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#### Abstract

Men with a low prostate-specific antigen (PSA) level ( $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) in midlife may extend the rescreening interval (if aged $40-59 \mathrm{yr}$ ) or forgo future PSA screening (if aged $>60 \mathrm{yr}$ ) owing to their low risk of aggressive prostate cancer (PCa). However, there is a subset of men who develop lethal PCa despite low baseline PSA. We investigated how a PCa polygenic risk score (PRS) in addition to baseline PSA impacts the prediction of lethal PCa among 483 men aged $40-70$ yr from the Physicians' Health Study followed over a median of 33 yr. We examined the association of the PRS with the risk of lethal PCa (lethal cases vs controls) using logistic regression adjusted for baseline PSA. The PCa PRS was associated with risk of lethal PCa (odds ratio per 1 standard deviation in PRS [OR] 1.79, 95\% confidence interval [CI] 1.28-2.49). The association between the PRS and lethal PCa was stronger for those with PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ (OR 2.23, $95 \%$ CI 1.19-4.21) than for men with PSA $\geq 1$ $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ (OR 1.61, $95 \%$ CI 1.07-2.42). Our PCa PRS improved the identification of men with PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ at greater risk of future lethal PCa who should consider ongoing PSA testing. Patient summary: A subset of men develop fatal prostate cancer despite having low prostate-specific antigen (PSA) levels in middle age. A risk score based on multiple genes can help in predicting men who may be at risk of developing lethal prostate cancer and who should be advised to have regular PSA measurements. © 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of European Association of Urology. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creative-commons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).


Prostate-specific antigen (PSA) screening effectively reduces prostate cancer (PCa)-specific mortality [1] but also results in overdiagnosis of indolent cancers [2]. Baseline PSA in midlife has been identified as a strong predictor of total
and lethal PCa for both Black and White men, and could be used to risk-stratify future screening [3,4]. One study found that repeated PSA screening was associated with lower cancer-specific mortality for men with baseline PSA

[^0]$\geq 2 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ at age 60 yr [5]. Another suggested that baseline PSA is highly specific and that men with PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ in midlife could discontinue screening because of the very low risk of developing lethal PCa ( $0.2 \%$ risk by age 85 yr ) [6]. Studies have found that men aged 55-59 yr with PSA above the median ( $\sim 1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) accounted for $\sim 90 \%$ of lethal or aggressive PCa cases [3,4]. However, there is still a proportion of men with PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ who develop lethal or aggressive PCa during their lifetime [3-6]. In addition to PSA, PCa genetic risk variants have the potential to inform risk-stratified screening. A polygenic risk score (PRS) combining 269 PCa-associated genetic variants accounted for 33.6-43.2\% of PCa familial relative risk [7]. We investigated how this PRS might improve prediction of lethal PCa in addition to baseline PSA levels.

The Physicians' Health Study began in 1982 as a randomized, double-blind trial among 22071 male US physicians. Cases were histologically confirmed between 1982 and 2012. Lethal PCa was defined as metastatic disease at diagnosis or during follow-up, or fatal PCa. Controls were never diagnosed with PCa during follow-up (Supplementary material). The study was approved by the institutional review boards of the Brigham and Women's Hospital and those of participating registries as required.

Baseline PSA was measured in two different nested studies [8,9]. As elevated PSA may indicate the presence of
cancer, we excluded participants with PSA $>25 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$. As baseline PSA in midlife was the primary interest, we excluded men aged $>70 \mathrm{yr}$ at baseline. Germline genetic variants were assessed as part of the PRACTICAL Consortium OncoArray and a weighted PRS was created [7]. There were 483 participants with both PSA and genetic data available.

We performed unconditional logistic regression to determine the association between the PRS (in terms of its standard deviation) and the risk of PCa and lethal outcomes, adjusting for age and PSA at baseline. We also stratified by baseline PSA ( $<1$ vs $\geq 1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) and categorized men according to their baseline PSA and PRS. We compared lethal PCa cases to nonlethal PCa cases and controls. Multivariable models including an interaction term for the PRS and the dichotomous PSA variable were run to generate $p$ values for the interaction. The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) for models with and without the PRS was compared to assess model performance. All $p$ values are two-sided, and analyses were performed with SAS v9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

The baseline characteristics of the participants are reported in Table 1. Of the 97 lethal and 274 nonlethal PCa cases, 22 and 72, respectively, had baseline PSA <1 $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$. Men with low baseline PSA had a longer time from baseline to diagnosis in comparison to men with higher

Table 1 - Characteristics of lethal and nonlethal PCa cases and control subjects in the Physicians' Health Study

|  | Lethal PCa cases |  | Nonlethal PCa cases |  | Control group |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Overall | PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ | Overall | PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ | Overall | PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ |
|  | ( $n=97$ ) | ( $n=22$ ) | ( $n=274$ ) | ( $n=72$ ) | ( $n=112$ ) | ( $n=47$ ) |
| Median age at blood draw, yr (range) | 59.7 (41-70) | 57.5 (41-68) | 56.1 (40-70) | 53.5 (40-66) | 60.1 (43-70) | 57.9 (43-68) |
| Median time from BD to Dx, yr, (IQR) | 9.2 (6.3) | 12.3 (4.4) | 10.1 (5.3) | 14.2 (5.8) |  |  |
| Median time from BD to EFU, yr (IQR) | 20.0 (11.4) | 21.4 (13.1) | 33.2 (4.8) | 33.3 (2.5) | 32.9 (11.6) | 32.9 (13.1) |
| Median age at Dx, yr (IQR) | 69.3 (9.1) | 68.5 (8.9) | 67.5 (9.0) | 66.6 (9.8) |  |  |
| Median PSA at baseline, ng/ml (IQR) | 2.37 (4.98) | 0.74 (0.20) | 1.66 (2.13) | 0.68 (0.29) | 1.10 (1.34) | 0.56 (0.27) |
| Median PSA at Dx, ng/ml (IQR) | 15.6 (29.2) | 7.2 (31.5) | 7.2 (6.9) | 5.8 (4.0) |  |  |
| Data missing, $n(\%)$ | 44 (45.4) | 7 (31.8) | 24 (8.8) | 3 (4.2) |  |  |
| Dx before 1989, $n(\%)$ | 32 (33.0) | 1 (4.6) | 35 (12.8) | 3 (4.2) |  |  |
| Clinical stage, $n$ (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T1/T2 | 58 (59.8) | 14 (63.6) | 254 (92.7) | 69 (95.8) |  |  |
| T3 | 6 (6.2) | 0 (0) | 13 (4.7) | 0 (0) |  |  |
| T4/N1/M1 | 19 (19.6) | 7 (31.8) | 3 (1.1) | 1 (1.4) |  |  |
| Data missing | 14 (14.4) | 1 (4.6) | 4 (1.5) | 2 (2.8) |  |  |
| Biopsy Gleason score, $n$ (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\leq 6$ | 31 (32.0) | 5 (22.7) | 186 (67.9) | 50 (69.4) |  |  |
| 7 | 25 (25.8) | 7 (31.8) | 54 (19.7) | 13 (18.1) |  |  |
| 8-10 | 20 (20.6) | 8 (36.4) | 17 (6.2) | 6 (8.3) |  |  |
| Data missing | 21 (21.7) | 2 (9.1) | 17 (6.2) | 3 (4.2) |  |  |
| RP Gleason score, $n$ (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\leq 6$ | 3 (3.1) | 1 (4.6) | 90 (32.9) | 23 (31.9) |  |  |
| 7 | 9 (9.3) | 2 (9.1) | 73 (26.6) | 20 (27.8) |  |  |
| 8-10 | 10 (10.3) | 2 (9.1) | 15 (5.5) | 6 (8.3) |  |  |
| No RP or data missing | 75 (77.3) | 17 (77.3) | 96 (35.0) | 23 (31.9) |  |  |
| Primary treatment, $n$ (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No treatment | 4 (4.1) | 1 (4.6) | 20 (7.3) | 2 (2.8) |  |  |
| RP | 26 (26.8) | 5 (22.7) | 184 (67.2) | 49 (68.1) |  |  |
| Radiation | 26 (26.8) | 5 (22.7) | 59 (21.5) | 19 (26.4) |  |  |
| Hormones/orchiectomy | 17 (17.5) | 5 (22.7) | 5 (1.8) | 1 (1.4) |  |  |
| Other | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (1.5) | 1 (1.4) |  |  |
| Data missing | 24 (24.7) | 6 (27.3) | 2 (0.7) | 0 (0) |  |  |
| PRS distribution by quartile, $n$ (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quartile 1 (score 21.55-23.01) | 9 (9.3) | 3 (13.6) | 18 (6.6) | 6 (8.3) | 28 (25.0) | 15 (31.9) |
| Quartile 2 (score 23.02-23.68) | 19 (19.6) | 5 (22.7) | 43 (15.7) | 4 (5.6) | 28 (25.0) | 10 (21.3) |
| Quartile 3 (score 23.69-24.24) | 22 (22.7) | 4 (18.2) | 60 (21.9) | 24 (33.3) | 27 (24.1) | 13 (27.7) |
| Quartile 4 (score 24.25-25.96) | 47 (48.5) | 10 (45.5) | 153 (55.8) | 38 (52.8) | 29 (25.9) | 19 (19.2) |

$\mathrm{BD}=$ blood draw; $\mathrm{Dx}=$ diagnosis; $\mathrm{EFU}=$ end of follow-up; $\mathrm{IQR}=$ interquartile range; $\mathrm{PSA}=$ prostate-specific antigen; $\mathrm{PRS}=$ polygenic risk score; $\mathrm{RP}=$ radical prostatectomy.


Fig. 1 - Association of the prostate cancer polygenic risk score with overall and lethal prostate cancer, Physicians' Health Study 1982-2015a a All models adjusted for baseline age and baseline prostate-specific antigen (PSA). ${ }^{\mathbf{b}}$ Per 1 standard deviation increment in the polygenic risk score.
baseline PSA. The median PSA at diagnosis for men with low baseline PSA who had a lethal outcome was $7.2 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$.

The PRS was significantly associated with overall PCa risk (odds ratio [OR] 1.91, 95\% confidence interval [CI] 1.49-2.44) and the risk of lethal PCa (OR 1.79, 95\% CI 1.28-2.49; Fig. 1 and Supplementary Table 1). The association between the PRS and lethal PCa was stronger for men with PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ (OR 2.23, 95\% CI 1.19-4.21) than for men with PSA $\geq 1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ (OR $1.61,95 \%$ CI 1.07-2.42) at baseline. For men with baseline PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$, PRS above the median was associated with a suggestive higher odds of lethal PCa (OR 1.92, 95\% CI 0.67-5.52; Supplementary Table 2) relative to PRS below the median. We also examined the association between the PRS and lethal PCa versus nonlethal PCa and controls: the OR was 1.26 ( $95 \%$ CI $0.76-$ 2.08) for $\mathrm{PSA}<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ and 0.97 ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI} 0.73-1.28$ ) for PSA $\geq 1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ (Fig. 1 and Supplementary Table 1). Addition of the PRS to age at blood collection and baseline PSA improved the AUC for prediction of lethal PCa for men with baseline PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ (from 0.69 to 0.74 ; Supplementary Fig. 1).

We observed that the PCa PRS was associated with higher risk of lethal PCa among men aged 40-69 yr with low baseline PSA. Although men with high baseline PSA account for the majority of lethal PCa cases $[3,4]$ and the advice for men with low baseline PSA at age 60 is that they can consider discontinuing screening [6], a proportion of men with low baseline PSA later die of PCa. In the Malmö Preventive Project, $9 \%$ of lethal cases occurred in the group of men aged 60-64 yr with baseline PSA $<1.1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ [5]. In a USA-based study with $20 \%$ non-White participants, $11 \%$ of men with clinically significant PCa (aged 55-60 yr) had baseline PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ (Supplementary Table 3) [6]. Interestingly, men with low baseline PSA in our study had a PSA level at diagnosis that was well within the range typically detectable on PSA screening, suggesting that if all men with baseline PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ discontinued screening,
some of them would miss the opportunity for PCa detection earlier in the disease course.

Consistent with prior studies, we observed that the PRS was associated with total PCa risk and lethal PCa risk [7,10]. The association between PRS and lethal PCa was stronger for men with low baseline PSA in comparison to those with high PSA. The PRS was even associated with a suggestive higher risk of lethal PCa versus nonlethal PCa and controls in the group with low baseline PSA, although this was not statistically significant. Moreover, addition of the PRS to baseline PSA improved the prediction of lethal PCa: the change in AUC was 0.05 , which is comparable to a previously reported AUC change [10]. In this study, $63.7 \%$ of lethal PCa cases with PSA $<1 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{ml}$ had a PRS above the median. These men are likely to benefit from continued PSA screening.

The current study has long-term follow-up and PSA levels were measured in prospectively collected samples, allowing analysis of how the PCa PRS is related to the risk of lethal outcomes by baseline PSA level. A limitation of the study is that the participants were predominantly White; however, given that a similar proportion ( $\sim 10 \%$ ) of men with lethal PCa have low baseline PSA across multiple studies [3-6] and that the PRS was generated from multiethnic populations, our findings could probably be generalized to other populations. The number of participants with both PSA and genetic data available was limited, and there was lack of information on PSA screening protocols regarding screening interval, age at cessation, and biopsy and treatment indications. The significant association between the PRS and lethal PCa outcomes should be validated in additional populations with larger sample sizes.

There is a proportion of men with lethal PCa who have baseline PSA <1 ng/ml. A PCa PRS may improve identification of men with low baseline PSA who should consider continued PSA screening.
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