

Biparametric versus Multiparametric MRI for Prostate Cancer Diagnosis: The PRIME Diagnostic Clinical Trial

Alexander Ng MBBS^{1,2,‡}, Aqua Asif MBChB^{1,2‡}, Ridhi Agarwal PhD³, Valeria Panebianco MD⁴, Rossano Girometti MD^{5,6}, Sangeet Ghai MD^{7,8}, Enrique Gomez-Gomez PhD⁹, Lars Budäus MD^{10,11}, Tristan Barrett MD¹², Jan Philipp Radtke MD^{13,14}, Claudia Kesch MD^{15,16}, Francesco De Cobelli MD^{17,18}, Tho Pham MD¹⁹, Samir S. Taneja MD²⁰, Jim C. Hu MD²¹, Ash Tewari MD²², Miguel Á. Rodríguez Cabello PhD²³, Adriano B. Dias MD^{7,8,24}, Lance A. Mynderse MD²⁵, Marcelo Borghi MD²⁶, Lars Boesen PhD^{27,28}, Paras Singh MD^{1,29}, Raphaële Renard-Penna PhD^{30,31}, Jeffrey J. Leow MPH^{32,33,34}, Fabian Falkenbach MD^{10,11}, Martina Pecoraro MD⁴, Gianluca Giannarini MD³⁵, Nathan Perlis MD³⁶, Daniel Lopez-Ruiz MD³⁷, Christof Kastner PhD³⁸, Lars Schimmöller MD^{39,40}, Marimo Rossiter BSc^{1,2}, Arjun Nathan MBBS^{1,2}, Pramit Khetrpal PhD^{1,2}, Vinson Wai-Shun Chan MBChB^{1,2}, Aiman Haider MD⁴¹, Caroline S. Clarke PhD⁴², Shonit Punwani PhD⁴³, Chris Brew-Graves MSc⁴³, Louise Dickinson PhD⁴⁴, Anita Mitra MD⁴⁵, Giorgio Brembilla PhD^{17,18}, Daniel J. A. Margolis MD⁴⁶, Yemisi Takwoingi PhD^{3,47}, Mark Emberton MD¹, Clare Allen BMBCh⁴⁴, Francesco Giganti PhD^{1,44}, Caroline M. Moore MD^{1,48}, Veeru Kasivisvanathan PhD^{1,2,48}; for the PRIME Study Group Collaborators

¹ Division of Surgery and Interventional Science, UCL, London, United Kingdom

² Centre for Urology Imaging, Prostate, AI and Surgical Studies (COMPASS) Research Group, Division of Surgery and Interventional Science, UCL, London, United Kingdom

³ Department of Applied Health Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

⁴ Department of Radiological Sciences, Oncology and Pathology, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

⁵ Institute of Radiology, Department of Medicine, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

27 ⁶ Institute of Radiology, University Hospital S. Maria della Misericordia, Azienda Sanitaria Universitaria Friuli Centrale (ASUFC),
28 Udine, Italy

29 ⁷ Joint Department of Medical Imaging, University Medical Imaging Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

30 ⁸ University Health Network-Mount Sinai Hospital-Women's College Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

31 ⁹ Urology Department Reina Sofia University Hospital, IMIBIC, Cordoba, Spain

32 ¹⁰ Martini-Klinik Prostate Cancer Center, University Hospital-Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistrasse 52, 20246 Hamburg, Germany

33 ¹¹ Martini-Klinik Prostate Cancer Center and Department of Urology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg,
34 Germany

35 ¹² Department of Radiology, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, Unit-
36 ed Kingdom

37 ¹³ Department of Urology, University Hospital Düsseldorf, Medical Faculty, Heinrich-Heine University Düsseldorf, Germany

38 ¹⁴ Department of Radiology, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany

39 ¹⁵ Department of Urology, University Hospital Essen, Essen, Germany

40 ¹⁶ German Cancer Consortium (DKTK)-University Hospital Essen, Essen, Germany

41 ¹⁷ Department of Radiology, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy

42 ¹⁸ Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, Milan, Italy

43 ¹⁹ Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

44 ²⁰ New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, USA

45 ²¹ Brady Department of Urology, New York Presbyterian Weill Cornell Medicine Hospital, New York, USA

46 ²² Department of Urology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, USA

47 ²³ Department of Urology, Hospital Universitario Sanitas La Moraleja, Madrid, Spain

48 ²⁴ Department of Radiology, Hospital Sírio-Libanês, São Paulo, Brazil

49 ²⁵ Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, USA

50 ²⁶ Centro de Urología, Buenos Aires, Argentina

51 ²⁷ Department of Urology and Urological Research, Herlev Gentofte University Hospital, Hellerup, Denmark

52 ²⁸ Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

53 ²⁹ Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

54 ³⁰ Sorbonne Université, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France

55 ³¹ Department of Radiology, Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, 75013, Paris, France

56 ³² Department of Urology, Tan Tock Seng Hospital, Singapore

57 ³³ Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

58 ³⁴ Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore

59 ³⁵ Urology Unit, University Hospital S. Maria della Misericordia, Azienda Sanitaria Universitaria Friuli Centrale (ASUFC), Udine,
60 Italy

61 ³⁶ Division of Urology, Department of Surgical Oncology, University Health Network, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

62 ³⁷ Radiology Department Reina Sofia University Hospital, IMIBIC, Cordoba, Spain

63 ³⁸ Department of Urology, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, United
64 Kingdom

³⁹ University Dusseldorf, Medical Faculty, Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, D-40225 Dusseldorf, Germany

⁴⁰ Department of Diagnostic, Interventional Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, Marien Hospital Herne, University Hospital of the Ruhr-University Bochum, Herne, Germany

⁴¹ Department of Pathology, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

⁴² UCL Research Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London, London, United Kingdom

⁴³ Centre for Medical Imaging, University College London, London, United Kingdom

⁴⁴ Department of Radiology, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

⁴⁵ Department of Clinical Oncology, UCLH NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

⁴⁶ Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, USA

⁴⁷ NIHR Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

⁴⁸ Department of Urology, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

[‡] Equally contributed to this research as first authors

Corresponding author

- Veeru Kasivisvanathan
- Division of Surgery and Interventional Science, University College London, 3rd Floor, Charles Bell House, 43-45 Foley Street, London, W1W 7TS, United Kingdom.
- +44(0)207 679 9092
- veeru.kasi@ucl.ac.uk

Word count: 3378

Date of revision: 04 July 2025

90 **Key points**

91 Question

92 Is biparametric MRI non-inferior to multiparametric MRI in the detection of
93 clinically significant prostate cancer?

94 Findings

95 In this level-1, prospective, multicentre, within-patient, non-inferiority trial of
96 490 biopsy-naïve men, biparametric MRI was non-inferior to multiparametric
97 MRI for detection of Gleason Grade Group 2 or higher prostate cancer
98 (difference, -0.4%; 95% confidence interval, -1.2% to 0.4%; $p=0.5$).

99 Meaning

100 In men with suspected prostate cancer, providing image quality is adequate,
101 an abbreviated biparametric MRI, with or without targeted biopsy, could
102 become the new standard of care for prostate cancer diagnosis.

103

104 **Abstract**

105 Importance

106 Multiparametric MRI (mpMRI), with or without prostate biopsy, has become
107 the standard of care for diagnosing clinically significant prostate cancer
108 (csPCa). Resource capacity limits widespread adoption. Biparametric MRI
109 (bpMRI) which omits the gadolinium contrast sequence, is a shorter and
110 cheaper alternative offering time-saving capacity gains for health systems
111 globally.

112 Objective

113 To assess whether bpMRI is non-inferior to mpMRI for csPCa diagnosis.

114 Design, setting and participants

115 A prospective, multicentre, within-patient, non-inferiority trial of biopsy-naïve
116 men from 22 centres (12 countries) with clinical suspicion of prostate cancer
117 (elevated prostate-specific antigen (PSA) and/or abnormal digital rectal
118 examination (DRE)) from April 2022 to September 2023, with the last follow-
119 up conducted on 03 December 2024.

120 Interventions

121 Participants underwent mpMRI, comprising T2-weighted (T2-WI), diffusion-
122 weighted (DWI) and dynamic contrast-enhanced (DCE) sequences.

123 Radiologists reported abbreviated bpMRI first (T2-WI and DWI), blinded to
124 DCE. After unblinding, radiologists reported the full mpMRI. Patients

125 underwent a targeted biopsy with or without systematic biopsy if either bpMRI
126 or mpMRI was suggestive of csPCa.

127 Main outcomes and measures

The primary outcome was the proportion of men with csPCa. Secondary outcomes included the proportion of men with clinically insignificant cancer. The non-inferiority margin was 5%.

Results

555 men were recruited, of whom 490 were included for primary outcome analysis. Median (IQR) age was 65 (59-70) years and PSA was 5.6 (4.4-8.0) ng/mL. The proportion of patients with abnormal DRE was 12.7%. BpMRI was non-inferior to mpMRI, detecting csPCa in 143 of 490 men (29.2%), compared to 145 of 490 men (29.6%) (difference, -0.4%; 95% CI, -1.2% to 0.4%; p=0.5). BpMRI detected clinically insignificant cancer in 45 of 490 men (9.2%), compared to 47 of 490 men (9.6%) on mpMRI (difference, -0.4%; 95% CI, -1.2% to 0.4%). Central quality control demonstrated that 99% of scans were of adequate diagnostic quality.

Conclusion and relevance

In men with suspected prostate cancer, providing image quality is adequate, an abbreviated bpMRI, with or without targeted biopsy, could become the new standard of care for prostate cancer diagnosis. With approximately 4 million prostate MRIs performed globally annually, adopting bpMRI could substantially increase scanner throughput and reduce costs worldwide.

Trial registration

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT04571840

(Funded by the John Black Charitable Foundation, Prostate Cancer UK, the European Association of Urology Research Foundation and the Wolfgang.Dieckmann Foundation)

Introduction

In the past five years, multiparametric MRI (mpMRI) with or without prostate biopsy has become an international standard of care for prostate cancer diagnosis¹⁻³. A mpMRI consists of three sequences: T2-weighted, diffusion-weighted and dynamic contrast-enhanced (DCE) imaging. However widespread adoption is challenging due to resource issues and increased demand for prostate MRI^{4,5}.

One solution is to adopt a shorter, less resource-intensive scan without the DCE sequence^{6,7}, known as biparametric MRI (bpMRI). This reduces scan time from 30-40 minutes to 15-20 minutes, thus increasing scanning capacity^{6,8,9}. Using contrast-medium for mpMRI necessitates a medical practitioner to be present in case of an allergic reaction, meaning that by avoiding a patient injection, bpMRI is less resource intensive in terms of staff and scanner time. Further, it is known that the contrast-medium used, gadolinium, deposits in the brain, bone, liver and skin^{10,11}. In addition to the cost of the contrast-medium and its administration, gadolinium contamination of the environment has been observed¹¹.

Most studies comparing bpMRI to mpMRI are typically small, single-centre, unblinded retrospective, and without MRI quality assurance^{7,12,13}. They typically use a scoring system¹⁴ which already assumes that DCE has a limited role in cancer detection, limiting their ability to show a difference in cancer detection¹⁵. Further, biopsies were typically either not targeted to MRI-suspicious areas or done on basis of the full mpMRI information only, without considering what would have been done without the DCE. The only randomised trial comparing bpMRI to mpMRI showed

177 significant cancer detection in favour of mpMRI (24% vs. 33%) but without statistical
178 significance due to being underpowered¹⁶. Genuine uncertainty remains as to
179 whether DCE improves significant cancer detection. Contrast is also thought to play
180 an important role in staging decisions and evaluating involvement of key anatomical
181 structures around the prostate, thus influencing treatment eligibility options and
182 treatment planning^{17,18}.

183

184 We designed the Prostate Imaging using MRI +/- contrast Enhancement (PRIME)
185 trial, to overcome these limitations^{15,19} and investigate whether bpMRI is non-inferior
186 to mpMRI for the detection of clinically significant prostate cancer (csPCa).

187

Methods

Trial design

PRIME, NCT04571840, was a prospective, international, multicentre, within-patient, non-inferiority, level-1 evidence diagnostic yield study conducted in 22 centres in 12 countries (eTable 1, Supplement 3). A diagnostic yield study is one which evaluates and compares the proportion of men with a target condition detected by different diagnostic tests. Men who gave written informed consent were enrolled into the study and underwent mpMRI. The trial protocol has been published¹⁹ and was approved by the ethical review board at each participating institution (Supplement 1). The trial was monitored by an independent Global Trial Steering Committee.

Participants

Participants were recruited in outpatient clinics and were eligible if they were referred with clinical suspicion of prostate cancer based on elevated PSA or abnormal digital rectal examination (Figure 1). Participants were required to have PSA \leq 20ng/mL and no prior MRI or biopsy. Self-reported ethnicity data were collected on enrolment using predefined categories to characterise the ethnic composition of the study cohort (Table 1).

MRI and prostate biopsy

Patients underwent mpMRI using a 1.5 or 3.0T scanner with a pelvic phased-array coil, with or without an endorectal coil (eTable 2, Supplement 3). T2-weighted, diffusion-weighted and DCE sequences were acquired according to Prostate Imaging - Reporting and Data System version 2.1 (PI-RADSv2.1) guidelines¹⁴. Image quality for each scanner was optimised to be guideline compliant at each site¹³.

A site radiologist first evaluated the bpMRI (T2-weighted and diffusion-weighted imaging), strictly blinded to DCE sequences (Figure 1). Successful blinding was confirmed for each case by an independent clinician or dedicated computer workflow. Suspicious areas on bpMRI were identified by the radiologist and assigned a score according to the Likert²⁰ and PI-RADSv2.1 scoring systems¹⁴ on a scale from 1 to 5, with higher numbers indicating a greater likelihood of csPCa. Both scoring systems were defined as 1 (highly unlikely), 2 (unlikely), 3 (equivocal), 4 (likely) and 5 (highly likely) to contain csPCa. Radiologists were mandated to record the bpMRI based decision and biopsy-target recommendations before DCE was revealed. This allowed an unbiased assessment of bpMRI's standalone contribution to cancer detection.

After immediate unblinding to DCE, the radiologist re-evaluated all three sequences and generated a new mpMRI report. If a completely new suspicious region was identified that was absent on bpMRI, or if an existing bpMRI lesion appeared significantly larger on mpMRI, the newly revealed region (or non-overlapping portion of the enlarged lesion) was marked as a separate, DCE-specific target for biopsy.

Areas on either bpMRI or mpMRI suggestive of cancer, scoring 3 (equivocal for csPCa), 4 (likely for csPCa), or 5 (highly likely for csPCa) on either the Likert or PI-RADSV2.1 scores underwent targeted prostate biopsy. Systematic biopsies were taken on MRI-negative sides of the prostate.

If the MRI was not suggestive of csPCa, scoring 1 or 2 on both the Likert and PI-RADSV2.1 scales, bilateral systematic biopsies were undertaken if there was high clinical suspicion of prostate cancer, with a PSA density of $\geq 0.15\text{ng/mL/mL}$; with a PSA density $< 0.15\text{ng/mL/mL}$, no prostate biopsy was taken.

MRI-targeted biopsy registration was performed by visual or software-assisted registration^{21,22} via the transperineal or transrectal route, according to local expertise. Biopsy operators took 4 cores from each suspicious area on MRI. The full biopsy schema is in the protocol¹⁹.

eTable 3 in Supplement 3 provides details regarding the experience of the clinicians in the trial.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was the proportion of men with csPCa, defined as the presence of a single biopsy core indicating disease of Gleason grade group (GGG) 2 or greater (the range for GGG is 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating a more aggressive form of prostate cancer). Secondary outcomes included the proportion of men with clinically insignificant cancer (GGG 1), test performance and the proportion

of patients in whom DCE made a difference to treatment eligibility or planning. The secondary outcomes are listed in eTable 4 in Supplement 3. Outcomes were reported according to the START²¹ and STARD²³ guidelines (eTables 5 and 6 in Supplement 3).

Follow-up

Participants were followed until their treatment decision. Participants who underwent further diagnostic tests or treatment were followed until after these procedures. Patients with negative test results returned to standard of care PSA monitoring.

Multidisciplinary team meeting

Radiologists, oncologists and urologists involved in the delivery of radiotherapy, surgery, focal therapy or active surveillance for prostate cancer led a dedicated trial multi-disciplinary team meeting. Treatment eligibility options and detailed treatment planning by individual treatment modality were discussed for each participant based on their clinical information including patient-reported outcome measures, bpMRI images and prostate biopsy results, blinded to any DCE-information or DCE-specific biopsies¹⁹. The group was then unblinded to DCE images and DCE-specific biopsies and re-evaluated the participants' treatment options and planning.

Patient-reported outcome measures

Participants completed baseline International Index of Erectile Function-5 and International Prostate Symptom Score questionnaires^{24,25} to ascertain erectile function and lower urinary tract symptoms.

Central quality control

Following completion of the trial, radiologists and pathologists at the coordinating centre, unaware of the results of the original reports, reviewed all the MRIs and 15% of the original pathological specimens, chosen at random from participants at each site. MRIs were evaluated using the PI-QUAL scoring system²⁶ on a scale from 1 to 5, with higher numbers indicating a higher quality scan.

Statistical analysis

The statistical analysis plan (Supplement 2) was prespecified and approved by the clinical trial group lead, statistician and chief investigator, prior to data analysis.

Using a non-inferiority margin of 5 percentage points and a one-sided alpha level of 2.5%, 400 men would provide 90% power to show non-inferiority of bpMRI to mpMRI, assuming an mpMRI underlying probability of detecting clinically significant cancer of 38%. This sample size was increased to 500 to allow for a 20% rate of dropout or exclusion after enrolment. A non-inferiority margin of 5 percentage points was chosen following a consensus meeting of clinicians and patients. This was determined to be the clinically acceptable trade-off between a small potential drop in cancer detection against the substantial practical, safety, and economic benefits of

bpMRI over mpMRI. Detailed justification of the sample size is provided in the protocol (Supplement 1).

For the primary outcome, the proportion of men with csPCa detected by bpMRI-targeted biopsy was defined as the number of men with csPCa identified on bpMRI-targeted biopsy divided by the number of men undergoing bpMRI. Similarly, the proportion of men with csPCa detected by mpMRI-targeted biopsy was defined as the number of men with csPCa identified on mpMRI-targeted biopsy divided by the number of men undergoing mpMRI. For the primary outcome, the Likert score was used to derive a suspicious MRI requiring MRI-targeted biopsy, planned sensitivity analyses were performed using the PI-RADS v2.1 scale. Detailed derivation of the status of each patient is given in the statistical analysis plan (Supplement 2). A p-value was obtained using a McNemar test.

A sensitivity analysis of the primary outcome was performed using a more stringent definition of csPCa of any core containing GGG 3 or greater.

For secondary outcomes, the results are reported as point estimates with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The widths of the CIs were not adjusted for multiplicity, so the intervals should not be used for inference. Further analysis details are provided in eSection 3, Supplement 3.

Results

Trial population

From April 2022 through September 2023, 555 men were enrolled into the study from 22 centres in 12 countries. Of these, 490 men were eligible for the primary outcome analysis (Figure 1). Baseline characteristics of the population are given in Table 1.

MRI scans were carried out on 39 scanners, 435/490 (88.8%) on 3.0T scanners, reported by 30 radiologists (eTable 7 in Supplement 3). MRI identified 308/490 (62.9%) men with at least one suspicious area for biopsy. In those men, the median number of suspicious areas identified was 2 [IQR:1-2]. Of men undergoing targeted biopsy, 193/319 (60.5%) were via the transperineal route and 260/319 (81.5%) were carried out using software-assisted or fusion registration (eTables 8 and 9 in Supplement 3).

Outcomes

The proportion of scans scoring 3 or greater on the Likert scale leading to a biopsy indication was 273/490 (55.7%) for bpMRI and 280/490 (57.1%) for mpMRI (difference, 1.4 percentage points) (Table 2; eTable 10A in Supplement 3). DCE identified newly suspicious areas in 31 of 490 patients (6.3%). Of these 31 patients, 21 (67.7%) had a suspicious area not visible on bpMRI, and 10 (32.3%) had a

suspicious area that was significantly larger on mpMRI. Twenty-nine of 31 patients (93.5%) derived no additional csPCa detection from the DCE-specific biopsy.

BpMRI was non-inferior to mpMRI for detection of csPCa, detecting 143 of 490 men (29.2%), compared to 145 of 490 men (29.6%) for mpMRI (difference, -0.4 percentage points; 95% CI, -1.2 to 0.4; $p=0.5$). This result was consistent in the sensitivity analysis using GGG 3 or higher to define csPCa (difference, -0.4 percentage points; 95% CI -1.2 to 0.4) (eTable 11 in Supplement 3).

For clinically insignificant cancer detection, bpMRI detected 45 of 490 men (9.2%), compared to 47 of 490 men (9.6%) on mpMRI (difference, -0.4 percentage points; 95% CI -1.2 to 0.4). Biopsy outcomes and test performance characteristics are given in Tables 2 and 3.

Sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values were similar for bpMRI (98.0%, 61.6%, 53.1%, 98.6%, respectively) and mpMRI (99.3%, 60.1%, 52.5%, 99.5%, respectively) (Table 3; eTable 12 in Supplement 3). There were no major differences in sensitivity (difference -1.4 percentage points, 95% CI, -3.9 to 1.2) or specificity (difference 1.5 percentage points, 95% CI, -1.2 to 4.2). Results were consistent when using the PI-RADsv2.1 scoring system instead of the Likert scoring system (eTable 10B, eTable 12 in Supplement 3).

Radiological T-staging decisions, likelihood of extracapsular extension, and involvement of the bladder neck, seminal vesicle, urethral sphincter and rectal wall were very similar between bpMRI and mpMRI (eTable 13-14 in Supplement 3).

After review at the post-trial multi-disciplinary team meeting with rotating clinician panels, DCE sequences or DCE-specific biopsies made a difference to treatment eligibility decisions in 21/488 (4.3%; 95% CI 2.7 to 6.5) of cases and treatment planning decisions, for example, in how surgery, radiotherapy or focal therapy were planned to be delivered, in 15/488 (3.1%; 95% CI 1.7 to 5.0) of cases (eTable 15 in Supplement 3).

Central review of image quality (eTable 16 in Supplement 3) revealed 482/488 (98.8%) of scans were of adequate diagnostic quality, scoring 3 or higher on the PI-QUALv1 scale. In those 143/488 (29.3%) without optimal diagnostic quality scans, scoring 4 or lower, 117/143 (81.8%) had an issue with the quality of the T2W or DWI sequences and 49/143 (34.3%) had an issue with the quality of the DCE sequence (eTable 17A, 17B in Supplement 3). Central quality review of biopsy specimens is outlined in eTable 18 in Supplement 3.

For both bpMRI and mpMRI with or without targeted biopsy, csPCa would have been missed by a targeted-only biopsy approach, and detected by systematic biopsy in 3/476 (0.6%, 95% CI 0.1 to 1.8) of patients (eTable 19A, 19B in Supplement 3), leading to a total csPCa prevalence in the cohort of 148/490 (30.2%; 95% CI 26.2 to 34.5).

Adverse events are described in eTable 20 in Supplement 3.

Discussion

The PRIME study demonstrates that a shorter and less resource-intensive bpMRI, detects as much clinically significant cancer as the full mpMRI, without increasing the diagnosis of clinically insignificant cancer. Despite earlier concerns that lack of contrast information would lead to more biopsy recommendations, we found no evidence of this, with biopsy rates being very similar between bpMRI and mpMRI. Although DCE sequences identified a small proportion of new suspicious areas on the mpMRI not seen on the bpMRI, the majority of these did not reveal significant cancer; overall, test performance characteristics were also very similar between both bpMRI and mpMRI.

With approximately four million prostate MRIs performed annually, these findings have critical global health implications⁴, and saving a significant proportion of scanner time and staff time should increase access to imaging and represent a major opportunity cost saving. The significant benefits of a bpMRI approach include a shorter scan for the patient, improved scanner throughput for the healthcare system, avoiding the need for use of gadolinium contrast, elimination of cannulation and contrast-agent safety risks, avoiding the need for a physician to be present during scanning and reduced environmental toxicity^{6,11,27}. DCE sequences have been thought to be particularly important in the local staging of prostate cancer and involvement of key anatomical structures around the prostate^{17,18}. However, we found that bpMRI did not really differ from mpMRI in this evaluation. Further, the use of DCE sequences only changed treatment eligibility decisions or treatment planning decisions in a minority of cases.

Additional findings include that systematic biopsy on MRI-negative sides of the prostate identified only a very small proportion of men with significant cancer and could likely be omitted.

A previous randomised trial showed an approximate 9% increase in significant cancer detection in favour of mpMRI, which we did not observe here¹⁶. However, our findings are consistent with most published studies comparing bpMRI and mpMRI^{7,12,15}, although these studies had major limitations.

Strengths of PRIME include its design as an appropriately powered prospective multicentre study in many different health care settings and optimised DCE prior to commencing the study to give the best chance of demonstrating any possible added value of contrast¹³. We ensured strict blinding of radiologists who had to submit their bpMRI findings and biopsy plans from this before being shown the contrast sequences and performed biopsies based not just on what the mpMRI suggested but also what the bpMRI suggested. For the first time, we evaluated the added value of DCE in treatment decision eligibility and planning in a blinded multi-disciplinary team meeting. We also carried out our primary analysis using the Likert scoring system, which permits radiologists to weight DCE findings higher than with the PI-RADSv2.1 scoring scale thus realistically permitting a difference between a man being offered a biopsy or not. We permitted centres to use their local expertise with respect to radiologists, biopsy operators, biopsy access route and registration technique, which increases the generalisability of the results.

We considered a randomised design, but chose a within-patient trial design as it had a number of advantages¹⁹: first, our patient group and funding peer-reviewed panel preferred this trial design as if one of the techniques was inferior, patients in a randomised design would be denied the benefit of targeted biopsies from the other arm. Second, the within-patient design is a more efficient trial design requiring a sevenfold lower sample size with equivalent quality of evidence in a diagnostic study. Third, patients act as their own controls, therefore allowing us to draw conclusions regarding the value of DCE sequences on a per patient level. Fourth, it allows for the evaluation of the impact of contrast on staging decisions and treatment eligibility decisions at an individual patient level.

There are limitations. First, MRI quality was good in PRIME, as participating sites' protocols had been optimised prior to taking part¹³. Thus, we would advise centres to ensure that their scans are of good quality prior to considering adopting a bpMRI approach. Our pre-trial quality control which included both academic and non-academic centres globally suggests that providing an MRI scanner is less than 10 years old, it is very feasible to deliver optimal scan quality, compliant with international standards, with simple optimisation¹³, regardless of whether the centre is academic or not, or whether they possess 1.5T or 3.0T scanners. We have demonstrated that this can be achieved without any cost requirements to upgrade equipment and with basic modifications to scanning protocols in line with international guidelines on minimal standards for MRI conduct¹³, thus we believe this is achievable in most centres. Further, our approach to optimise scan quality pre-trial may have given results in favour of mpMRI detecting more cancer over bpMRI, as we found that in unoptimised scans amongst our trial network that DCE was the least

well-done sequence^{13,22,26} whereas in PRIME our post-trial central evaluation demonstrated that DCE was of high quality. Of note, a suboptimal bpMRI scan was not likely to be compensated for by the DCE sequence as in most of these cases, the DCE was also suboptimal (eTable 17 in Supplement 3).

Second, it is important to consider the possibility of anchoring bias underestimating significant cancer detection by mpMRI, as radiologists could have been less likely to deviate from their report on the bpMRI when declaring their mpMRI findings as they had already seen the bpMRI. Conversely, as clinicians were aware of the hypothesis of the study, the standard of care was mpMRI prior to the trial and as the core group designing the study used DCE in their daily practice, the results were more likely to have been biased in favour of mpMRI detecting cancer. This is because radiologists knew that the purpose of the study was to see if areas of suspicion seen when DCE was revealed harboured significant cancer, thus they would have paid more attention to the DCE sequences than they might have in routine clinical practice and thus, may have been more likely to declare a DCE-specific lesion.

Third, our results reflect practice in centres with highly experienced radiologists and biopsy operators. It is therefore important to address the need for structured training and quality control in other centres. Widespread, successful implementation of bpMRI and targeted biopsy would be supported by educational programmes and a standardised approach to reporting, potentially including formal accreditation, to ensure diagnostic accuracy is maintained across diverse practice settings²⁸⁻³¹. Such initiatives are important in aiding clinicians to interpret scans without the perceived safety net of contrast-enhanced sequences³².

504

505 Fourth, whilst a shorter scan that avoids the use of contrast, requires fewer staff to
506 deliver and has similar clinical outcomes, is likely to be cost-effective, a formal health
507 economic analysis is planned and will be reported separately.

508

509 Finally, while the immediate focus must be on education and quality
510 improvement^{13,28-31}, the development of artificial intelligence tools to support image
511 interpretation could play a significant role in augmenting the future diagnostic
512 pathway and should be a focus of future work³³⁻³⁵.

513

514 **Conclusion**

515

516 In summary, in this international multicentre non-inferiority trial, we have
517 demonstrated that amongst experienced radiologists and providing image quality is
518 adequate, bpMRI performs very similarly to mpMRI for cancer detection, staging and
519 treatment planning. We provide level-1 evidence that bpMRI could be an alternative
520 first-line diagnostic test to mpMRI for cancer diagnosis in men with suspected
521 prostate cancer.

522

523 **Acknowledgements**

524 Data were gathered by the trial team members listed in eSection 1. RA analysed the
525 data, and the analysis was independently verified by YT and PM. The authors
526 assume responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the data and analyses
527 and adherence to the protocol.

528
529 The first draft of the manuscript was written by VK. The decision to publish the
530 manuscript was taken by all authors. No commercial entity was involved in the study.
531 The study funders listed in eSection 2 had no role in protocol development or data
532 analysis.

533
534 **Author contributions:** Dr. Kasivisvanathan and Dr. Agarwal had full access to all
535 the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the
536 accuracy of the data analysis. Dr. Ng and Dr. Asif contributed equally.

537 **Concept and design:** Allen, Asif, Brew-Graves, Budäus, Chan, Clarke, Dickinson,
538 Emberton, Ghai, Giganti, Kasivisvanathan, Kastner, Khetrapal, Moore, Nathan, Ng,
539 Punwani, Takwoingi, Taneja, Tewari

540 **Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data:** Agarwal, Allen, Asif, Barrett,
541 Boesen, Borghi, Brew-Graves, Brembilla, Budäus, Chan, De Cobelli, Dickinson,
542 Emberton, Falkenbach, Giannarini, Giganti, Girometti, Gomez-Gomez, Haider, Hu,
543 Kasivisvanathan, Kesch, Khetrapal, Leow, Lopez Ruiz, Margolis, Mitra, Moore,
544 Mynderse, Ng, Panebianco, Pecoraro, Pham, Punwani, Radtke, Renard-Penna,
545 Rodriguez Cabello, Rossiter, Schimmöller, Singh, Takwoingi, Taneja

546 **Drafting of the manuscript:** Asif, Chan, Emberton, Giganti, Kasivisvanathan,
547 Nathan, Ng

548 **Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content:** Agarwal,
549 Allen, Asif, Barrett, Boesen, Borghi, Brew-Graves, Brembilla, Budäus, Chan, Clarke,
550 De Cobelli, Dias, Dickinson, Emberton, Falkenbach, Ghai, Giannarini, Giganti,
551 Girometti, Gomez-Gomez, Haider, Hu, Kasivisvanathan, Kastner, Kesch, Khetrapal,
552 Leow, Lopez Ruiz, Margolis, Mitra, Moore, Mynderse, Nathan, Ng, Panebianco,
553 Pecoraro, Perlis, Pham, Punwani, Radtke, Renard-Penna, Rodriguez Cabello,
554 Rossiter, Schimmöller, Singh, Takwoingi, Taneja, Tewari

555 **Statistical analysis:** Agarwal, Kasivisvanathan, Takwoingi

556 **Obtained funding:** Brew-Graves, Budäus, Emberton, Kasivisvanathan

557 **Administrative, technical, or material support:** Allen, Asif, Barrett, Boesen, Brew-
558 Graves, Chan, De Cobelli, Dias, Dickinson, Emberton, Falkenbach, Ghai, Girometti,
559 Haider, Hu, Kesch, Khetrapal, Margolis, Mynderse, Nathan, Ng, Perlis, Punwani,
560 Radtke, Rodriguez Cabello, Rossiter, Schimmöller, Taneja, Tewari

561 **Supervision:** Allen, Brew-Graves, Budäus, Clarke, Emberton, Giannarini, Giganti,
562 Kasivisvanathan, Kastner, Moore, Ng, Panebianco, Punwani, Schimmöller, Singh,
563 Takwoingi

564

565 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:**

566 Dr. Brew-Graves reports grants from Prostate Cancer UK, which funded the trial and
567 paid a proportion of Dr. Brew-Graves' salary, during the conduct of the study.

568 Dr. Budäus reports serving as a board member for EAU Section of Urological
569 Imaging and Wolfgang Dieckmann Stiftung.

570 Dr. Chan reports grants from Cancer Research UK, non-financial support from BVM
571 Medical Ltd., and grants from Leeds Hospital Charity outside the submitted work.

572 Dr. De Cobelli reports personal fees from Bayer outside the submitted work.

573 Dr. Dias reports speaker fees from Bayer outside the submitted work.

574 Dr. Falkenbach reported travel support from Focal Healthcare (Toronto, Canada) to
575 attend the European Association of Urology annual congresses in 2024 and 2025.

576 Dr. Ghai reports grants from University College London during the conduct of the
577 study.

578 Dr. Kasivisvanathan reports grants from John Black Charitable Foundation &
579 Prostate Cancer UK, grants from European Association of Urology Research
580 Foundation, and grants from Wolfgang Dieckmann Foundation during the conduct of
581 the study; Dr. Kasivisvanathan serves as a Medical Advisor to Telix Pharmaceuticals
582 but has not yet received any payments from them.

583 Dr. Kesch reports grants from Novartis, grants from Amgen, grants from Mariana
584 Oncology, personal fees from Novartis, personal fees from Pfizer, and personal fees
585 from Bayer outside the submitted work.

586 Dr. Margolis reports non-financial support from Stratagen Bio outside the submitted
587 work.

588 Dr. Moore reports grants from NIHR Research Professorship, grants from Prostate
589 Cancer UK, grants from Medical Research Council, grants from SpectraCure, and
590 personal fees from SonaCare outside the submitted work.

591 Dr. Ng reports grants from Prostate Cancer UK outside the submitted work.

592 Dr. Punwani reported research funding from Prostate Cancer UK, Cancer Research
593 UK, and the NIHR; consulting fees from NVISION Ltd, Gold Standard Phantoms, and
594 Quibim; and service on the Cancer Research UK Early Detection and Diagnosis
595 Committee.

596 Dr. Radtke reports grants from Innovationsfonds of G-BA Germany, grants from
597 Novartis Pharmaceuticals, personal fees from Janssen Pharmaceuticals, grants from

598 Forschungskommission Heinrich-Heine-University Duesseldorf, consulting fees from
599 Dr. Wolf, Beckelmann und Partner, consulting fees from Saegeling Medizintechnik,
600 consulting fees from Novartis Pharmaceuticals, personal fees from AMGEN,
601 personal fees from Apogepha, personal fees from Astellas, personal fees from Astra
602 Zeneca, personal fees from Bayer, personal fees from Bender Group, personal fees
603 from Johnson & Johnson, personal fees from MedCom, and personal fees from
604 Philips Invivo outside the submitted work.

605 Dr. Takwoingi reports grants from Prostate Cancer UK with funding to University of
606 Birmingham via UCL during the conduct of the study.

607 All other authors report no conflicts of interest.

608

609 **Funding/Support:** This study was sponsored by University College London. Primary
610 funding was provided by Prostate Cancer UK (grant TLD-PF19-004) and the John
611 Black Charitable Trust Travelling Prize Grant. Additional support for international
612 sites was supplied by the European Association of Urology Research Foundation
613 and the Wolfgang.Dieckmann Foundation.

614

615 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funders took no part in the study's design or
616 conduct; in the collection, management, analysis, or interpretation of the data; or in
617 the preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript. They exerted no influence
618 over the decision to submit the work for publication, the choice of journal, or the
619 timing of submission, and they held no right to delay or veto publication.

620

621 **Group Information:** The members of the PRIME Study Team are listed in eSection
622 1 and Supplement 4.

623

624 **Additional Contributions:** We thank the participants who volunteered to take part in
625 this trial and the trial teams that cared for them, the investigators for their
626 contribution, the UCL NCITA Trials Unit for coordination of the trial, and the trial
627 steering committee for oversight of the trial.

628

References

1. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. NICE Guidance - Prostate cancer: diagnosis and management. *BJU International*. 2019;124(1):9-26. doi:10.1111/bju.14809
2. 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. *European Urology*. 2021;79(2):243-262. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2020.09.042
3. Eastham JA, Auffenberg GB, Barocas DA, et al. Clinically Localized Prostate Cancer: AUA/ASTRO Guideline, Part I: Introduction, Risk Assessment, Staging, and Risk-Based Management. *The Journal of Urology*. 2022;208:10-18. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000002757
4. James ND, Tannock I, N'Dow J, et al. The Lancet Commission on prostate cancer: planning for the surge in cases. *The Lancet*. 2024;403(10437):1683-1722. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00651-2
5. Soerensen SJC, Li S, Langston ME, Fan RE, Rusu M, Sonn GA. Trends in pre-biopsy MRI usage for prostate cancer detection, 2007-2022. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis*. Published online September 21, 2024:1-4. doi:10.1038/s41391-024-00896-y
6. Boesen L, Nørgaard N, Løgager V, et al. Assessment of the Diagnostic Accuracy of Biparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Prostate Cancer in Biopsy-Naive Men: The Biparametric MRI for Detection of Prostate Cancer (BIDOC)

- 651 Study. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2018;1(2):e180219.
652 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.0219
- 653 7. Kang Z, Min X, Weinreb J, Li Q, Feng Z, Wang L. Abbreviated Biparametric
654 Versus Standard Multiparametric MRI for Diagnosis of Prostate Cancer: A
655 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Roentgenology*.
656 2019;212(2):357-365. doi:10.2214/AJR.18.20103
- 657 8. Mowatt G, Scotland G, Boachie C, et al. The diagnostic accuracy and cost-
658 effectiveness of magnetic resonance spectroscopy and enhanced magnetic
659 resonance imaging techniques in aiding the localisation of prostate abnormalities
660 for biopsy:A systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technology*
661 *Assessment*. 2013;17(20):vii-xix, 1. doi:10.3310/hta17200
- 662 9. van der Leest M, Israël B, Cornel EB, et al. High Diagnostic Performance of
663 Short Magnetic Resonance Imaging Protocols for Prostate Cancer Detection in
664 Biopsy-naïve Men: The Next Step in Magnetic Resonance Imaging Accessibility.
665 *European Urology*. 2019;76(5):574-581. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2019.05.029
- 666 10. Fraum TJ, Ludwig DR, Bashir MR, Fowler KJ. Gadolinium-based contrast agents:
667 A comprehensive risk assessment. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging*.
668 2017;46(2):338-353. doi:10.1002/jmri.25625
- 669 11. European Society of Urogenital Radiology. *ESUR Guidelines on Contrast Agents*
670 *10.0.*; 2018. Accessed January 24, 2025. [https://www.esur.org/wp-](https://www.esur.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/ESUR-Guidelines-10_0-Final-Version.pdf)
671 [content/uploads/2022/03/ESUR-Guidelines-10_0-Final-Version.pdf](https://www.esur.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/ESUR-Guidelines-10_0-Final-Version.pdf)
- 672 12. Alabousi M, Salameh JP, Gusenbauer K, et al. Biparametric vs multiparametric
673 prostate magnetic resonance imaging for the detection of prostate cancer in

674 treatment-naïve patients: a diagnostic test accuracy systematic review and meta-
675 analysis. *BJU International*. 2019;124(2):209-220. doi:10.1111/bju.14759

676 13. Giganti F, Ng A, Asif A, et al. Global variation in magnetic resonance imaging
677 quality of the prostate. *Radiology*. 2023;309(1):e231130.
678 doi:10.1148/radiol.231130

679 14. Turkbey B, Rosenkrantz AB, Haider MA, et al. Prostate Imaging Reporting and
680 Data System Version 2.1: 2019 Update of Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data
681 System Version 2. *European Urology*. 2019;76(3):340-351.
682 doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2019.02.033

683 15. Ng A, Khetrapal P, Kasivisvanathan V. Is It PRIME Time for Biparametric
684 Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Prostate Cancer Diagnosis? *European Urology*.
685 2022;82(1):1-2. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2022.02.021

686 16. Russo F, Mazzetti S, Regge D, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Single-plane
687 Biparametric and Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Prostate
688 Cancer: A Randomized Noninferiority Trial in Biopsy-naïve Men. *European*
689 *Urology Oncology*. 2021;4(6):855-862. doi:10.1016/j.euo.2021.03.007

690 17. Barentsz JO, Richenberg J, Clements R, et al. ESUR prostate MR guidelines
691 2012. *Eur Radiol*. 2012;22(4):746-757. doi:10.1007/s00330-011-2377-y

692 18. Mazaheri Y, Akin O, Hricak H. Dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance
693 imaging of prostate cancer: A review of current methods and applications. *World*
694 *Journal of Radiology*. 2017;9(12):416-425. doi:10.4329/wjr.v9.i12.416

- 695 19. Asif A, Nathan A, Ng A, et al. Comparing biparametric to multiparametric MRI in
696 the diagnosis of clinically significant prostate cancer in biopsy-naive men
697 (PRIME): a prospective, international, multicentre, non-inferiority within-patient,
698 diagnostic yield trial protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(4):e070280.
699 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-070280
- 700 20. Dickinson L, Ahmed HU, Allen C, et al. Magnetic Resonance Imaging for the
701 Detection, Localisation, and Characterisation of Prostate Cancer:
702 Recommendations from a European Consensus Meeting. *European Urology*.
703 2011;59(4):477-494. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2010.12.009
- 704 21. Moore CM, Kasivisvanathan V, Eggener S, et al. Standards of Reporting for MRI-
705 targeted Biopsy Studies (START) of the Prostate: Recommendations from an
706 International Working Group. *European Urology*. 2013;64(4):544-552.
707 doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2013.03.030
- 708 22. Kasivisvanathan V, Rannikko AS, Borghi M, et al. MRI-Targeted or Standard
709 Biopsy for Prostate-Cancer Diagnosis. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
710 2018;378(19):1767-1777. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1801993
- 711 23. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, et al. STARD 2015: an updated list of
712 essential items for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies. *BMJ*. 2015;351:h5527.
713 doi:10.1136/bmj.h5527
- 714 24. Rosen RC, Cappelleri JC, Smith MD, Lipsky J, Peña BM. Development and
715 evaluation of an abridged, 5-item version of the International Index of Erectile
716 Function (IIEF-5) as a diagnostic tool for erectile dysfunction. *Int J Impot Res*.
717 1999;11(6):319-326. doi:10.1038/sj.ijir.3900472

- 718 25. eProvide. International Prostate Symptom Score (I-PSS). ePROVIDE - Mapi
719 Research Trust. August 22, 2024. Accessed April 17, 2021.
720 <https://eprovide.mapi-trust.org/instruments/international-prostate-symptom->
721 [score](https://eprovide.mapi-trust.org/instruments/international-prostate-symptom-score)
- 722 26. Giganti F, Allen C, Emberton M, Moore CM, Kasivisvanathan V. Prostate Imaging
723 Quality (PI-QUAL): A New Quality Control Scoring System for Multiparametric
724 Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the Prostate from the PRECISION trial.
725 *European Urology Oncology*. 2020;3(5):615-619. doi:10.1016/j.euo.2020.06.007
- 726 27. Porter KK, King A, Galgano SJ, Sherrer RL, Gordetsky JB, Rais-Bahrami S.
727 Financial implications of biparametric prostate MRI. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic*
728 *Dis*. 2020;23(1):88-93. doi:10.1038/s41391-019-0158-x
- 729 28. Kasivisvanathan V, Ambrosi A, Giganti F, et al. A Dedicated Prostate MRI
730 Teaching Course Improves the Ability of the Urologist to Interpret Clinically
731 Significant Prostate Cancer on Multiparametric MRI. *European Urology*.
732 2019;75(1):203-204. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2018.09.033
- 733 29. de Rooij M, Israël B, Tummers M, et al. ESUR/ESUI consensus statements on
734 multi-parametric MRI for the detection of clinically significant prostate cancer:
735 quality requirements for image acquisition, interpretation and radiologists'
736 training. *Eur Radiol*. 2020;30(10):5404-5416. doi:10.1007/s00330-020-06929-z
- 737 30. Purysko AS, Zacharias-Andrews K, Tomkins KG, et al. Improving Prostate MR
738 Image Quality in Practice—Initial Results From the ACR Prostate MR Image
739 Quality Improvement Collaborative. *Journal of the American College of*
740 *Radiology*. 2024;21(9):1464-1474. doi:10.1016/j.jacr.2024.04.008

31. de Rooij M, Allen C, Twilt JJ, et al. PI-QUAL version 2: an update of a standardised scoring system for the assessment of image quality of prostate MRI. *Eur Radiol*. 2024;34(11):7068-7079. doi:10.1007/s00330-024-10795-4
32. Caglic I, Sushentsev N, Shah N, Warren AY, Lamb BW, Barrett T. Comparison of biparametric versus multiparametric prostate MRI for the detection of extracapsular extension and seminal vesicle invasion in biopsy naïve patients. *European Journal of Radiology*. 2021;141:109804. doi:10.1016/j.ejrad.2021.109804
33. Saha A, Bosma JS, Twilt JJ, et al. Artificial intelligence and radiologists in prostate cancer detection on MRI (PI-CAI): an international, paired, non-inferiority, confirmatory study. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2024;25(7):879-887. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(24)00220-1
34. The Royal College of Radiologists. Workforce Census 2022. Workforce Census 2022. Accessed February 29, 2024. <https://www.rcr.ac.uk/news-policy/policy-reports-initiatives/clinical-radiology-census-reports/>
35. Ng AB, Giganti F, Kasivisvanathan V. Artificial Intelligence in Prostate Cancer Diagnosis on Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Time for a New PARADIGM. *European Urology*. 2025;88(1):4-7. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2025.04.018

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Flow of participants in the PRIME trial.

Radiologists first reported the biparametric MRI (T2-WI + DWI) blinded to DCE, with independent verification of blinding. They recorded bpMRI-based decisions and biopsy targets before DCE was revealed. After immediate unblinding to DCE, radiologists re-evaluated all sequences and generated an mpMRI report. Any new suspicious regions or significantly larger lesions on mpMRI compared to bpMRI were marked as separate, DCE-specific biopsy targets.

^a Each MRI lesion is scored 1-5 representing the likelihood of clinically significant prostate cancer using both Likert and PI-RADSv2.1 scoring systems, with the highest score on either system determining the subsequent pathway. A score of 1 indicates clinically significant cancer is highly unlikely, 3 is equivocal and 5 indicates it is highly likely. In this trial, scores of 1-2 were considered 'non-suspicious,' and providing PSA Density ≤ 0.15 , they were recommended to avoid biopsy. Scores of 3-5 were considered "suspicious" and recommended to undergo targeted \pm systematic biopsy.

^b Nine participants identified with no lesions on biparametric MRI and multiparametric MRI, but a PSA density ≥ 0.15 did not have systematic biopsy.

^c Clinically significant prostate cancer (csPCa) was defined as the presence of any cancer with a Gleason Grade Group (GGG) of 2 or greater. The proportion of men diagnosed with csPCa was the primary outcome. The GGG system is the standard for grading prostate cancer aggressiveness, ranging from GGG 1 (least aggressive) to GGG 5 (most aggressive). Higher scores indicate a more aggressive tumour and a poorer prognosis.

Abbreviations: bpMRI, biparametric MRI; DCE, dynamic contrast-enhanced sequence; DWI, diffusion-weighted sequence; DRE, digital rectal examination; mpMRI, multiparametric MRI; PI-RADS, Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System; PSA, prostate-specific antigen; PSAD, prostate-specific antigen density; T2-WI, T2-weighted sequence.

798 **Figure 2. Difference in proportion of men with clinically significant prostate**
799 **cancer between bpMRI and mpMRI, with non-inferiority margin and 95% CI.**

800 The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval does not cross the non-inferiority
801 margin, indicating that bpMRI-targeted biopsy is non-inferior to mpMRI-targeted
802 biopsy.

803 **Tables**

804 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants**

Characteristic	All participants (n = 490)
Age (years), median [IQR]	65 [59-70]
Ethnicity (self-reported), n (%)	
Asian	17 (3.5)
Black, African or Caribbean	20 (4.1)
Mixed or Multiple	2 (0.4)
Other ^a	14 (2.9)
White	437 (89.2)
Obesity (BMI > 30 kg/m ²), n (%)	32 (6.5)
Medical history, n (%)	
Family history of prostate cancer	92 (18.8)
Any tumour within last 5 yrs	10 (2.0)
Myocardial infarction	12 (2.5)
Peripheral vascular disease	10 (2.0)
Cerebrovascular disease	10 (2.0)
Chronic pulmonary disease	15 (3.1)
Diabetes without organ damage	26 (5.3)
Diabetes with organ damage	2 (0.6)
On blood thinning medication	23 (4.7)
Abnormal DRE, n (%)	62 (12.7)
PSA (ng/mL), median [IQR]	5.6 [4.4-8.0]
WHO Performance Status ^b , n (%)	
0: Fully active	469 (95.7)
1: Restricted in strenuous activity	20 (4.1)
2: Self-caring but unable to work	1 (0.2)

805

^a The 'Other' category (n=14) includes men that self-reported their ethnicity as Arabic-Asian (n=1), Chinese (n=1), Hispanic (n=1), Inder (n=1), South Asian (n=1), Turkish (n=1), Not disclosed (n=8).

^b WHO Performance Status: a scale to assess a patient's functional ability, ranging from 0 (fully active) to 5 (dead). Higher scores indicate a greater degree of disability.

Abbreviations: DRE, Digital rectal examination; PSA, Prostate-specific antigen; WHO, World Health Organisation.

Table 2. Comparison of outcomes between biparametric and multiparametric MRI

Outcome	bpMRI (n=490) n (%; 95% CI)	mpMRI (n=490) n (%; 95% CI)	Difference ^a (% points; 95% CI)
Clinically significant cancer ^b (Primary outcome)	143 (29.2; 25.2 to 33.4)	145 (29.6; 25.6 to 33.9)	-0.4; (-1.2 to 0.4), p=0.5
Gleason Grade Group ^c 2	70 (14.3)	70 (14.3)	
Gleason Grade Group 3	39 (8.0)	40 (8.2)	
Gleason Grade Group 4	13 (2.7)	13 (2.7)	
Gleason Grade Group 5	21 (4.3)	22 (4.5)	
Clinically insignificant cancer (Gleason Grade Group 1) (Secondary outcome)	45 (9.2; 6.8 to 12.1)	47 (9.6; 7.1 to 12.6)	-0.4; (-1.2 to 0.4)
Proportion of patients with biopsy indication ^d	273 (55.7; 95% CI 51.2 to 60.2)	280 (57.1; 95% CI 52.6 to 61.6)	1.4, 95% CI - 0.5 to 3.4
Proportion of patients with no biopsy indication ^d	217 (44.3)	210 (42.9)	1.4; (-3.4 to 0.5)
No cancer on biopsy (benign)	85 (17.3)	88 (18.0)	-0.7; (-2.2 to 1.4)

^a Difference between rates are shown in percentage points.

^b As per primary outcome definition of clinically significant cancer, which was defined as the presence of a single biopsy core indicating disease of Gleason Grade Group 2 or greater. It was assessed for non-inferiority of bpMRI compared to mpMRI with a pre-specified margin of 5 percentage points. Clinically insignificant cancer was therefore defined as the presence of disease only of Gleason Grade Group 1.

^c The Gleason Grade Group (GGG) system classifies prostate cancer based on glandular architecture seen on histology from biopsy. It is derived from the sum of the two most common Gleason patterns (each scored 1-5), then mapped to a Grade Group from 1 to 5, where higher groups indicate more aggressive disease. Specifically: GGG 1 = Gleason ≤6 (3+3; clinically insignificant cancer), GGG 2 = Gleason 7 (3+4), GGG 3 = Gleason 7 (4+3), GGG 4 = Gleason 8 (4+4, 3+5 or 5+3), GGG 5 = Gleason 9-10 (4+5, 5+4, or 5+5).

^d As indicated by a Likert score of 3 or greater.

Table 3. Test performance characteristics

Table 3A. Test performance characteristics of biparametric MRI

		Clinically significant prostate cancer, n (%)		
		Present	Absent	Total
bpMRI, n (%)	Positive	145	128	273
	Negative	3	205	208
	Total	148	333	481

Sensitivity: 145/148=98.0% (95% CI: 94.2, 99.6)

Specificity: 205/333=61.6% (95% CI: 56.1, 66.8)

Positive Predictive Value: 145/273=53.1% (95% CI: 47.0, 59.2)

Negative Predictive Value: 205/208=98.6% (95% CI: 95.8, 99.7)

Table 3B. Test performance characteristics of multiparametric MRI

		Clinically significant prostate cancer, n (%)		
		Present	Absent	Total
mpMRI, n (%)	Present	147	133	280
	Absent	1	200	201
	Total	148	333	481

Sensitivity: 147/148=99.3% (95% CI: 96.3, 100.0)

Specificity: 200/333=60.1% (95% CI: 54.6, 65.4)

Positive Predictive Value: 147/280=52.5% (95% CI: 46.5, 58.5)

Negative Predictive Value: 200/201=99.5% (95% CI: 97.3, 100.0)

Difference (95% CI) in sensitivity: 1.4 (95% CI: -1.2, 3.9)

Difference (95% CI) in specificity: 1.5 (95% CI: -1.2, 4.2)

Contingency tables (2x2) and corresponding test performance characteristics for the biparametric (bpMRI) and multiparametric (mpMRI) pathways. The tables cross-tabulate the MRI result (positive defined as a Likert score ≥ 3 , or negative) against the final histological diagnosis of clinically significant prostate cancer being present or absent. Analyses for diagnostic performance were performed on n=481 out of 490 participant cohort, excluding 9 participants who did not undergo systematic biopsy as per protocol.