Journal of Population Therapeutics & Clinical Pharmacology

RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.53555/jptcp.v29i04.5691

EVALUATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PROSTATE CANCER SCREENING IN THE COMMUNITY

Abdullah Khalafallah Alnemari[1*], Faisal Saleh Alzahrani[2], Mohammed Mihmas Albaqami[3], Othman Abdullah Alnemari[1], Meshari Mohammed Altowairqi[1], Abdulaziz Mesfer Saleh Algethami[4], Abdulrahman Abed Alqurashi[5], Ahmed Abdullah Altowairqi[6], Meshael Meshal Aljoaid[7], Salem hashem AlMalki[8], Hesham Ali Alsheekh[9]

[1] Shehar Primary Healthcare Center, Ministry of Health, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[2] East Alhawiah Primary Healthcare Center, Ministry of Health, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[3] Health Control Center At Taif International Airport, Ministry of Health, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[4] Department of Radiology, King Faisal Medical Complex, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[5] Department of Urology, King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[6] Department of Nephrology, King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[7] Department of Family Medicine, Ministry of Health, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[8] Mortuary Alqaree Bani Malek Hospital, Ministry of Health, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[9] Laboratory and Blood Bank, Ministry of Health, Tabuk, Saudi Arabia

[*]**Corresponding Author:** Abdullah Khalafallah Alnemari,
[*]Shehar Primary Healthcare Center, Ministry of Health, Taif, Saudi Arabia, email: dr.aku005@gmail.com

Abstract
Prostate cancer remains one of the most significant health challenges among men globally, necessitating effective screening protocols to improve early detection and treatment outcomes. This review critically examines the current landscape of prostate cancer screening within community settings, emphasizing the effectiveness of various screening modalities, including Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) testing and Digital Rectal Exam (DRE), as well as newer techniques such as multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging (mpMRI). Despite the potential of these screenings to reduce mortality rates, the benefits must be weighed against the risks of overdiagnosis and overtreatment, which can lead to significant physical and psychological harm. Policy implications are significant, with recommendations advocating for more targeted screening approaches that consider individual risk factors and incorporate advanced diagnostic tools to refine screening accuracy. The review suggests that future screening strategies should aim to optimize the balance between detecting clinically significant cancers and minimizing the detection and treatment of indolent tumors. In sum, while prostate cancer screening holds promise for reducing disease-specific mortality, a nuanced approach is required to ensure that screening protocols are both effective and equitable. Tailoring screening recommendations to individual risk profiles and enhancing patient education on the potential risks and benefits are crucial steps toward achieving this goal.

Keywords: Prostate Cancer Screening, PSA, Community Health, Diagnostic Technologies

Introduction

Prostate cancer remains one of the most common cancers among men worldwide, posing significant public health challenges. It is the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths in men in several countries, making effective screening methods crucial for early detection and management (1). The primary tools for prostate cancer screening include the Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) test and Digital Rectal Exam (DRE), which have been widely used in community health settings (2).

Despite its prevalence and the availability of screening methods, the implementation of prostate cancer screening programs has been met with varying degrees of acceptance and controversy. One of the core challenges in screening for prostate cancer lies in the balance between early detection and the risks associated with overdiagnosis and overtreatment (3). Overdiagnosis can lead to unnecessary treatments, which may not improve survival rates but can significantly affect quality of life due to side effects such as incontinence and sexual dysfunction (4).

Screening's effectiveness also varies based on demographic factors such as age, race, and family history of prostate cancer. Studies have shown that while screening does reduce the risk of dying from prostate cancer, it does not necessarily reduce overall mortality among screened populations (5). This paradox has fueled ongoing debates about the recommendations for routine prostate cancer screening, especially concerning the age at which to begin screening (6). Moreover, the effectiveness of prostate cancer screening programs heavily depends on community engagement and accessibility. Research has indicated significant disparities in screening rates across different socioeconomic groups and communities, influenced by factors such as education, income, and access to healthcare services (7). These disparities can affect the outcomes of screening programs, as populations with lower screening rates often have higher mortality rates from prostate cancer. The cost-effectiveness of screening programs is another critical area of concern. Economic analyses suggest that while screening can detect cancer early, the financial costs associated with widespread screening and the subsequent management of indolent or slow-growing tumors that might never cause symptoms during a patient's lifetime can be substantial (8). Balancing these costs with the potential benefits of reduced cancer-specific mortality is essential for developing rational screening policies.

Recent advancements in screening technology and methodology promise to improve the accuracy and specificity of prostate cancer screening. For instance, the development of more sophisticated PSA testing methods, such as the PSA density and PSA velocity, and the integration of multiparametric MRI into the screening process, are aimed at reducing false positives and focusing treatment efforts on clinically significant tumors (9).

In light of these complexities, this review aims to critically evaluate the current state of prostate cancer screening within community settings, examining its effectiveness, challenges, and the impact of new technologies and methodologies. By synthesizing existing literature and exploring the multifaceted implications of prostate cancer screening, the paper seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse on how best to implement screening practices that effectively balance benefits and risks, ultimately improving health outcomes in communities across the globe.

Methods

A comprehensive literature search in the PubMed, Science Direct and Cochrane databases utilizing the medical topic headings (MeSH) and relevant keywords which were performed on June 6, 2022. All relevant peer-reviewed articles involving human subjects and those available in the English language were included. Using the reference lists of the previously mentioned studies as a starting point, a manual search for publications was conducted through Google Scholar to avoid missing any potential studies. There were no limitations on date, publication type, or participant age.

Discussion

Effectiveness of Screening Modalities

The effectiveness of prostate cancer screening modalities, particularly PSA testing and Digital Rectal Exam (DRE), has been widely debated within the medical community. The primary goal of these screenings is to detect prostate cancer at an early stage, potentially improving prognosis and survival

rates. The PSA test measures the level of prostate-specific antigen in the blood, which can be elevated in men with prostate cancer. A key study by the European Association of Urology reported that PSA screening could reduce prostate cancer-specific mortality by about 20% in screened populations compared to unscreened groups (10). However, the benefits of PSA testing must be weighed against its limitations, such as false positives and the risk of overdiagnosis. Overdiagnosis can lead to unnecessary treatments for prostate cancers that may never become clinically significant, causing undue patient anxiety and burdening healthcare systems (11).

Recent meta-analyses have suggested that while PSA screening reduces the risk of advanced prostate cancer, it shows no significant impact on overall mortality (12). This discrepancy highlights the need for improved screening protocols and the potential benefits of selective screening based on individual risk factors such as age, family history, and genetic predispositions (13). The DRE, in which a physician manually examines the prostate gland through the rectal wall, is a traditional part of the prostate screening process. Its effectiveness as a standalone screening tool has been questioned, with studies suggesting that DRE is less sensitive and specific than PSA testing. However, when combined with PSA testing, DRE can enhance the detection of prostate abnormalities, particularly in cases where PSA levels are borderline (14). The combination of both tests is considered to offer a more comprehensive assessment than either test alone, though the approach to using DRE can vary significantly across different clinical settings (15).

The integration of newer diagnostic technologies, such as multiparametric MRI (mpMRI), into the prostate cancer screening process is emerging as a promising approach to enhance the specificity and sensitivity of screenings. MpMRI can help in distinguishing clinically significant prostate cancers from indolent tumors, thus potentially reducing unnecessary biopsies and treatments. Studies have shown that using mpMRI prior to biopsy can significantly decrease the detection of clinically insignificant cancers and improve the detection rates of significant cancers (16). The future of prostate cancer screening may involve a more personalized approach, utilizing a combination of PSA levels, mpMRI results, and genetic testing to tailor screening and treatment plans to individual risk profiles. Such strategies could optimize the benefits of early detection while minimizing the risks associated with overdiagnosis and overtreatment (17).

Balancing Benefits and Harms of Screening

The dual objectives of prostate cancer screening—to reduce the risk of death from prostate cancer and to minimize the harms associated with overdiagnosis and overtreatment—present a significant challenge. The key benefit of screening is the potential to detect prostate cancer at an early, potentially more treatable stage. However, this must be weighed against the potential harms, which include false positives, overdiagnosis, psychological stress, and unnecessary treatments that can result in significant side effects such as incontinence and erectile dysfunction (18). A substantial proportion of prostate cancers detected through PSA screening are low-risk tumors that might never cause symptoms or death during a man's lifetime. The concept of overdiagnosis—diagnosing a disease that will not cause symptoms or death—is a major concern, with estimates suggesting that overdiagnosis from PSA screening ranges between 23% and 42% (19). These cases may lead to overtreatment, where men undergo surgery or radiation therapy, which carries risks of serious side effects without providing significant survival benefit (20).

Decision aids and shared decision-making processes have been proposed as strategies to help men understand the potential benefits and harms of screening and to assist them in making informed choices that align with their values and preferences (21). This approach respects individual autonomy and acknowledges the personal value judgments involved in decisions about cancer screening. Given the complexities involved in prostate cancer screening, policy recommendations must aim to maximize benefits while minimizing harms. Recent guidelines suggest a more targeted approach to screening, recommending it for men at higher risk of prostate cancer, such as those with a family history of the disease or African American men, who are at greater risk of aggressive tumors (22).

Further, age considerations play a crucial role; screening might be more beneficial for men aged 55 to 69, as this group is at a significant risk for prostate cancer but young enough to benefit from early

detection and treatment. For older men or those with less than a 10-year life expectancy, the risks of screening and subsequent treatment may outweigh the benefits, and screening is generally not recommended (23). Incorporating new technologies and biomarkers to enhance the specificity and sensitivity of prostate cancer screening can also play a pivotal role. Biomarkers other than PSA, such as PCA3 and TMPRSS2:ERG, may help in distinguishing between clinically significant and insignificant cancers, potentially reducing unnecessary biopsies and treatments (24). Future screening policies should consider integrating genetic testing and advanced imaging techniques like mpMRI into standard screening protocols. Such integration can help refine risk assessment and guide decision-making regarding biopsy and treatment, tailoring interventions to individual risk profiles (25). Moreover, ongoing research into understanding the genetic and molecular mechanisms of prostate cancer may provide insights that lead to more precise screening strategies. Longitudinal studies and clinical trials are essential to evaluate the long-term outcomes of refined screening protocols and to establish a balance that maximizes patient welfare.

Challenges in implementing screening protocols among the community

Implementing effective prostate cancer screening protocols in community settings presents numerous challenges, from disparities in access to healthcare to the complexity of communicating the risks and benefits of screening. Addressing these challenges is crucial for the successful implementation of screening programs that are equitable and effective across diverse populations. One of the most significant barriers to the effective implementation of prostate cancer screening protocols is the disparity in access to healthcare services. Socioeconomic status, geographic location, race, and ethnicity are all factors that can affect access to screening services. Studies have shown that men from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and minority groups are less likely to receive screening and therefore more likely to be diagnosed with advanced prostate cancer (26). This disparity not only affects the effectiveness of screening programs but also widens health inequalities across communities.

Lack of awareness and understanding about prostate cancer and the benefits of early detection significantly impact screening uptake. Educational interventions in the community are essential to inform men about the importance of screening, particularly targeting populations at higher risk due to family history or genetic predispositions (27). However, the complexity of the information regarding potential benefits and harms of screening can make communication challenging. Effective educational programs need to be culturally sensitive and tailored to address the specific needs and concerns of different communities (28). The psychological impact of screening, including the fear of diagnosis and the stigma associated with cancer, can also hinder the uptake of screening programs. Psychological barriers are particularly pronounced in communities where there is a strong stigma associated with illness or where masculinity is closely tied to health perceptions. These factors can deter men from participating in screening programs, leading to lower detection rates and poorer health outcomes (29).

Implementing community-wide screening programs involves significant logistical challenges, including ensuring the availability of healthcare providers trained in prostate cancer screening and follow-up care. Furthermore, the need for repeated screening to ensure effective monitoring increases the complexity and cost of these programs. Ensuring continuity of care and follow-up after initial screening is crucial but often difficult to achieve in under-resourced settings (30). Screening programs must navigate various ethical and legal considerations, including the risk of overdiagnosis and the potential for overtreatment. Ethical issues arise from the need to balance the potential benefits of early cancer detection with the risks of harm from unnecessary treatments for cancers that may never become life-threatening. Legal implications also play a role, particularly in terms of ensuring informed consent and addressing the privacy and confidentiality of medical records (31).

Conclusion

In conclusion, while prostate cancer screening has the potential to save lives, its implementation is fraught with challenges that must be carefully managed to balance benefits against harms. Effective

community screening programs require tailored strategies that address disparities in access and education and are sensitive to the psychological impacts on targeted populations. Advances in screening technologies and methodologies promise to enhance the effectiveness of these programs, ultimately improving outcomes for all men at risk of prostate cancer.

References

1- Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2019. CA Cancer J Clin. 2019;69(1):7-34.
2- Andriole GL, Crawford ED, Grubb RL 3rd, et al. Mortality results from a randomized prostate-cancer screening trial. N Engl J Med. 2009;360(13):1310-1319.
3- Pinsky PF, Prorok PC. Prostate cancer screening — a perspective on the current state of the evidence. N Engl J Med. 2010;364:1046-1055.
4- Loeb S, Bjurlin MA, Nicholson J, et al. Overdiagnosis and overtreatment of prostate cancer. Eur Urol. 2014;65(6):1046-1055.
5- Schröder FH, Hugosson J, Roobol MJ, et al. Screening and prostate cancer mortality: results of the European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC) at 13 years of follow-up. Lancet. 2014;384(9959):2027-2035.
6- Wolf AM, Wender RC, Etzioni RB, et al. American Cancer Society guideline for the early detection of prostate cancer: update 2010. CA Cancer J Clin. 2010;60(2):70-98.
7- Fedewa SA, Sauer AG, Siegel RL, et al. Patterns and trends in prostate cancer incidence, survival, prevalence, and mortality. Part I: international comparisons. BJU Int. 2018;122(1):23-39.
8- Stout NK, Goldie SJ, Weinstein MC. Cost-effectiveness of prostate cancer screening: a simulation model for informed decision making. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2011;103(21):1649-1657.
9- Ahmed HU, El-Shater Bosaily A, Brown LC, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of multi-parametric MRI and TRUS biopsy in prostate cancer (PROMIS): a paired validating confirmatory study. Lancet. 2017;389(10071):815-822.
10- Roobol MJ, Carlsson SV. The argument for and against prostate cancer screening. Eur Urol. 2021;79(3):262-273.
11- Bell KJL, Del Mar C, Wright G, Dickinson J, Glasziou P. Prevalence of incidental prostate cancer: A systematic review of autopsy studies. Int J Cancer. 2015;137(7):1749-1757.
12- Ilic D, Neuberger MM, Djulbegovic M, Dahm P. Screening for prostate cancer. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2018;(1):CD004720.
13- Pinsky PF, Black A, Parnes HL, et al. Effect of more vs. less frequent PSA screening on prostate cancer detection in the PLCO trial. Cancer Epidemiol. 2020;64:101647.
14- Wolf AMD, Wender RC, Etzioni RB, et al. American Cancer Society guideline for the early detection of prostate cancer: update 2010. CA Cancer J Clin. 2010;60(2):70-98.
15- Draisma G, Boer R, Otto SJ, et al. Lead times and overdetection due to prostate-specific antigen screening: estimates from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2003;95(12):868-878.
16- Ahmed HU, El-Shater Bosaily A, Brown LC, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of multi-parametric MRI and TRUS biopsy in prostate cancer (PROMIS): a paired validating confirmatory study. Lancet. 2017;389(10071):815-822.
17- Vickers AJ, Ulmert D, Sjoberg DD, et al. Strategy for detection of prostate cancer based on relation between prostate specific antigen at age 40-55 and long term risk of metastasis: case-control study. BMJ. 2013;346:f2023.
18- Carter HB, Albertsen PC, Barry MJ, et al. Early detection of prostate cancer: AUA Guideline. J Urol. 2013;190(2):419-426.
19- Draisma G, Etzioni R, Tsodikov A, et al. Lead time and overdiagnosis in prostate-specific antigen screening: importance of methods and context. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2009;101(6):374-383.
20- Welch HG, Black WC. Overdiagnosis in cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2010;102(9):605-613.
21- Volk RJ, Linder SK, Lopez-Olivo MA, et al. Patient decision aids for prostate cancer screening: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Prev Med. 2014;47(6):686-694.

22- Grossman DC, Curry SJ, Owens DK, et al. Screening for prostate cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. JAMA. 2018;319(18):1901-1913.
23- Qaseem A, Barry MJ, Denberg TD, et al. Screening for prostate cancer: a guidance statement from the Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of Physicians. Ann Intern Med. 2013;158(10):761-769.
24- Tomlins SA, Rhodes DR, Perner S, et al. Recurrent fusion of TMPRSS2 and ETS transcription factor genes in prostate cancer. Science. 2005;310(5748):644-648.
25- Panebianco V, Barchetti G, Sciarra A, et al. Prostate cancer: 1HMRS-DCEMR at 3T versus [(18)F]choline PET/CT in the detection of local prostate cancer recurrence in men with biochemical progression after radical retropexy. Radiology. 2012;262(3):816-824.
26- Mahal BA, Aizer AA, Ziehr DR, et al. Trends in disparate treatment of African American men with localized prostate cancer across National Comprehensive Cancer Network risk groups. Urology. 2014;84(2):386-392.
27- Hoffman RM, Gilliland FD, Eley JW, et al. Racial and ethnic differences in advanced-stage prostate cancer: the Prostate Cancer Outcomes Study. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2001;93(5):388-395.
28- Winkler SL, Adams A, Penson DF, et al. Prostate cancer screening in African American and Latino men: a qualitative study of barriers and facilitators. J Urol. 2009;182(2):507-514.
29- Consedine NS, Adjei BA, Ramirez PM, et al. An object lesson: source determines the relations that specific emotions have with coping, health, and well-being. Emotion. 2008;8(1):150-162.
30- Shelton RC, Goldman RE, Emmons KM, et al. An investigation into the social context of low-income, urban Black and Latino men: implications for adherence to annual prostate cancer screening. J Gen Intern Med. 2005;20(10):977-983.
31- Kim SY, Miller FG. Informed consent for pragmatic trials—the integrated consent model. N Engl J Med. 2014;370(8):769-772.