

Appendix: Systematic search of the literature

Search strategy

A literature search of published systematic reviews and/or meta-analyses was performed using PubMed/Medline and Cochrane database (last search: August 10, 2022). For the search string this combination of text words was used: (prostat*) AND ((systematic review) OR (meta-analysis)) AND (PSMA).

Study selection

Recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses focused on PSMA-targeted imaging or therapy in prostate cancer, alone or in comparison with other imaging modalities or therapies, published in English language from 2020 were included. Recent consensus documents and guidelines on the same topic published from 2020 were also retrieved and provided as supporting documents. The time limit (publication year: 2020) was chosen since the publication velocity of papers within this area is so fast and a systematic review or meta-analysis published before 2020 on this topic would be likely outdated.

Search results

Among 126 records retrieved, 62 were excluded (35 because not in the field of interest, 26 because systematic reviews or meta-analyses in the field of interest but published before the year 2020 and 1 because published in other than English language). Sixty-four articles (recent systematic reviews or meta-analyses) were included and provided to the panellists [Abrams-Pompe R et al. 2021; Alberts I et al. 2021; Alongi P et al. 2022; Annunziata S et al. 2020; Awenat S et al. 2021; Ballal S et al. 2021; Chavoshi M et al. 2020; Diao W et al. 2021; Evangelista L et al. 2021; Evangelista L et al. 2022; Farolfi A et al. 2021; Ferrari M et al. 2021; Gauthé M et al. 2021; Guglielmo P et al. 2021; Han S et al. 2021; Hernes E et al. 2021; Hu X et al. 2021; Huang Y et al. 2022; Huo H et al. 2022; Kawada T et al. 2022; Kimura S et al. 2020; Lee D et al. 2020; Ling S et al. 2022; Liu F et al. 2021; Liu X et al. 2022 (a); Liu X et al. 2022 (b); Ma J et al. 2022; Ma W et al. 2022; Manfredi C et al. 2021; Matushita C et al. 2021; Mazrani W et al. 2022; McGeorge S et al. 2021; Nautiyal A et al. 2022; Pan K et al. 2021; Peng L et al. 2020; Perera M et al. 2020; Petersen L et al. 2020; Piccardo A et al. 2020; Pozdnyakov A et al. 2022; Qin Z et al. 2022; Sadaghiani M et al. 2021; Sadaghiani M et al. 2022; Satapathy S et al. 2020; Satapathy S et al. 2021 (a); Satapathy S et al. 2021 (b); Stabile A et al. 2022; Sun J et al. 2021; Sun M et al. 2020; Tan N et al. 2020; Tu X et al. 2020; Turpin A et al. 2020; Valle L et al. 2021; von Eyben F et al. 2020; von Eyben F et al. 2021; Wang J et al. 2021; Wang R et al. 2020; Wang R et al. 2021; Wang X et al. 2021; Woo S et al. 2020; Wu H et al. 2020; Yadav D et al. 2022; Zhao G et al. 2022; Zhao R et al. 2021; Zhao Y et al. 2022].

Seven additional articles (reporting information on recent consensus statements or guidelines) were also selected and provided as supporting documents [Aluwini S et al. 2021; Ceci F et al. 2021; Fanti S et al. 2021; Fanti S et al. 2022; Gandaglia G et al. 2021; Gillessen S et al. 2022; Schöder H et al. 2022].

Systematic reviews and meta-analyses were divided taking into account the different tracks. Some of them were assigned to multiple tracks.

Quality assessment (AMSTAR 2)* of the included systematic reviews

Items judged of critical importance: comprehensiveness of the literature search (item 4); included studies described in adequate detail (item 8); adequacy of risk of bias assessment of primary studies (item 9); appropriateness of meta-analytical methods (item 11); consideration of risk of bias when interpreting the results of the review (item 13). According to the responses to critical items, a final overall judgment of the whole review can be:

High quality: No or one non-critical weakness: the systematic review provides an accurate and comprehensive summary of the results of the available studies that address the question of interest

Moderate quality: More than one non-critical weakness but no critical flaws. It may provide an accurate summary of the results of the available studies that were included in the review

Low quality: One critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses: the review may not provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies that address the question of interest

Critically low quality: More than one critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses: the review should not be relied on to provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies

*Shea, B.J., et al., AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. BMJ, 2017. 358: p. j4008

Track 1: Staging of Intermediate and High-Risk Prostate Cancer

Quality assessment of the included systematic reviews

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Abrams-Pompe R et al. 2021	Annunziata S et al. 2020	Awenat S et al. 2021	Chavoshi M et al. 2022	Evangelista L et al. 2021	Evangelista L et al. 2022	Guglielmo P et al. 2021	Hernes E et al. 2021	Hu X et al. 2021
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	not reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	not reported	not reported	yes	not reported	yes	yes	not reported	not reported	yes
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	no	yes
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	no	yes

16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	moderate	low	moderate	low	low	moderate	moderate	low	high	

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Huang Y et al. 2022	Kawada T et al. 2022	Ling S et al. 2021	Liu F et al. 2021	Liu X et al. 2022 (a)	Liu X et al. 2022 (b)	Manfredi C et al. 2021	Matshita C et al. 2021	McGeorge S et al. 2022	Pan K et al. 2021	Peng L et al. 2020
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	partial yes	yes	partial yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	not reported	yes	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	not reported	yes	yes
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	moderate	moderate	high	moderate	high	high	moderate	moderate	moderate	high	high

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Perera M et al. 2020	Petersen L et al. 2020	Piccardo A et al. 2020	Qin Z et al. 2022	Satapathy S et al. 2021 (a)	Stabile A et al. 2022	Tu X et al. 2020	Turpin A et al. 2020	Wang J et al. 2021	Wang R et al. 2020	Wang Y et al. 2021
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	ye	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	no	not reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	yes	yes	not reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes

13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	no	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	no	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no	yes	yes
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	moderate	low	low	low	high	high	high	low	moderate	high	high

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Woo S et al. 2020	Wu H et al. 2020	Yadav D et al. 2022	Zhao G et al. 2022	Zhao R et al. 2021	Zhao Y et al. 2022
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	yes	not reported	yes	yes	yes	yes
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	high	high	high	high	moderate	moderate

Track 2: Imaging of Biochemical Recurrence in Prostate Cancer

Quality assessment of the included systematic reviews

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Alberts I et al. 2021	Annunziata S et al. 2020	Chavoshi M et al. 2022	Diao W et al. 2021	Evangelista L et al. 2021	Evangelista L et al. 2022	Farolfi A et al. 2021	Ferrari M et al. 2021	Hernes E et al. 2021	Huo H et al. 2022
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	yes	no	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	not reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	yes	not reported	not reported	yes	yes	yes	not reported	yes	not reported	yes
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	no	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	no	yes
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes

15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	no	yes
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	high	low	low	moderate	low	moderate	low	high	low	high

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Kimura S et al. 2020	Liu F et al. 2021	Liu X et al. 2022 (a)	Liu X et al. 2022 (b)	Ma W et al. 2022	Manfredi C et al. 2021	Matushita C et al. 2021	Mazrani W et al. 2022	McGeorge S et al. 2022	Pan K et al. 2021
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	yes	yes	yes	yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	not reported	not reported	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	not reported	not reported	yes
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	no	no meta-analysis conducted	yes
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes

15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no	no	no meta-analysis conducted	yes
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	high	moderate	high	high	high	moderate	moderate	low	moderate	high

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Perera M et al. 2020	Piccardo A et al. 2020	Pozdnyakov A et al. 2022	Qin Z et al. 2022	Sun J et al. 2021	Tan N et al. 2020	Turpin A et al. 2020	Valle L et al. 2021	Wang R et al. 2020	Wang R et al. 2021	Zhao G et al. 2022	Zhao R et al. 2021
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	not reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	yes	not reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	partial yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	no	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	no	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	no
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	moderate	low	high	low	high	high	low	low	high	high	high	moderate

Track 3: Imaging of Advanced Prostate Cancer

Quality assessment of the included systematic reviews

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Alongi P et al. 2022	Han S et al. 2021	Liu F et al. 2021	McGeorge S et al. 2022	Perera M et al. 2020	Satopathy S et al. 2020	Turpin A et al. 2020	Zhao G et al. 2022	Zhao R et al. 2021
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	partial yes	yes	yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	partial yes	partial yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	yes	yes	not reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	not reported	yes	yes	not reported	yes	not reported	yes	yes	yes
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	no	no meta-analysis conducted	no	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	no
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	moderate	high	moderate	moderate	moderate	moderate	low	high	moderate

Tracks 4-5: Therapy of Advanced Prostate Cancer and Theranostics in Prostate Cancer

Quality assessment of the included systematic reviews

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	Ballal S et al. 2021	Gauthé M et al. 2021	Lee D et al. 2022	Ma J et al. 2022	Nautiyal A et al. 2022	Sadaghiani M et al 2021	Sadaghiani M et al 2022	Satapathy S et al. 2020	Satapathy S et al. 2021 (b)	Sun M et al. 2020
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	partial yes	partial yes	yes	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	no	partial yes	yes	no
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	not reported	no	yes	yes	not reported
6	Data extraction in duplicate	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	not reported	no	not reported	not reported	not reported
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	partial yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted	yes	yes	yes	yes	no meta-analysis conducted
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	high	low	high	high	low	low	low	moderate	moderate	low

n	AMSTAR-2 criteria	von Eyben F et al. 2020	von Eyben F et al. 2021
1	Research questions and inclusion criteria include components of PICO	yes	yes
2	Review methods established prior to the conduct of the review (protocol) and deviations justified	partial yes	partial yes
3	Selection of study design explained	yes	yes
4	Comprehensive literature search strategy	yes	partial yes
5	Study selection in duplicate	yes	yes
6	Data extraction in duplicate	yes	no
7	List of excluded studies and justification of the exclusions	partial yes	partial yes
8	Included studies described in adequate detail	yes	yes
9	Technique for assessing the risk of bias satisfactory	yes	yes
10	Sources of funding for the primary studies reported	no	no
11	Appropriate methods for meta-analysis	yes	yes
12	Potential impact of risk of bias results on meta-analysis assessed	yes	yes
13	Risk of bias results accounted for in discussion/conclusion	yes	yes
14	Satisfactory discussion and explanation of observed heterogeneity, if any	yes	yes

15	Adequate investigation of publication bias	yes	yes
16	Conflict of interest of review authors and funding received for conducting the review reported	yes	yes
	Overall methodological quality	high	high

List of recent selected systematic reviews and meta-analyses (from 2020):

- Abrams-Pompe RS, Fanti S, Schoots IG, Moore CM, Turkbey B, Vickers AJ, Walz J, Steuber T, Eastham JA. The Role of Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography in the Primary Staging of Newly Diagnosed Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Eur Urol Oncol*. 2021 Jun;4(3):370-395. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2020.11.002.
- Alberts IL, Seide SE, Mingels C, Bohn KP, Shi K, Zacho HD, Rominger A, Afshar-Oromieh A. Comparing the diagnostic performance of radiotracers in recurrent prostate cancer: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2021 Aug;48(9):2978-2989. doi: 10.1007/s00259-021-05210-9.
- Alongi P, Laudicella R, Lanzafame H, Farolfi A, Mapelli P, Picchio M, Burger IA, Iagaru A, Minutoli F, Evangelista L. PSMA and Choline PET for the Assessment of Response to Therapy and Survival Outcomes in Prostate Cancer Patients: A Systematic Review from the Literature. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2022 Mar 31;14(7):1770. doi: 10.3390/cancers14071770.
- Annunziata S, Pizzuto DA, Treglia G. Diagnostic Performance of PET Imaging Using Different Radiopharmaceuticals in Prostate Cancer According to Published Meta-Analyses. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2020 Aug 4;12(8):2153. doi: 10.3390/cancers12082153.
- Awenat S, Piccardo A, Carvoeiras P, Signore G, Giovannella L, Prior JO, Treglia G. Diagnostic Role of 18F-PSMA-1007 PET/CT in Prostate Cancer Staging: A Systematic Review. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2021 Mar 19;11(3):552. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics11030552.
- Ballal S, Yadav MP, Sahoo RK, Tripathi M, Dwivedi SN, Bal C. 225Ac-PSMA-617-targeted alpha therapy for the treatment of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prostate*. 2021 Jun;81(9):580-591. doi: 10.1002/pros.24137.
- Chavoshi M, Mirshahvalad SA, Metser U, Veit-Haibach P. 68Ga-PSMA PET in prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the observer agreement. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2022 Feb;49(3):1021-1029. doi: 10.1007/s00259-021-05616-5.
- Diao W, Cao Y, Su D, Jia Z. Impact of ⁶⁸Gallium prostate-specific membrane antigen tracers on the management of patients with prostate cancer who experience biochemical recurrence. *BJU Int*. 2021 Feb;127(2):153-163. doi: 10.1111/bju.15257.
- Evangelista L, Zattoni F, Cassarino G, Artioli P, Cecchin D, Dal Moro F, Zucchetta P. PET/MRI in prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2021 Mar;48(3):859-873. doi: 10.1007/s00259-020-05025-0.
- Evangelista L, Maurer T, van der Poel H, Alongi F, Kunikowska J, Laudicella R, Fanti S, Hofman MS. [68Ga]Ga-PSMA Versus [18F]PSMA Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography in the Staging of Primary and Recurrent Prostate Cancer. A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Eur Urol Oncol*. 2022 Jun;5(3):273-282. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2022.03.004.
- Farolfi A, Hadaschik B, Hamdy FC, Herrmann K, Hofman MS, Murphy DG, Ost P, Padhani AR, Fanti S. Positron Emission Tomography and Whole-body Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Metastasis-directed Therapy in Hormone-sensitive Oligometastatic Prostate Cancer After Primary Radical Treatment: A Systematic Review. *Eur Urol Oncol*. 2021 Oct;4(5):714-730. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2021.02.003.
- Ferrari M, Treglia G. 18F-PSMA-1007 PET in Biochemical Recurrent Prostate Cancer: An Updated Meta-Analysis. *Contrast Media Mol Imaging*. 2021 Dec 18;2021:3502389. doi: 10.1155/2021/3502389.
- Gauthé M, Sargos P, Barret E, Fromont-Hankard G, Beauval JB, Brureau L, Créhange G, Renard-Penna R, Dariane C, Fiard G, Mathieu R, Roubaud G, Ruffion A, Roupêt M, Ploussard G, On Behalf Of The Cc-Afu. Potential Targets Other Than PSMA for Prostate Cancer Theranostics: A Systematic Review. *J Clin Med*. 2021 Oct 24;10(21):4909. doi: 10.3390/jcm10214909.
- Guglielmo P, Marturano F, Bettinelli A, Gregjanin M, Paiusco M, Evangelista L. Additional Value of PET Radiomic Features for the Initial Staging of Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review from the Literature. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2021 Nov 30;13(23):6026. doi: 10.3390/cancers13236026.
- Han S, Woo S, Kim YI, Lee JL, Wibmer AG, Schoder H, Ryu JS, Vargas HA. Concordance between Response Assessment Using Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen PET and Serum Prostate-Specific Antigen Levels after Systemic Treatment in Patients with Metastatic Castration Resistant Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2021 Apr 7;11(4):663. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics11040663.
- Hernes E, Revheim ME, Hole KH, Tulipan AJ, Strømme H, Lilleby W, Seierstad T. Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen PET for Assessment of Primary and Recurrent Prostate Cancer with Histopathology as Reference Standard: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PET Clin*. 2021 Apr;16(2):147-165. doi: 10.1016/j.cpet.2020.12.001.
- Hu X, Wu Y, Yang P, Wang J, Wang P, Cai J. Performance of 68Ga-labeled prostate-specific membrane antigen ligand positron emission tomography/computed tomography in the diagnosis of primary prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int Braz J Urol*. 2021 Mar 5;47. doi: 10.1590/S1677-5538.IBJU.2020.0986.

Huang YT, Tseng NC, Chen YK, Huang KH, Lin HY, Huang YY, Hwang TIS, Ou YC. The Detection Performance of 18 F-Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen-1007 PET/CT in Primary Prostate Cancer : A Systemic Review and Meta-analysis. *Clin Nucl Med.* 2022 Sep 1;47(9):755-762. doi: 10.1097/RLU.0000000000004228.

Huo H, Shen S, He D, Liu B, Yang F. Head-to-head comparison of 68Ga-PSMA-11 PET/CT and 68Ga-PSMA-11 PET/MRI in the detection of biochemical recurrence of prostate cancer: summary of head-to-head comparison studies. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis.* 2022 Aug 5. doi: 10.1038/s41391-022-00581-y.

Kawada T, Yanagisawa T, Rajwa P, Sari Motlagh R, Mostafaei H, Quhal F, Laukhtina E, Aydh A, König F, Pallauf M, Pradere B, Ceci F, Baltzer PAT, Hacker M, Rasul S, Karakiewicz PI, Araki M, Nasu Y, Shariat SF. Diagnostic Performance of Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography-targeted biopsy for Detection of Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Eur Urol Oncol.* 2022 Aug;5(4):390-400. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2022.04.006.

Kimura S, Abufaraj M, Janisch F, Iwata T, Parizi MK, Foerster B, Fossati N, Briganti A, Egawa S, Hartenbach M, Shariat SF. Performance of [68Ga]Ga-PSMA 11 PET for detecting prostate cancer in the lymph nodes before salvage lymph node dissection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis.* 2020 Mar;23(1):1-10. doi: 10.1038/s41391-019-0156-z.

Lee DY, Kim YI. Effects of 225Ac-Labeled Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen Radioligand Therapy in Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer: A Meta-Analysis. *J Nucl Med.* 2022 Jun;63(6):840-846. doi: 10.2967/jnumed.121.262017.

Ling SW, de Jong AC, Schoots IG, Nasserinejad K, Busstra MB, van der Veldt AAM, Brabander T. Comparison of 68Ga-labeled Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Ligand Positron Emission Tomography/Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography for Primary Staging of Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Eur Urol Open Sci.* 2021 Sep 28;33:61-71. doi: 10.1016/j.euros.2021.09.006.

Liu F, Dong J, Shen Y, Yun C, Wang R, Wang G, Tan J, Wang T, Yao Q, Wang B, Li L, Mi J, Zhou D, Xiong F. Comparison of PET/CT and MRI in the Diagnosis of Bone Metastasis in Prostate Cancer Patients: A Network Analysis of Diagnostic Studies. *Front Oncol.* 2021 Oct 4;11:736654. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.736654.

Liu X, Wang Q, Zhang B, Jiang T, Zeng W. Diagnostic accuracy of 18F-PSMA-1007 PET/CT for prostate cancer in primary staging and biochemical recurrence with different serum PSA levels: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Hell J Nucl Med.* 2022 Jan-Apr;25(1):88-102. doi: 10.1967/s002449912438.

Liu X, Jiang T, Gao C, Liu H, Sun Y, Zou Q, Tang R, Zeng W. Detection rate of fluorine-18 prostate-specific membrane antigen-1007 PET/CT for prostate cancer in primary staging and biochemical recurrence with different serum PSA levels: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Oncol.* 2022 Jul 22;12:911146. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.911146.

Ma J, Li L, Liao T, Gong W, Zhang C. Efficacy and Safety of 225Ac-PSMA-617-Targeted Alpha Therapy in Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol.* 2022 Feb 3;12:796657. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.796657.

Ma W, Mao J, Yang J, Wang T, Zhao ZH. Comparing the diagnostic performance of radiotracers in prostate cancer biochemical recurrence: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol.* 2022 Apr 29. doi: 10.1007/s00330-022-08802-7.

Manfredi C, Fernández-Pascual E, Arcaniolo D, Emberton M, Sanchez-Salas R, Artigas Guix C, Bianco F, Cathcart P, Murphy DG, Couñago F, Martínez-Ballesteros C, Verze P, Martínez-Salamanca JI. The Role of Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Primary and Recurrent Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Eur Urol Focus.* 2021 Sep 15:S2405-4569(21)00228-5. doi: 10.1016/j.euf.2021.08.013.

Matushita CS, da Silva AMM, Schuck PN, Bardisserotto M, Piant DB, Pereira JL, Cerci JJ, Coura-Filho GB, Esteves FP, Amorim BJ, Gomes GV, Brito AET, Bernardo WM, Mundstock E, Fanti S, Macedo B, Roman DH, Tem-Pass CS, Hochegger B. 68Ga-Prostate-specific membrane antigen (psma) positron emission tomography (pet) in prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int Braz J Urol.* 2021 Jul-Aug;47(4):705-729. doi: 10.1590/S1677-5538.IBJU.2019.0817.

Mazrani W, Cook GJR, Bomanji J. Role of 68Ga and 18F PSMA PET/CT and PET/MRI in biochemical recurrence of prostate cancer: a systematic review of prospective studies. *Nucl Med Commun.* 2022 Jun 1;43(6):631-637. doi: 10.1097/MNM.0000000000001557.

McGeorge S, Kwok M, Jiang A, Emmett L, Pattison DA, Thomas PA, Yaxley JW, Roberts MJ. Dual-Tracer Positron-Emission Tomography Using Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen and Fluorodeoxyglucose for Staging of Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review. *Adv Urol.* 2021 Aug 18;2021:1544208. doi: 10.1155/2021/1544208.

Nautiyal A, Jha AK, Mithun S, Rangarajan V. Dosimetry in Lu-177-PSMA-617 prostate-specific membrane antigen targeted radioligand therapy: a systematic review. *Nucl Med Commun.* 2022 Apr 1;43(4):369-377. doi: 10.1097/MNM.0000000000001535.

Pan KH, Wang JF, Wang CY, Nikzad AA, Kong FQ, Jian L, Zhang YQ, Lu XM, Xu B, Wang YL, Chen M. Evaluation of 18F-DCFPyL PSMA PET/CT for Prostate Cancer: A Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol.* 2021 Feb 17;10:597422. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.597422.

Peng L, Li J, Meng C, Li J, You C, Tang D, Wei T, Xiong W, Li Y. Can 68Ga-prostate specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/computerized tomography provide an accurate lymph node staging for patients with medium/high risk prostate cancer? A diagnostic meta-analysis. *Radiat Oncol.* 2020 Oct 1;15(1):227. doi: 10.1186/s13014-020-01675-4.

Perera M, Papa N, Roberts M, Williams M, Udovicich C, Vela I, Christidis D, Bolton D, Hofman MS, Lawrentschuk N, Murphy DG. Gallium-68 Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography in Advanced Prostate Cancer-Updated Diagnostic Utility, Sensitivity, Specificity, and Distribution of Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen-avid Lesions: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Eur Urol.* 2020 Apr;77(4):403-417. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2019.01.049.

Petersen LJ, Zacho HD. PSMA PET for primary lymph node staging of intermediate and high-risk prostate cancer: an expedited systematic review. *Cancer Imaging.* 2020 Jan 23;20(1):10. doi: 10.1186/s40644-020-0290-9.

Piccardo A, Ugolini M, Righi S, Bottoni G, Cistaro A, Paparo F, Giovanella L, Evangelista L. Copper, PET/CT and prostate cancer: a systematic review of the literature. *Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2020 Dec;64(4):382-392. doi: 10.23736/S1824-4785.20.03277-X.

Pozdnyakov A, Kulanthavelu R, Bauman G, Ortega C, Veit-Haibach P, Metsker U. The impact of PSMA PET on the treatment and outcomes of men with biochemical recurrence of prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis.* 2022 Apr 19. doi: 10.1038/s41391-022-00544-3.

Qin ZQ, Pan GJ, Xu Z, Wang H, Xu LW, Jia RP. The performance of 18F-PSMA PET/CT in the detection of prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Asian J Androl.* 2022 Jul-Aug;24(4):373-379. doi: 10.4103/aja202162.

Sadaghiani MS, Sheikhabaei S, Werner RA, Pienta KJ, Pomper MG, Solnes LB, Gorin MA, Wang NY, Rowe SP. A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Effectiveness and Toxicities of Lutetium-177-labeled Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen-targeted Radioligand Therapy in Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol.* 2021 Jul;80(1):82-94. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2021.03.004.

Sadaghiani MS, Sheikhabaei S, Werner RA, Pienta KJ, Pomper MG, Gorin MA, Solnes LB, Rowe SP. 177Lu-PSMA radioligand therapy effectiveness in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prostate.* 2022 May;82(7):826-835. doi: 10.1002/pros.24325.

Satapathy S, Mittal BR, Sood A. Visceral Metastases as Predictors of Response and Survival Outcomes in Patients of Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer Treated With 177Lu-Labeled Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen Radioligand Therapy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Clin Nucl Med.* 2020 Dec;45(12):935-942. doi: 10.1097/RLU.0000000000003307.

Satapathy S, Singh H, Kumar R, Mittal BR. Diagnostic Accuracy of 68Ga-PSMA PET/CT for Initial Detection in Patients With Suspected Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2021 Mar;216(3):599-607. doi: 10.2214/AJR.20.23912.

Satapathy S, Sood A, Das CK, Mittal BR. Evolving role of 225Ac-PSMA radioligand therapy in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer-a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis.* 2021 Sep;24(3):880-890. doi: 10.1038/s41391-021-00349-w.

Stabile A, Pellegrino A, Mazzone E, Cannoletta D, de Angelis M, Barletta F, Scuderi S, Cucchiara V, Gandaglia G, Raggi D, Necchi A, Karakiewicz P, Montorsi F, Briganti A. Can Negative Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography Avoid the Need for Pelvic Lymph Node Dissection in Newly Diagnosed Prostate Cancer Patients? A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis with Backup Histology as Reference Standard. *Eur Urol Oncol.* 2022 Feb;5(1):1-17. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2021.08.001.

Sun J, Lin Y, Wei X, Ouyang J, Huang Y, Ling Z. Performance of 18F-DCFPyL PET/CT Imaging in Early Detection of Biochemically Recurrent Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol.* 2021 Apr 26;11:649171. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.649171.

Sun M, Niaz MO, Nelson A, Skafida M, Niaz MJ. Review of 177Lu-PSMA-617 in Patients With Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. *Cureus.* 2020 Jun 30;12(6):e8921. doi: 10.7759/cureus.8921.

Tan N, Oyoyo U, Bavadian N, Ferguson N, Mukkamala A, Calais J, Davenport MS. PSMA-targeted Radiotracers versus ¹⁸F Fluciclovine for the Detection of Prostate Cancer Biochemical Recurrence after Definitive Therapy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Radiology.* 2020 Jul;296(1):44-55. doi: 10.1148/radiol.2020191689.

Tu X, Zhang C, Liu Z, Shen G, Wu X, Nie L, Chang T, Xu H, Bao Y, Yang L, Wie Q. The Role of 68Ga-PSMA Positron Emission Tomography/Computerized Tomography for Preoperative Lymph Node Staging in Intermediate/High Risk Patients With Prostate Cancer: A Diagnostic Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol.* 2020 Aug 18;10:1365. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.01365.

- Turpin A, Girard E, Baillet C, Pasquier D, Olivier J, Villers A, Puech P, Penel N. Imaging for Metastasis in Prostate Cancer: A Review of the Literature. *Front Oncol.* 2020 Jan 31;10:55. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.00055.
- Valle L, Shabsovich D, de Meerleer G, Maurer T, Murphy DG, Nickols NG, Vapiwala N, Calais J, Kishan AU. Use and Impact of Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography Prior to Salvage Radiation Therapy in Men with Biochemical Recurrence After Radical Prostatectomy: A Scoping Review. *Eur Urol Oncol.* 2021 Jun;4(3):339-355. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2021.01.007.
- von Eyben FE, Bauman G, von Eyben R, Rahbar K, Soydal C, Haug AR, Virgolini I, Kulkarni H, Baum R, Paganelli G. Optimizing PSMA Radioligand Therapy for Patients with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2020 Nov 28;21(23):9054. doi: 10.3390/ijms21239054.
- von Eyben FE, Kairemo K, Paller C, Hoffmann MA, Paganelli G, Virgolini I, Roviello G. ¹⁷⁷Lu-PSMA Radioligand Therapy Is Favorable as Third-Line Treatment of Patients with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Biomedicines.* 2021 Aug 19;9(8):1042. doi: 10.3390/biomedicines9081042.
- Wang J, Han Y, Lin L, Zhang L, Li J, Gao H, Fu P. Systematic review & meta-analysis of positron emission tomography/computed tomography and bone scan in the diagnosis of prostate lesions. *Transl Androl Urol.* 2021 Nov;10(11):4231-4240. doi: 10.21037/tau-21-912.
- Wang R, Shen G, Yang R, Ma X, Tian R. ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA PET/MRI for the diagnosis of primary and biochemically recurrent prostate cancer: A meta-analysis. *Eur J Radiol.* 2020 Sep;130:109131. doi: 10.1016/j.ejrad.2020.109131.
- Wang R, Shen G, Huang M, Tian R. The Diagnostic Role of ¹⁸F-Choline, ¹⁸F-Fluciclovine and ¹⁸F-PSMA PET/CT in the Detection of Prostate Cancer With Biochemical Recurrence: A Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol.* 2021 Jun 17;11:684629. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.684629.
- Wang X, Wen Q, Zhang H, Ji B. Head-to-Head Comparison of ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-11 PET/CT and Multiparametric MRI for Pelvic Lymph Node Staging Prior to Radical Prostatectomy in Patients With Intermediate to High-Risk Prostate Cancer: A Meta-Analysis. *Front Oncol.* 2021 Oct 20;11:737989. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.737989.
- Woo S, Ghafoor S, Becker AS, Han S, Wibmer AG, Hricak H, Burger IA, Schöder H, Vargas HA. Prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography (PSMA-PET) for local staging of prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Hybrid Imaging.* 2020 Sep 9;4(1):16. doi: 10.1186/s41824-020-00085-9.
- Wu H, Xu T, Wang X, Yu YB, Fan ZY, Li DX, Luo L, Yang XC, Jiao W, Niu HT. Diagnostic Performance of ⁶⁸Gallium Labelled Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography and Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Staging the Prostate Cancer with Intermediate or High Risk Prior to Radical Prostatectomy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *World J Mens Health.* 2020 Apr;38(2):208-219. doi: 10.5534/wjmh.180124.
- Yadav D, Hwang H, Qiao W, Upadhyay R, Chapin BF, Tang C, Aparicio A, Lopez-Olivo MA, Kang SK, Macapinlac HA, Bathala TK, Surasi DS. ¹⁸F-Fluciclovine versus PSMA PET Imaging in Primary Tumor Detection during Initial Staging of High-Risk Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Radiol Imaging Cancer.* 2022 Mar;4(2):e210091. doi: 10.1148/rycan.210091.
- Zhao G, Ji B. Head-To-Head Comparison of ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-11 PET/CT and ^{99m}Tc-MDP Bone Scintigraphy for the Detection of Bone Metastases in Patients With Prostate Cancer: A Meta-Analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2022 Jun 29:1-10. doi: 10.2214/AJR.21.27323.
- Zhao R, Li Y, Nie L, Qin K, Zhang H, Shi H. The meta-analysis of the effect of ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET/CT diagnosis of prostatic cancer compared with bone scan. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2021 Apr 16;100(15):e25417. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000025417.
- Zhao Y, Simpson BS, Morka N, Freeman A, Kirkham A, Kelly D, Whitaker HC, Emberton M, Norris JM. Comparison of Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging with Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen Positron-Emission Tomography Imaging in Primary Prostate Cancer Diagnosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cancers (Basel).* 2022 Jul 19;14(14):3497. doi: 10.3390/cancers14143497.

List of selected recent consensus documents or guidelines (from 2020):

Aluwini S, Oprea-Lager DE, de Barros H, Mehra N, Stoevelaar H, Yakar D, van der Poel H; Dutch M1a Prostate Cancer Working Group. M1a prostate cancer: Results of a Dutch multidisciplinary consensus meeting. *BJUI Compass*. 2021 Feb 3;2(3):159-168. doi: 10.1002/bco.2.73.

Ceci F, Oprea-Lager DE, Emmett L, Adam JA, Bomanji J, Czernin J, Eiber M, Haberkorn U, Hofman MS, Hope TA, Kumar R, Rowe SP, Schwarzenboeck SM, Fanti S, Herrmann K. E-PSMA: the EANM standardized reporting guidelines v1.0 for PSMA-PET. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2021 May;48(5):1626-1638. doi: 10.1007/s00259-021-05245-y.

Fanti S, Goffin K, Hadaschik BA, Herrmann K, Maurer T, MacLennan S, Oprea-Lager DE, Oyen WJ, Rouvière O, Mottet N, Bjartell A. Consensus statements on PSMA PET/CT response assessment criteria in prostate cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2021 Feb;48(2):469-476. doi: 10.1007/s00259-020-04934-4.

Fanti S, Briganti A, Emmett L, Fizazi K, Gillessen S, Goffin K, Hadaschik BA, Herrmann K, Kunikowska J, Maurer T, MacLennan S, Mottet N, Murphy DG, Oprea-Lager DE, O'Sullivan JM, Oyen WJG, Rouvière O, Sartor O, Stenzl A, Van Poppel H, Walz J, Witjes W, Bjartell A. EAU-EANM Consensus Statements on the Role of Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography in Patients with Prostate Cancer and with Respect to [177Lu]Lu-PSMA Radioligand Therapy. *Eur Urol Oncol*. 2022 Jun 10:S2588-9311(22)00086-4. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2022.05.003.

Gandaglia G, Leni R, Fossati N, Cucchiara V, Montorsi F, Briganti A. Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Imaging in Clinical Guidelines: European Association of Urology, National Comprehensive Cancer Network, and Beyond. *Eur Urol Focus*. 2021 Mar;7(2):245-249. doi: 10.1016/j.euf.2020.12.014.

Gillessen S, Armstrong A, Attard G, Beer TM, Beltran H, Bjartell A, Bossi A, Briganti A, Bristow RG, Bulbul M, Caffo O, Chi KN, Clarke CS, Clarke N, Davis ID, de Bono JS, Duran I, Eeles R, Efstathiou E, Efstathiou J, Ekeke ON, Evans CP, Fanti S, Feng FY, Fizazi K, Frydenberg M, George D, Gleave M, Halabi S, Heinrich D, Higano C, Hofman MS, Hussain M, James N, Jones R, Kanesvaran R, Khauli RB, Klotz L, Leibowitz R, Logothetis C, Maluf F, Millman R, Morgans AK, Morris MJ, Mottet N, Mrabti H, Murphy DG, Murthy V, Oh WK, Ost P, O'Sullivan JM, Padhani AR, Parker C, Poon DMC, Pritchard CC, Rabah DM, Rathkopf D, Reiter RE, Rubin M, Ryan CJ, Saad F, Sade JP, Sartor O, Scher HI, Shore N, Skoneczna I, Small E, Smith M, Soule H, Spratt DE, Sternberg CN, Suzuki H, Sweeney C, Sydes MR, Taplin ME, Tilki D, Tombal B, Türkeri L, Uemura H, Uemura H, van Oort I, Yamoah K, Ye D, Zaporotko A, Omlin A. Management of Patients with Advanced Prostate Cancer: Report from the Advanced Prostate Cancer Consensus Conference 2021. *Eur Urol*. 2022 Jul;82(1):115-141. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2022.04.002.

Schöder H, Hope TA, Knopp M, Kelly WK, Michalski JM, Lerner SP, Tawab-Amiri A, Mann BS, Lin DW, Yu EY, Chen RC, Beach GC, Reeves SA; Members of the Working Group, Shankar LK. Considerations on Integrating Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography Imaging Into Clinical Prostate Cancer Trials by National Clinical Trials Network Cooperative Groups. *J Clin Oncol*. 2022 May 1;40(13):1500-1505. doi: 10.1200/JCO.21.02440.