

Understanding PSA and its derivatives in prediction of tumor volume: addressing health disparities in prostate cancer risk stratification

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Supplementary Table 1: General characteristics of men at different BMI categories

Variable	Normal weight (BMI < 25)	Overweight (BMI 25-<30)	Obese (BMI ≥30)	<i>p</i> -value ^a
	n=160	n=307	n=116	
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	
BMI ^b	23.1 ± 1.56	27.5 ± 1.44	33.0 ± 2.64	n/a
Patient height, m	1.78 ± 0.07	1.78 ± 0.07	1.78 ± 0.07	0.87
Prostate weight, gm	43.5 ± 15.4	49.7 ± 21.9	55.2 ± 20.8	<0.001
PSA, ng/mL	4.5 ± 1.9	4.6 ± 2.0	4.7 ± 2.0	1.0
PSA mass, µg	0.51 ± 0.21	0.56 ± 0.25	0.62 ± 0.27	0.01
PSA density, ng/mL/gm	0.11 ± 0.05	0.10 ± 0.05	0.09 ± 0.04	0.001
PSA mass density, µg/gm	0.012 ± 0.01	0.012 ± 0.01	0.012 ± 0.01	0.60
Tumor volume, cm ³	0.65 ± 0.89	0.67 ± 0.88	0.84 ± 1.16	0.82

^a Kruskal-Wallis test was used in calculation of p-values.

^b Six patients had missing BMI values and were excluded from this table.

Supplementary Table 2: Comparison of clinical and pathological parameters in patients with insignificant tumor volume in different BMI categories dichotomized according to gland weight

Tumor volume <0.5 cm ³													
Normal weight (BMI < 25), n=98			Overweight (BMI 25-29), n=178			Obese (≥30), n=67							
^a Median PW = 42.2			^a Median PW = 49.1			^a Median PW = 58		p-value ^b					
All (n=98)	< MPW (n=49)	≥ MPW (n=49)	All (n=178)	< MPW (n=89)	≥ MPW (n=89)	All (n=67)	< MPW (n=32)	≥ MPW (n=35)					
Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	p-value ^c	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	p-value ^c	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	p-value ^c					
BMI	23.1 ± 1.48	23.0 ± 1.7	23.3 ± 1.3	0.56	27.5 ± 1.4	27.5 ± 1.5	27.5 ± 1.3	0.77	33.0 ± 2.7	33.1 ± 2.3	32.8 ± 3.0	0.28	<0.001
Patient height, m	1.78 ± 0.06	1.77 ± 0.06	1.78 ± 0.1	0.39	1.78 ± 0.07	1.78 ± 0.06	1.78 ± 0.07	0.63	1.78 ± 0.07	1.78 ± 0.07	1.76 ± 0.07	0.40	0.78
Prostate weight, gm	46.3 ± 1.75	33.3 ± 6.37	59.3 ± 14.9	<0.001	52.8 ± 21.3	38.4 ± 7.3	67.3 ± 21.0	<0.001	62.2 ± 22.2	44.6 ± 8.0	78.3 ± 18.5	<0.001	<0.001
Tumor volume, cm ³	0.18 ± 0.13	0.19 ± 0.1	0.18 ± 0.1	0.6	0.18 ± 0.2	0.19 ± 0.2	0.16 ± 0.15	0.37	0.18 ± 0.1	0.21 ± 0.15	0.15 ± 0.1	0.19	0.52
PSA, ng/mL	4.3 ± 1.98	3.8 ± 1.8	4.8 ± 2.0	0.03	4.4 ± 2.1	3.6 ± 1.9	5.1 ± 2.1	<0.001	4.7 ± 2.3	3.5 ± 1.2	5.8 ± 2.4	<0.001	0.72
PSA mass, µg	0.48 ± 0.22	0.42 ± 0.2	0.54 ± 0.2	0.02	0.53 ± 0.3	0.44 ± 0.2	0.62 ± 0.3	<0.001	0.61 ± 0.3	0.46 ± 0.2	0.74 ± 0.3	<0.001	0.03
PSA density, ng/mL/gm	0.10 ± 0.05	0.11 ± 0.1	0.08 ± 0.04	0.003	0.09 ± 0.05	0.1 ± 0.1	0.08 ± 0.03	0.08	0.08 ± 0.03	0.08 ± 0.03	0.08 ± 0.03	0.51	0.02
PSA mass density, µg/gm	0.011 ± 0.01	0.013 ± 0.01	0.009 ± 0.004	0.002	0.011 ± 0.01	0.012 ± 0.01	0.01 ± 0.004	0.10	0.009 ± 0.003	0.01 ± 0.003	0.009 ± 0.004	0.32	0.52
PSA density > 0.15	14/98 (14%)	12/49	2/49	0.01	20/178 (11%)	17/87	3/91	0.001	0/67 (0%)	0/32	0/35	n/a	0.01
PSA mass density > 0.012	40/98 (41%)	29/49	11/49	<0.001	60/178 (34%)	35/87	25/91	0.10	25/67 (36%)	12/32	13/35	0.99	0.50

Abbreviations: BMI = body mass index; PW = prostate weight; MPW = median prostate weight.

^a prostates are dichotomized at a threshold of median prostate weight at each BMI category.

^b p-value applicable to general column (Kruskal-Wallis test for continuous and Fisher test for categorical variables).

^c p-value comparing distribution of findings in each BMI category.

Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney rank sum test (U test) was used for comparison of 2 sets of data.

Supplementary Table 3: Comparison of clinical and pathological parameters in patients with significant tumor volume in different BMI categories dichotomized according to gland weight

Tumor volume $\geq 0.5 \text{ cm}^3$													
Normal weight (BMI < 25), n=62			Overweight (BMI 25-29), n=127			Obese (≥ 30), n=49							
^a Median PW = 38.6			^a Median PW = 40.2			^a Median PW = 42.0			^b p-value ^b				
All (n=62)	< MPW (n=31)	\geq MPW (n=31)	All (n=127)	< MPW (n=64)	\geq MPW (n=63)	All (n=49)	< MPW (n=24)	\geq MPW (n=25)					
	Mean \pm SD	Mean \pm SD		Mean \pm SD	Mean \pm SD		Mean \pm SD	Mean \pm SD					
BMI	22.9 \pm 1.7	22.8 \pm 1.6	23.1 \pm 1.8	0.31	27.5 \pm 1.5	27.2 \pm 1.4	27.8 \pm 1.5	0.06	33.0 \pm 2.6	32.9 \pm 3.2	33.0 \pm 2.1	0.29	<0.001
Patient height, m	1.78 \pm 0.08	1.76 \pm 0.07	1.80 \pm 0.08	0.07	1.78 \pm 0.1	1.77 \pm 0.07	1.80 \pm 0.07	0.10	1.80 \pm 0.1	1.79 \pm 0.1	1.80 \pm 0.05	0.63	0.41
Prostate weight, gm	39.2 \pm 10.5	30.6 \pm 4.5	47.7 \pm 7.4	<0.001	45.3 \pm 22.1	31.9 \pm 5.1	58.9 \pm 24.3	<0.001	45.7 \pm 14.2	35.2 \pm 5.0	56.2 \pm 12.5	<0.001	0.06
Tumor volume, cm^3	1.38 \pm 1.1	1.36 \pm 0.8	1.41 \pm 1.3	0.67	1.37 \pm 1.0	1.41 \pm 1.1	1.3 \pm 0.9	0.70	1.73 \pm 1.3	1.54 \pm 1.0	1.92 \pm 1.6	0.60	0.45
PSA, ng/mL	4.9 \pm 1.6	4.3 \pm 1.4	5.5 \pm 1.6	0.01	5.0 \pm 1.8	4.6 \pm 1.8	5.3 \pm 1.7	0.02	4.7 \pm 1.5	4.3 \pm 1.5	5.0 \pm 1.4	0.03	0.60
PSA mass, μg	0.55 \pm 0.18	0.47 \pm 0.2	0.63 \pm 0.2	0.001	0.6 \pm 0.2	0.56 \pm 0.2	0.65 \pm 0.2	0.01	0.64 \pm 0.3	0.55 \pm 0.2	0.67 \pm 0.2	0.03	0.29
PSA density, ng/mL/gm	0.13 \pm 0.04	0.14 \pm 0.05	0.12 \pm 0.03	0.02	0.12 \pm 0.05	0.15 \pm 0.05	0.1 \pm 0.04	<0.001	0.11 \pm 0.04	0.12 \pm 0.04	0.09 \pm 0.03	0.02	0.02
PSA mass density, $\mu\text{g}/\text{gm}$	0.014 \pm 0.004	0.016 \pm 0.005	0.013 \pm 0.003	0.04	0.015 \pm 0.006	0.018 \pm 0.006	0.012 \pm 0.005	<0.001	0.015 \pm 0.008	0.016 \pm 0.005	0.012 \pm 0.004	0.02	0.86
PSA density > 0.15	19/62 (31%)	14/31	5/31	0.03	32/127 (25%)	25/63	7/64	<0.001	6/49 (0.1%)	5/24	1/25	0.17	0.07
PSA mass density > 0.012	44/62 (71%)	23/31	21/31	0.78	80/127 (63%)	52/63	28/64	0.10	33/49 (67%)	19/24	14/25	0.15	0.54

Abbreviations: BMI = body mass index; PW = prostate weight; MPW = median prostate weight.

^a prostates are dichotomized at a threshold of median prostate weight at each BMI category.

^b p-value applicable to general column (Kruskal-Wallis test for continuous and Fisher test for categorical variables).

^c p-value comparing distribution of findings in each BMI category.

Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney rank sum test (U test) was used for comparison of 2 sets of data.

Supplementary Table 4: Univariable linear regression models to examine PSA derivatives in predicting for total tumor volume within racial/ethnic groups

Variable	All (n=589)		NHW (n=390)		NHB (n=87)		Hispanic/Latino (n=78)		Other (n=34)	
	R-square	p-value	R-square	p-value	R-square	p-value	R-square	p-value	R-square	p-value
PSA, ng/mL	0.030	<0.001	0.018	0.01	0.027	0.08	0.078	0.01	0.022	0.40
PSA density, ng/mL/gm	0.098	<0.001	0.090	<0.001	0.152	<0.001	0.176	<0.001	0.148	0.03
PSA mass, μ g	0.032	<0.001	0.021	0.003	0.030	0.06	0.080	0.01	0.016	0.48
PSA mass density, μ g/gm	0.107	<0.001	0.099	<0.001	0.164	<0.001	0.187	<0.001	0.148	0.03

Abbreviations: NHW = Non-Hispanic White; NHB = Non-Hispanic Black.

R-square denotes a goodness-of-fit measure of linear regression model. P-value is reported for regression coefficient of PSA and its derivatives. These results are based on linear regression models using log-transformed total tumor volume and PSA and its derivatives.

Supplementary Table 5: Analysis of correlation between tumor volume of prostate cancer and PSA and its derivatives

Variable	<i>All</i> ^a		<i>All</i> ^b		<i>Non-Hispanic White</i> ^b	<i>Non-Hispanic Black</i> ^b	<i>Hispanic/Latino</i> ^b	<i>Other</i> ^b
	r	p-value	r	r	r	r	r	r
<i>PSA, ng/mL</i>	0.172	<0.001	0.177	0.142	0.194	0.300	0.194	
<i>PSA density</i>	0.319	<0.001	0.316	0.303	0.402	0.432	0.184	
<i>PSA mass</i>	0.178	<0.001	0.182	0.152	0.204	0.303	0.192	
<i>PSA mass density</i>	0.334	<0.001	0.330	0.318	0.417	0.445	0.188	

Abbreviations: r = Pearson's correlation coefficient.

^a Partial correlation coefficient with adjustment of age.

^b Unadjusted correlation coefficient using log-transformed value.

Supplementary Table 6: Multivariable analysis of PSA derivatives prediction of tumor volume at radical prostatectomy

Variable	R-square	p-value
<i>PSA, ng/mL</i>	0.035	<0.001
<i>PSA density</i>	0.115	<0.001
<i>PSA mass</i>	0.037	<0.001
<i>PSA mass density</i>	0.125	<0.001

*Age was included in the model for the adjustment.

R-square denotes a goodness-of-fit measure of linear regression model. p-value is reported for regression coefficient of PSA and its derivatives. These results are based on linear regression models using log-transformed total tumor volume and PSA and its derivatives.