POLITECNICO DI TORINO Repository ISTITUZIONALE

Artificial intelligence for target prostate biopsy outcomes prediction the potential application of fuzzy logic

Original

Artificial intelligence for target prostate biopsy outcomes prediction the potential application of fuzzy logic / Checcucci, Enrico; Rosati, Samanta; De Cillis, Sabrina; Vagni, Marica; Giordano, Noemi; Piana, Alberto; Granato, Stefano; Amparore, Daniele; De Luca, Stefano; Fiori, Cristian; Balestra, Gabriella; Porpiglia, Francesco. - In: PROSTATE CANCER AND PROSTATIC DISEASES. - ISSN 1365-7852. - ELETTRONICO. - (2021). [10.1038/s41391-021-00441-1]

Availability: This version is available at: 11583/2921458 since: 2021-09-27T16:40:05Z

Publisher: NATURE PUBLISHING GROUP

Published DOI:10.1038/s41391-021-00441-1

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

GENERICO -- per es. EPJ (European Physical Journal) : quando richiesto un rinvio generico specifico per

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in PROSTATE CANCER AND PROSTATIC DISEASES. The final authenticated version is available online at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41391-021-00441-1

(Article begins on next page)

1	Artificial intelligence for target prostate biopsy outcomes prediction:
2	the potential application of fuzzy logic
3	
4	Running title: artificial intelligence predicts target biopsy outcomes
5	
6	^{1-3*} Enrico Checcucci, ^{4*} Samanta Rosati, ³ Sabrina De Cillis, ⁴ Marica Vagni,
7	⁴ Noemi Giordano, ³ Alberto Piana, ³ Stefano Granato, ³ Daniele Amparore,
8	³ Stefano De Luca, ³ Cristian Fiori, ^{4§} Gabriella Balestra, ^{3§} Francesco Porpiglia
9	on behalf of the Uro-technology and SoMe Working Group of the Young Academic Urologists
10	Working Party of the European Association of Urology
11	
12	¹ Department of Surgery, Candiolo Cancer Institute, FPO-IRCCS, Candiolo, Turin, Italy
13 14	² Uro-technology and SoMe Working Group of the Young Academic Urologists (YAU) Working Party of the European Association of Urology (EAU), Arnhem, The Netherlands
15 16	³ Department of Oncology, Division of Urology, University of Turin, San Luigi Gonzaga Hospital, Orbassano (Turin), Italy
17	⁴ Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Politecnico di Torino, Italy
18	
19	*These authors contributed equally to the first authorship
20	§These authors contributed equally to senior authorship
21	Corresponding author:
22	Enrico Checcucci, MD
23	Department of Surgery, Candiolo Cancer Institute, FPO-IRCCS
24	Strada Provinciale 142, km 3,95 10060 Candiolo, Turin – Italy
25	Email address: checcu.e@hotmail.it
26	Key words: Prostate cancer, artificial intelligence, prostate biopsy, fuzzy logic,
27	Word Count: 1052 (abs 250 words)

28 ABSTRACT:

- 29 **Background:** In current precision prostate cancer (PCa) surgery era the identification of the
- 30 best patients candidate for prostate biopsy still remains an open issue. The aim of this study
- 31 was to evaluate if the prostate target biopsy (TB) outcomes could be predicted by using
- 32 artificial intelligence approach based on a set of clinical prebiopsy.
- 33 Methods: Prebiopsy characteristics in terms of PSA, PSA density, digital rectal examination
- 34 (DRE), previous prostate biopsies, number of suspicious lesions at mp-MRI, lesion volume,
- 35 lesion location and Pi-Rads score were extracted from our prospectively maintained TB
- 36 database from March 2014 to December 2019. Our approach is based on Fuzzy logic and
- 37 associative rules mining, with the aim to predict TB outcomes.
- 38 **Results:** A total of 1448 patients were included. Using the Frequent-Pattern growth
- algorithm we extracted 875 rules and used to build the fuzzy classifier. 963 subjects were
- 40 classified whereas for the remaining 484 subjects were not classified since no rules matched
- 41 with their input variables. Analyzing the classified subjects we obtained a specificity of
- 42 59.2% and sensitivity of 90.8% with a negative and the positive predictive values of 81.3%
- 43 and 76.6%, respectively. In particular, focusing on ISUP \geq 3 PCa, our model is able to
- 44 correctly predict the biopsy outcomes in 98.1% of the cases.
- 45 **Conclusions:** in this study we demonstrated that the possibility to look at several prebiopsy
- 46 variables simultaneously with Artificial Intelligence algorithms can improve the prediction of
- 47 TB outcomes, outclassing the performance of PSA, its derivates and MRI alone.

48

49 MANUSCRIPT

In precision prostate cancer (PCa) surgery era [1], an early recognition of subjects with the 50 51 risk of developing PCa still remains an unmet need. In the last years, notwithstanding the advent of mp-MRI the excessive variability in the performance and interpretation of its 52 findings together with the intrinsic biological heterogeneity of PCa features cause 40% of 53 54 the patients who underwent mp-MRI guided target biopsy (TB) to have a negative pathological report. Hence the necessity to better identify the ideal candidate for TB with 55 56 risk of PCa. Nowadays, artificial intelligence (AI) helps physicians to build personalized 57 predictive models (PPMs), which are gaining a wide diffusion even in urology [2-4]. The 58 possibility of analyzing several variables at the same time and focusing on underlying patterns by including whole data packets simultaneously, makes this technology very 59 60 appealing [5,6]. As mentioned in a recently published systematic review that included 55 papers, 26 studies explored the role of AI in prostate cancer diagnosis; the majority of them 61 62 were focused on the distinction between benign and malignant samples at pathological analysis or on mp-MRI images [7], whilst the role of AI as predictive tool by using the clinical 63 variables was less explored. 64 65 Fuzzy logic (FL) is a powerful tool belonging to the AI allowing to manage uncertainty that 66 affects most real-world problems and characterizes human reasoning, representing uncertain information in a form that can be understood by a computer and, 67 thus, it is suitable for developing PPMs in many medical fields [8]. 68 In this study we evaluate the role of FL-based PPM in the identification right candidate for 69 70 TB, based on a set of clinical prebiopsy variables. For this study, we retrospectively reviewed our prospectively maintained TB database from 71 72 March 2014 to December 2019. Prebiopsy features in terms of PSA, PSA density, digital 73 rectal examination (DRE), previous prostate biopsies, number of suspicious lesions at mp-MRI, lesion volume, lesion location and Pi-Rads score were collected [9, 10]. A total of 1447 74 patients were finally included in this analysis: 824 patients with positive TB outcome, 623 75 with negative TB outcome. 76 The proposed PPM was based on a Fuzzy Inference System (FIS), requiring the definition of a 77 78 set of fuzzy input and output variables and a list of rules. Specifically, the 8 prebiopsy variables were used as input and described in fuzzy terms according to the 79

80 thresholds/categories showed in Figure 1A, using trapezoidal or triangular membership functions. The output variable of the FIS represented the patient classification, and it was 81 described using two triangular membership functions corresponding to the negative (no risk 82 83 of PCa) and positive class (risk of PCa), respectively. In order to connect input and output variables and to obtain the final patient classification, a set of IF-THEN rules is required by 84 85 the FIS. In this study, a total of 875 rules were automatically extracted from the entire dataset of patients, using the FP-Growth (frequent-pattern growth) algorithm, that is a basic 86 algorithm for association rules mining [11]. The patient classification was than obtained by 87 88 entering in the PPM the values of his prebiopsy variables: if one or more rules matched with 89 his input values, one of the two classes (positive or negative) was assigned by the FIS, 90 otherwise the patient was labeled as not classified.

91 Our Personalized Predictive Model (PPM) was tested on the entire dataset and the results 92 are summarized in Figure 1.B. 963 subjects were classified whereas for the remaining 484 93 subjects were not classified. Focusing on the classified subjects, 231 out of 390 patients (specificity; Sp = 59.2%) were correctly classified as negative and 520 out of 573 patients 94 (sensitivity; Se = 90.8%) were correctly recognized as positive. The negative and the positive 95 predictive values (NPV and PPV) of the PPM were 81.3% and 76.6%, respectively. The 96 97 distribution of the ISUP score among the positive patients is showed in Figure 1.C. The ROC 98 curve obtained for the 963 classified patients, corresponding to an AUC value of 0.77 (Figure 99 1D).

100 The results presented above show how taking together 8 pre-biopsy characteristics makes it 101 possible to correctly classify patients with suspicious PCa by using AI algorithms. 102 Our findings are particularly noteworthy if we focus on more aggressive PCa, defined as 103 ISUP \geq 3, for which our PPM is able to correctly predict the biopsy outcomes in 98.1% of the cases. These results outclass the performance of PSA and its derivates such as PSA density 104 105 or free PSA, which Sp ranging from 30-40% and Se between 70% and 80%. Similarly, 106 considering the indication to perform TB with respect to mp-MRI findings [12], the PPV of suspicious mpMRI for csPCa was 40% (95% confidence interval 36–43%), with large 107 heterogeneity between the studies analyzed in a recent metanalysis (I^2 94%, p < 0.01) [13]. 108 109 If these are the findings that analyzed one single variable (serum markers or images) alone, different risk calculators (RC) were already published with the aim to better identify the 110

- 111 patients with risk of Pca taking together multiple variables. However, none of them have
- 112 clearly shown superiority, therefore it remains a personal decision as to which one to use
- 113 [14]. A comparative analysis showed RCs containing MRI to be most predictive.
- 114 In fact, the discriminative ability of MRI RCs for the detection of csPCa was superior (AUC
- 115 0.81-0.87) to the traditional RCs (AUC 0.76-0.80) [15]
- 116 On the other side, few studies explored the role of AI in the creation of a predictive models
- 117 [7]. Roffman et al. published the largest series of data [16] including 2016 patients with the
- aim to create and validate a multi-parametric Artificial Neuronal Network model, able to
- simultaneously examine anamnestic details of each patients in order to predict PCa risk and
- stratification. They showed a Se of 23%, Sp of 89%, AUC of 0.72, and positive predictive
- 121 value of 27%.
- 122 We think that the possibility of correctly prioritizing the patients who require TB by using AI
- is particularly appealing for two reasons: firstly because, especially in re-biopsy setting (a
- 124 fortiori after previously negative TB), the correct indication to a further biopsy is an
- unsolved issue of the current literature; secondarily, because in actual COVID-19 pandemic
- 126 era, characterized by limited access to medical facilities and limited resources, the
- 127 individuation of patients with higher risk of PCa could lead to a better assignment of the
- 128 assets [17, 18].
- 129 Under a technical point of view, one of the main strengths of such approach for PPMs
- 130 construction lies in the understandability of FIS results that allow to know the subset of
- rules matching with the input parameters and, thus, to evaluate the confidence in the
- 132 obtained result.
- 133 The main limit of our study is the presence of patients that were not classified. This finding 134 encourages the reflection on the huge biological heterogeneity of PCa and further studies
- encourages the reflection on the huge biological heterogeneity of PCa and further studies
 are warranted trying to reclassify also this rate of missed patients using other supervised AI
- 136 techniques such as Random Forest.
- Notwithstanding the above-mentioned limitation, together with the unavailability of a
 validation cohort, the proposed PPMs based on AI FL algorithms showed how looking at
 multiple prebiopsy variables simultaneously is possible to improve the prediction of TB
 outcomes.
- 141

142 **REFERENCES**

- 143 1. Checcucci E, Amparore D, De Luca S, Autorino R, Fiori C, Porpiglia F. Precision
- prostate cancer surgery: An overview of new technologies and techniques. Minerva
 Urol e Nefrol. 2019;71(5):487–501.
- 146 2. Checcucci E, Autorino R, Cacciamani GE, Amparore D, De Cillis S, Piana A, et al.
- Artificial intelligence and neural networks in Urology: Current clinical applications.
 Minerva Urol e Nefrol. 2020;72(1):49–57.
- 149 3. Giannini V, Rosati S, Regge D, Balestra G. Specificity improvement of a CAD system
- 150 for multiparametric MR prostate cancer using texture features and artificial neural
- 151 networks. Health Technol (Berl). 2017;7(1):71–80.
- 4. Rosati S, Balestra G, Giannini V, Mazzetti S, Russo F, Regge D. ChiMerge
- discretization method: Impact on a computer aided diagnosis system for prostate
- 154 cancer in MRI. In: 2015 IEEE International Symposium on Medical Measurements and

155 Applications (MeMeA) Proceedings. IEEE; 2015. p. 297–302.

- Bhandari M, Reddiboina M. Building artificial intelligence-based personalized
 predictive models. BJU Int. 2019;124(2):189–91.
- Hung AJ. Can machine-learning algorithms replace conventional statistics? BJU Int.
 2019;123(1):1.
- 160 7. Checcucci E, De Cillis S, Granato S, Chang P, Afyouni AS, Okhunov Z; Uro-
- technology and SoMe Working Group of the Young Academic Urologists
- 162 Working Party of the European Association of Urology. Applications of neural
- 163 networks in urology: a systematic review. Curr Opin Urol. 2020 Nov;30(6):788-
- 164 807. doi: 10.1097/MOU.0000000000814. PMID: 32881726.

165	8.	Rosati S, Agostini V, Balestra G, Knaflitz M. Basographic gait impairment score: A
166		fuzzy classifier based on foot-floor contact parameters. In: 2014 IEEE International
167		Symposium on Medical Measurements and Applications (MeMeA). 2014. p. 1–5.
168	9.	Barentsz JO, Richenberg J, Clements R, et al. ESUR prostate MR guidelines 2012. Eur
169		Radiol. 2012;22(4):746-757. doi:10.1007/s00330-011-2377-y
170	10	Barentsz JO, Weinreb JC, Verma S, et al. Synopsis of the PI-RADS v2 Guidelines for
171		Multiparametric Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Recommendations for
172		Use. Eur Urol. 2016;69(1):41-49. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2015.08.038
173	11	Han J, Pei J, Yin Y, Mao R. Mining frequent patterns without candidate generation: A
174		frequent-pattern tree approach. Data Min Knowl Discov. 2004;8:53–87.
175	12	Checcucci E, de Cillis S, Piramide F, Amparore D, Kasivisvanathan V, Giganti F, et al.
176		The role of additional standard biopsy in the MRI-targeted biopsy era. Minerva Urol
177		e Nefrol. 2020;72(5):637–9.
178	13	Mazzone E, Stabile A, Pellegrino F, Basile G, Cignoli D, Cirulli GO et al. Positive
179		Predictive Value of Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System Version 2 for the
180		Detection of Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-
181		analysis. Eur Urol Oncol. 2020 Dec 25:S2588-9311(20)30212-1. doi:
182		10.1016/j.euo.2020.12.004. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33358543.
183	14	. Mottet N, van den Bergh RCN, Briers E, Van den Broeck T, Cumberbatch MG, De
184		Santis M, et al EAU-EANM-ESTRO-ESUR-SIOG Guidelines on Prostate Cancer-2020
185		Update. Part 1: Screening, Diagnosis, and Local Treatment with Curative Intent. Eur
186		Urol. 2021 Feb;79(2):243-262. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2020.09.042. Epub 2020 Nov 7.
187		PMID: 33172724.
188	15	. Mortezavi A, Palsdottir T, Eklund M, Chellappa V, Murugan SK, Saba K et al.
189		Head-to-head Comparison of Conventional, and Image- and Biomarker-based
190		Prostate Cancer Risk Calculators. Eur Urol Focus. 2020 May 22:S2405-
191		4569(20)30113-9. doi: 10.1016/i.euf.2020.05.002. Epub ahead of print. PMID:
192		32451315.

16. Roffman DA, Hart GR, Leapman MS, Yu JB, Guo FL, Ali I, Deng J. Development and 193 194 Validation of a Multiparameterized Artificial Neural Network for Prostate Cancer Risk 195 Prediction and Stratification. JCO Clin Cancer Inform. 2018 Dec;2:1-10. doi: 10.1200/CCI.17.00119. PMID: 30652591; PMCID: PMC6873987. 196 17. Amparore D, Campi R, Checcucci E, Sessa F, Pecoraro A, Minervini A et al. Forecasting 197 the Future of Urology Practice: A Comprehensive Review of the Recommendations 198 by International and European Associations on Priority Procedures During the 199 200 COVID-19 Pandemic. Eur Urol Focus. 2020 Sep 15;6(5):1032-1048. doi: 10.1016/j.euf.2020.05.007. Epub 2020 May 31. PMID: 32553544; PMCID: 201 202 PMC7261455. 203 18. Wallis CJD, Novara G, Marandino L, et al. Risks from deferring treatment for 204 genitourinary cancers: a collaborative review to aid triage and management during the COVID-19 pandemic. Eur Urol 2020. 205 206 207

208

- 209 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
- 210 None declared.

211

212 ETHICAL APPROVAL:

- 213 The study was conducted in accordance with good clinical practice guidelines, and informed
- 214 consent was obtained from the patients. According to Italian law (Agenzia Italiana del
- 215 Farmaco Guidelines for Observational Studies, March 20, 2008), no formal institutional
- 216 review board or ethics committee approval was required.
- 217

218

219

220 FIGURE LEGEND:

222	Figure 1. Overview of study results. A): Distribution of 1448 classified patients with negative
223	and positive TB for the 8 prebiopsy variable, according to the thresholds/categories used for
224	PPM construction. B): Confusion matrix reporting the results of our PPM with respect to the
225	TB outcome. C): Distribution of false negative (red) and true positive (green) patients by
226	ISUP. Focusing on the 53 false negative patients, the distribution of ISUP score was: 30.18%
227	(16/53) with ISUP 1, 60.3% (32/53) with ISUP 2, 3.7% (2/53) with ISUP 3, 5.6% (3/53) with
228	ISUP 4, 0% (0/53) with ISUP 5. D): ROC Curve obtained for the 983 classified patients