

Table 1. Efficacy of Ga-68 PSMA-11 imaging in detecting primary PCa.								
STUDY*	N	MODALITY	REGION	SENSITIVITY (%)	SPECIFICITY (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	CHANGE IN CLINICAL MANAGEMENT (%)
Al-Bayati et al, 2018 <sup>27</sup>	22	PET, PET/MRI	Prostate	M-1 PET: 81, PET/MRI: 88 M-2 PET: 91, PET/MRI: 94				
Basha et al, 2019 <sup>18</sup>	173	PET/CT	Prostate	96				
Berger et al, 2018 <sup>19</sup>	48	PET/CT	Prostate	81 (p) 100 (lesion-based)	85 (p)	89 (p)	74 (p)	
Budaus et al, 2016 <sup>20</sup>	30	PET/CT	In	33 (In)	100	100	69	
Chen et al, 2019 <sup>21</sup>	51	PET/CT	Prostate	90	94			
Chen et al, 2020 <sup>22</sup>	54	PET/CT/MRI	Prostate	78 (ece) 75 (svi)	94 (ece) 95 (svi)	97 (ece) 82 (svi)	67 (ece) 93 (svi)	19
Demirci et al, 2019 <sup>23</sup>	141	PET/CT	Prostate	78	81			
Donato et al, 2019 <sup>25</sup>	58	PET/CT	Prostate	93				
Donato et al, 2020 <sup>24</sup>	144	PET/CT	Prostate	90	94			
El Hajj et al, 2019 <sup>26</sup>	23	PET/CT	Prostate	42	89	74	67	
Fendler et al, 2016 <sup>27</sup>	21	PET/CT	Prostate	67 73 (svi)	92 100 (svi)	97 100 (svi)	42 77 (svi)	
Fendler et al, 2017 <sup>28</sup>	10	PET/CT	Prostate, In	93 <sup>a</sup>	85 <sup>a</sup>			
Ferraro et al, 2020 <sup>29</sup>	60	PET/CT	In	58	98	88	90	
Gao et al, 2019 <sup>30</sup>	49	PET/CT	Prostate	76 (pp) 77 (pl)	86 (pp) 88 (pl)			
Gupta et al, 2017 <sup>31</sup>	12	PET/CT	In	67	99	86	96	
Gupta et al, 2018 <sup>32</sup>	23	PET/CT	Prostate, In	63 (epe) 55 (svi) 66 (Inm)	100 (epe) 100 (svi) 99 (Inm)	100 (epe) 100 (svi) 88 (Inm)	36 (epe) 25 (svi) 98 (Inm)	
Herlemann et al, 2016 <sup>33</sup>	20	PET/CT	In	84	82	84	82	
Hicks et al, 2018 <sup>32</sup>	32	PET/MRI	Prostate, In	73 <sup>b</sup>	88 <sup>b</sup>			
Hinsenveld et al, 2020 <sup>34</sup>	53	PET/CT	In	100	86			
Hirmas et al, 2019 <sup>35</sup>	21	PET/CT	Prostate, In, bone	86 (pro) 92 (pln) 100 (eln) 100 (bm)	100 (pln) 100 (eln) 92 (bm)	100 (pro) 100 (pln) 100 (eln) 90 (bm)	89 (pln) 100 (eln) 100 (bm)	52
Hoffman et al, 2017 <sup>36</sup>	25	PET/CT	Prostate, In, bone, lung	84 <sup>c</sup>	100 <sup>c</sup>	67 <sup>c</sup>	100 <sup>c</sup>	
Hofman et al, 2020 <sup>37</sup>	150	PET/CT	Prostate, In	85	98			28
Hope et al, 2021 <sup>63</sup>	277	PET/CT, PET/ MRI	In	40	95	75	81	
Jena et al, 2018 <sup>38</sup>	82	PET/MRI	Prostate, In	78	86			
Kalapara et al, 2020 <sup>39</sup>	205	PET/CT	Prostate	94				
Kopp et al, 2020 <sup>40</sup>	90	PET/CT	In	44	96	70	89	
Liu et al, 2020 <sup>41</sup>	31	PET/CT	Prostate	100 (csPCa) 93 (PCa)	68 (csPCa) 75 (PCa)	67 (csPCa)	100 (csPCa)	
Lopci et al, 2018 <sup>43</sup>	45	PET	Prostate	82	72			
Lopci et al, 2021 <sup>42</sup>	97	PET/CT	Prostate	60	97	92	81	24
Maurer et al, 2016 <sup>44</sup>	130	PET/CT, PET/ MRI	In	74	99	95	95	

**Table 1 (cont). Efficacy of Ga-68 PSMA-11 imaging in detecting primary PCa.**

STUDY*	N	MODALITY	REGION	SENSITIVITY (%)	SPECIFICITY (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	CHANGE IN CLINICAL MANAGEMENT (%)
Muehlematter et al, 2019 <sup>45</sup>	40	PET/MRI	Prostate	69 (ece) 55 (svi)	67 (ece) 94 (svi)			
Nandurkar et al, 2019 <sup>46</sup>	101	PET/CT	Prostate, ln	47 (svi)	87 (svi)			
Obek et al, 2017 <sup>47</sup>	51	PET/CT	Prostate	53	86	62	81	
Pallavi et al, 2020 <sup>48</sup>	29	PET/CT	Prostate, ln	86 71 (lnm) 75 (ppe) 60 (svi) 50 (bni)	95			
Park et al, 2018 <sup>49</sup>	33	PET/MRI	Prostate	100 (pp) 86 (pl) 50 (pn)	88 (pl) 98 (pn)			
Petersen et al, 2020 <sup>50</sup>	20	PET/CT	ln	39	100	100	47	
Rahbar et al, 2016 <sup>51</sup>	6	PET/CT	Prostate	92	92	96	85	
Rahman et al, 2019 <sup>52</sup>	28	PET/CT	Lymph node				100	
Sahlmann et al, 2016 <sup>53</sup>	12	PET/CT	Prostate, lymph node	99a	89a	100a		
Thalgott et al, 2018 <sup>54</sup>	73	PET/MRI	Prostate, ln	60 (lnm) 94 (ece) 82 (svi)	100 (lnm) 45 (ece) 80 (svi)	100 (lnm) 82 (ece) 77 (svi)	83 (lnm) 75 (ece) 84 (svi)	
Tulsyan et al, 2017 <sup>55</sup>	36	PET/CT	Prostate, ln	49	95	85	88	
van Leeuwen et al, 2017 <sup>56</sup>	30	PET/CT	ln	54	99	92	94	
van Leeuwen et al, 2019 <sup>57</sup>	140	PET/CT	ln, SVI	53 (lnm) 46 (svi)	88 (lnm) 93 (svi)	71 (lnm) 74 (svi)	76 (lnm) 80 (svi)	
von Klot et al, 2017 <sup>58</sup>	21	PET/CT	Prostate	95	75	97	60	
Wong et al, 2018 <sup>59</sup>	131	PET/CT	Prostate, ln	66	99			28
Yaxley et al, 2019 <sup>64</sup>	208	PET/CT	ln	38 (pb) 24 (ln)	94 (pb) 100 (ln)	68 (pb) 75 (ln)	81 (pb) 96 (ln)	
Yilmaz et al, 2019 <sup>59</sup>	24	PET/CT	Prostate, ln	30 (epe) 75 (svi) 33 (bni) 100 (lnm)	93 (epe) 90 (svi) 100 (bni) 100 (lnm)	75 (epe) 60 (svi) 100 (bni) 100 (lnm)	65 (epe) 95 (svi) 82 (bni) 100 (lnm)	
Zang et al, 2017 <sup>60</sup>	22	PET/CT	ln	97	100			43
Zhang et al, 2017 <sup>61</sup>	42	PET/CT	ln	93	96	93	96	
Zhang et al, 2019 <sup>62</sup>	58	PET/CT	Prostate	92	82	89	86	

\*Klingenberg et al 2022 is not included in this table, as endpoints recorded in this table were not reported in the study.

Abbreviations: bm, bone metastases; bni, bladder neck invasion; csPCa, clinically significant prostate cancer; CT, computed tomography; ece, extracapsular extension; eln, extrapelvic lymph nodes; epe, extraprostatic extension; ln, lymph node; lnm, lymph node metastasis; M-1, method-1; M-2, method-2; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; NPV, negative predictive value; p, primary/index localization; pb, patient based; PCa, prostate cancer; pl, per lobe; pln, pelvic lymph node; pn, per node; pp, per patient; ppe, periprostatic lesions; pro, prostate, PET, positron emission tomography; PPV, positive predictive value; PSMA, prostate-specific membrane antigen; svi, seminal vesicle invasion.

<sup>a</sup>N staging results pooled data over patients with primary PCa and biochemical recurrence of PCa.

<sup>b</sup>Median.

<sup>c</sup>Comparison between Gleason scores based on a receiver operating characteristic curve analysis cutoff score.

Collation of publicly available data. Cross-trial comparisons not based on head-to-head studies should be interpreted with caution.