.



Fig. 3. Distribution of D90s in 66 patients implanted with ¹²⁵I with prostate volumes $\geq 50 \text{ cm}^3$. Median implant D90 was 18,750 eGy.

Int. J. Radiation Oncology Biol. Phys., Vol. 46, No. 5, pp. 1199-1204, 2000

Does Neoadjuvant Hormonal Therapy Improve Urinary Function When Given to Men With Large Prostates Undergoing Prostate Brachytherapy?

Nelson N. Stone,*,† David T. Marshall,‡ Jonathan J. Stone, Jamie A. Cesaretti§ and Richard G. Stock

	Maan + CD	Mass + PD	n) (alua
Variable	No Retention	Retention	(ANOVA)
Age	66.5 ± 6.9	66.9 ± 7.0	0.564
PSA (ng/ml)	7.9 ± 4.8	8.1 ± 7.1	0.814
Baseline I-PSS	7.9 ± 5.9	8.9 ± 5.3	0.318
Biologically effective dose (Gy)	194 ± 35	190 ± 37	0.494
UD30	140 ± 31	147 ± 29	0.245
PV (cc)	57.4 ± 14.3	56.8 ± 17.3	0.815

Table 3. Comparison of values with vs without urinary retention

Urinary retention 41/395(10.4%)



Figure 1. After implantation from baseline (*time 0*) patients without HT (squares) had greater increase in I-PPS and needed longer to return to baseline than those with NHT (diamonds).

Retention and high IPSS

IPSS ≥ 15, n=52
No NHT: 2/15 (25%)
NHT: 2/40 (5)%
OR 6.3, 95% 1-43, p=0.04

Prostate brachytherapy in men with gland volume of 100 cc or greater: Technique, cancer control, and morbidity

Nelson N. Stone^{1,*}, Richard G. Stock²

Table 1 Characteristics of the	2051 men treated b	y prostate brachyther	apy	
Variable	PV < 100 (%)	$PV \ge 100 \ (\%)$	p-Value	
PSA (ng/mL)				
<10	1509 (74.8)	14 (41.2)	< 0.001	
10.1-19.9	363 (18)	14 (41.2)		
≥20	145 (7.2)	6 (17.6)		
Gleason score				
≤6	1365 (66.7)	22 (64.7)	0.819	
7	472 (22.4)	9 (26.5)		
8-10	220 (10.9)	3 (8.8)		
Stage				
T1c-T2a	1378 (68.4)	22 (64.7)	0.362	
T2b-T2c	581 (28.8)	10 (29.4)		
T3	58 (2.8)	2 (5.9)		
Initial IPSS	7.4	8.5	0.283	
Preimplant TURP				
Yes	106 (5.3)	0 (0)	0.170	
Hormonal therapy				
Yes	1110 (54.5)	30 (88.2)	< 0.001	
BED (Gy ₂)				
≤150	163 (9.3)	4 (11.8)		
>150-200	851 (43.5)	17 (50)		
>200	943 (48.2)	13 (38.2)	0.476	
Followup time (y)	6.5	7.0	0.372	

Two-Phase Technique







Biochemical Control

Table 3 Regression analysis of PSA failure (bFFF)

			95% CI fo	or HR
Parameters	Significance	HR	Lower	Upper
Age	0.303	0.989	0.969	1.010
Stage	0.000	1.341	1.178	1.526
PSA	0.000	1.009	1.005	1.013
Gleason score	0.000	1.385	1.204	1.592
Hormone therapy	0.025	1.489	1.051	2.110
BED	0.000	0.989	0.985	0.992
Prostate volume	0.646	1.309	0.414	4.137

Management of Retention

Complications Following Permanent Prostate Brachytherapy N.N. Stone^{*}, R.G. Stock

Departments of Urology and Radiation Oncology, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, 1 Gustav Levy Place, New York, NY 10028, USA

Urinary retention rates following prostate seed implantation ($^{125}I/^{103}Pd$, both isotopes used alone, EBRT/ ^{125}I either isotope alone or in combination with EBRT, EBRT + ^{103}Pd , isotope combined with EBRT, EBR-T/ $^{125}I/^{103}Pd$, isotopes alone or in combination with EBRT)

Study	Number	Treatment	Retention rate (%)
Blasko	196	¹²⁵ I	7
Vijverberg	46	¹²⁵ I	22
Wallner	92	¹²⁵ I	14
Storey	206	¹²⁵ I	11
Terk	251	¹²⁵ I/ ¹⁰³ Pd	5
Kaye	76	EBRT/ ¹²⁵ I	5
Dattoli	73	$EBRT + {}^{103}Pd$	7
Ragde	152	EBRT/ ¹²⁵ I/ ¹⁰³ Pd	10
Merrik	170	EBRT/125I/103Pd	6
Benoit	1409	EBRT/ ¹²⁵ I/ ¹⁰³ Pd	14.5
Zeitlin	212	EBRT/ ¹²⁵ I/ ¹⁰³ Pd	1.5

Management of Significant or Persistent Obstructive Symptoms

- Full dose alpha blockers
 - Push dose
 - 2 tamsulosin HCI in am then increasing doses of terazosin at hs
 - Add anti-inflammatory medications
 - Consider PDE-5s

What about patients with obstructive and irritative voiding symptoms?

- Maximize alpha blockers
- Add anticholinergic at hs
 - Start with 25-50 mg of diphenhydramine (especially if nocturia)
 - Then low dose anticholinergic
 - Check for glaucoma

Prolonged retention

CIC or TURP?

TURP rates following prostate brachytherapy

Study	Number	Treatment	TURP rate (%)
Wallner	92	¹²⁵ I	8.7
Storey	206	¹²⁵ I	0
Nag	32	¹⁰³ Pd	6.2
Terk	251	¹²⁵ I/ ¹⁰³ Pd	2.4
Dattoli	73	$EBRT + {}^{103}Pd$	2.8 ^a
Merrik	170	EBRT/125I/103Pd	1.2
Benoit	1409	EBRT/125I/103Pd	8.3
Gelblum	693	EBRT/125I/103Pd	4.0

^a An additional six patients (8.2%) had a TURP at time of implant.

Risk of Urinary Incontinence Following Post-Brachytherapy Transurethral Resection of the Prostate and Correlation with Clinical and Treatment Parameters

Stephen Mock,*,† Michael Leapman,† Richard G. Stock,† Simon J. Hall‡ and Nelson Neal Stone§

From the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, New York

- 2,495 seed implantation
 - pre-implant TURP were excluded
 - 79 (3.3%) underwent channel TURP due to urinary retention or refractory obstructive urinary symptoms
- Median follow up after implantation was 7.2 yrs (range 2.2 to 18.5 yrs)
- Median time to first post-implantation TURP was 14.8 months (range 0.5 to 188 months)
- Twenty of the 79 patients (25.3%) had urinary incontinence compared with 3.1% for implantation only patients (odds ratio 10.4; 95% CI, 6-18; p<0.001).



Figure 1. Incontinence rates for implantation only vs postimplantation TURP.

Effect of Multiple TURPs on Incontinence





Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier curve for risk of incontinence stratified by number of transurethral prostate resections.

Table 2. Risk table from Kaplan-Meier curve						
No. TURP	No. 1 Yr (%)	No. 5 Yrs (%)	No. 10 Yrs (%)			
0	32 (1.4)	63 (3)	69 (3.6)			
1	2 (3.1)	8 (14.3)	12 (34.1)			
2+	2 (13.3)	6 (44)	8 (77)			

Table 4. Multivariate linear regression analysis with incontinence vs other significant clinical and treatment variables as predictors

	Hazard Rate	p Value
Stage	0.57	0.57
Hormone use	2.28	0.02
TRUS vol	0.02	0.99
CT vol	1.28	0.2
Total BED	1.45	0.15
No. post-implantation TURP	11.1	0.00

Bottom Line:

- CIC for at least 1 year
- Minimum channel TURP
 - Preserve blood vessels at 5 and 7 o' clock positions
 - Utilize minimum fine cautery
 - Avoid laser and widespread tissue destruction

URINARY SYMPTOM FLARE FOLLOWING I-125 PROSTATE BRACHYTHERAPY

JAMIE A. CESARETTI, M.D.,* NELSON N. STONE, M.D.,[†] AND RICHARD G. STOCK, M.D.*

Departments of *Radiation Oncology and [†]Urology, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY



Fig. 2. International Prostate Symptom Score (IPSS) at 6-month intervals for the flare and nonflare groups.



Years since I-125 prostate implant

Fig. 3. Actuarial incidence of flare over time for 172 patients after I-125 prostate therapy.

Int. J. Radiation Oncology Biol. Phys., Vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 1085–1092, 2003

No predisposing factors

Haematuria after prostate brachytherapy

Michael S. Leapman^{*}, Simon J. Hall^{*}, Nelson N. Stone^{*†} and Richard G. Stock[†] Departments of *Urology and [†]Radiation Oncology, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA

- 2454 patients treated with transperineal
- prostate brachytherapy over a 20-year period at a single
- Patients were followed for a median of 5.9 years.
- 218 men (8.9%) reported gross haematuria at a median time of 772.2 days after implantation.

Fig. 2 Number of patients with haematuria in each 6-month time interval post-implantation.





Table 3 Binary logistic regression model for covariants associated with haematuria.

Variable	SE	Significance	95% CI	
			Lower	Upper
Race	0.085	0.854	0.859	1.201
Prostate cancer stage	0.073	0.052	0.753	1.002
Biochemical failure	0.355	0.035	1.052	4.222
ADT	0.173	0.478	0.631	1.241
Urinary retention	0.254	0.404	0.751	2.034
PSA >10 ng/mL	0.201	0.151	0.505	1.111
Gleason score >7	0.232	0.720	0.690	1.712
BED >200 Gy	0.157	0.268	0.875	1.621
Prostate volume >40 cm ³	0.152	0.002	1.193	2.166
External beam radiation	0.240	0.001	0.289	0.738

Findings at Cystoscopy Performed for Cause After Prostate Brachytherapy

Michael S. Leapman, Richard G. Stock, Nelson N. Stone, and Simon J. Hall



Figure 1. A total of 185 men underwent cystoscopy for hematuria or refractory urinary symptoms after prostate brachytherapy. The median time to cystoscopy in 181 men was 2.7 y. The 10-y freedom from cystoscopy was 89%. (Color version available online.)

Urology. 2014 Jun;83(6):1350-5.



Bladder Tumor

- 18 bladder tumors (18/2532, 0.7%)
- median time to detection of bladder cancer was 3.1 years (8.4 months-14.3 years)
 - one-third (6 patients) diagnosed within 2 years of radiation therapy.
- 13 (72.2%) were identified as low-grade, noninvasive urothelial carcinoma.
- 3 individuals (16.7%) had high-grade noninvasive (Ta) with concomitant carcinoma in situ.
- 2 individuals (11.1%) invasive (T2) disease

Do not leave seeds in bladder!



Limit size of resection!



Small TURP

Big TURP: this patient is incontinent!



Management of incontinence





Try Collagen Injections











Worst Situation

- Patient who has multiple resections and ends up with stricture posterior urethra and incontinence
- Avoid sending him to a cowboy urologist
- First treat the stricture by either urethrotomy or dilation followed by patient self catheterization with progressive increase in intervals. It may take a year to rehabilitate urethra.
- Then deal with incontinence



64 y/o low risk, PV 65cc, no NHT I-125 D90 194 Gy Obstructive symptoms Local urologist did extensive TURP at 9 months Developed retention 4 months later Another TURP Developed retention 3 months later Has SP tube placed Presents now 2 years post-implant Has TURP scrapping of calculi and started on CIC

 Not able to pass cath, cysto 4 weeks later



Long-term Erectile Function Following Prostate Brachytherapy: Effect of Race and Vascular Comorbidities

	TOTAL (997)	CAUCASIAN (782)	AFRICAN AMERICAN (112)	HISPANIC (58)	ASIAN (19)	OTHERS (26)	P VALUE
BRACHYTHERAPY TYPE							0.006
IMPLANT	380 (38.1%)	322 (41.2%)	28 (25.0%)	16 (27.6%)	8 (42.1%)	6 (23.1%)	
IMPLANT+HT	204 (20.5%)	161 (20.6%)	26 (23.2%)	8 (13.8%)	2 (10.5%)	7 (26.9%)	
IMPLANT+EBRT	97 (9.7%)	76 (9.7%)	9 (8.0%)	6 (10.3%)	2 (10.5%)	4 (15.4%)	
IMPLANT+HT+EBRT	316 (31.7%)	223 (28.5%)	49 (43.8%)	28 (48.3%)	7 (36.8%)	9 (34.6%)	
BED Gy2							0.282
≤ 150	11 (1.1%)	8 (1.0%)	2 (1.8%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
150 - 200	398 (39.9%)	299 (38.8%)	51 (45.5%)	28 (48.3%)	5 (26.3%)	15 (57.7%)	
> 200	576 (57.8%)	463 (60.1%)	59 (52.7%)	29 (50.0%)	14 (73.7%)	11 (42.3%)	
RECEIVED NHT	520 (52.2%)	384 (49.1%)	75 (67.0%)	36 (62.1%)	9 (47.4%)	16 (61.5%)	0.003

Kyle A. Blum, Jared S. Winoker, Jamie A. Cavallo, Carl A. Olsson, Richard G. Stock, Nelson N. Stone Presented at AUA 2017

	Pre-Implant (%)	Last follow up (%) min. 5 years	% preserved
	n	n	
White	539 (68.9)	349 (64.7)	64.7%
AA	74 (66.8)	55 (74.3)	74.3%
Hispanic	38 (65.5)	26 (68.4)	68.7%
Asian	15 (78.9)	9 (60.0)	60.0%
Other	14 (53.8)	11 (78.6)	78.6%
TOTAL	680	450	66.17%

SHIM ≥ 12 remaining ≥ 12

	Variable	10 years potency % (n)	12 years potency % (n)	Mean time years (CI)	p value	
Age	≤ 65	71.2 (131)	52.6 (53)	11.7 (11.3-12.1)	-0	
	> 65	55.4 (78)	32.1 (31)	10.1 (9.7-10.6)	~0	
BED	≤ 150	30 (11)	(1)	8.1 (6.1-10.1)		
	150 - 200	61.7 (79)	37.8 (22)	10.7 (10.2-11.2)	0.017	
	> 200	67.2 (129)	47.5 (61)	11.2 (10.8-11.3)		
NHT	Yes	58.0(97)	37.2(39)	10.4(10.0-10.8)	-0	
	No	70.7 (112)	49.6 (44)	11.7 (11.2-12.11)	<0	
T300	yes	64 (74)	37.6 (22)	?	0 160	
	No	67.2 (103)	46.4 (45)	?	0.100	
Smoker	Yes	58.9 (78)	41.9 (30)	10.6 (10.1-11.0)	0.200	
	No	68.3 (130)	44.8 (53)	11.3 (10.9-11.7)		
Diabetes	Yes	60.9 (17)	42.2 (8)	10.6 (9.5-11.1)	0.515	
	No	64.5 (191)	43.5 (76)	11.0 (10.7-11.3)		
CAD	Yes	69.1 (13)	23.0 (2)	9.9 (8.8-11.0)	0 160	
	No	64.4 (200)	44.3 (81)	11.1 (10.7-11.4)	0.169	
EtOH	Yes	61.8 (100)	43.1 (43)	10.8 (10.3-11.2)	0.072	
	No	68.3 (111)	44.4 (40)	11.3 (10.9-11.8)	0.072	
Afib	Yes	16.2 (1)	16.2 (1)	8.5 (6.6-10.5)	0.011	
	No	65.4 (209)	43.8 (83)	11.1 (10.7-11.4)	0.011	
Heart	Yes	57.8 (7)	43.4 (6)	10.0 (8.8-11.3)		
Disease	No	64.9 (200)	43.4 (78)	11.1 (10.8-11.4)	0.081	
HTN	Yes	60.5 (66)	39.1 (23)	10.6 (10.1-11.1)		
	No	66.1 (45)	45.5 (60)	11.2 (10.8-11.6)	0.095	

			95.0% CI for Hazard Ratio		
	Sig.	Hazard Ratio			
			Lower	Upper	
Age at Initial Rx	.000	1.043	1.023	1.064	
Total BED	.661	.999	.992	1.005	
Last Testosterone	.659	1.000	.999	1.001	
Smoker	.327	.870	.659	1.149	
CAD	.101	.608	.336	1.101	
Alcohol	.085	.779	.586	1.035	
Atrial Fibrillation	.520	.740	.296	1.850	
Heart Disease	.596	.859	.489	1.508	
Hypertension	.284	.859	.649	1.135	
TotalHRMs	.000	1.057	1.026	1.089	

