

Something About Prostate Cancer

Andrew Bates

November 15, 2018

Executive Summary

This is the executive summary. Unfortunately, it has to be typed in the .yaml header. The only other thing i can think of is to have a separate file for the abstract. I'm not sure I want to do this. But actually, this may not be so bad. Each section could have a different file. this might make things a bit easier to edit. because then i would only have to look at say, the conclusion file instead of having to scroll all the way down, passing it, scrolling up, passing it, etc.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we investigate the relationship between the results of various prostate related exams and whether tumor penetration of the prostatic capsule has occurred. The objective of this analysis is to determine if there are any factors that have a particularly influential relationship with prostatic capsule penetration. Additionally, we wish to develop a model to predict capsule penetration so it can be used as a diagnostic tool for future patients.

2 Methods

In this analysis we examine a subset of data collected by the Ohio State University Comprehensive Cancer Center as part of a study to determine the potential of standard exam results to predict whether a tumor will penetrate the prostatic capsule. Out of 380 patients, 153 have experienced capsule penetration and 227 have not. The data set contains six explanatory variables: the patients age and race, results of a digital rectal exam (DRE), whether capsular involvement was detected, Prostatic Specific Antigen (PSA) value, and total Gleason score. For a detailed description of each variable see Table 1. Observe that race is recorded as only Black or White. This may be the reason why three observations contain missing values for race. Perhaps three of the patients were neither Black nor White. However, without access to details of the study and the population considered, we can only speculate. Furthermore, the other variables in these observations do not point to any particular reason as to why race is not recorded¹. Because of this, we decided to omit these three observations. The data set used for analysis then, consists of 377 observations. Of these, 151 patients have experienced tumor penetration of the prostatic capsule, and 226 have not.

To investigate the relationship between the covariates and tumor penetration status, we use a logistic regression model. The response is especially well balanced with 40% of the observations having capsular penetration and 60% not having penetration. As such, procedures designed to assist with class imbalances, such as downsampling, are not considered in this analysis. In addition to the explanatory variables included in the data set, all two-way interaction terms are examined. Using this as a starting point, the model is chosen via a backwards elimination procedure using Akaike

¹As in, some have experienced capsule penetration, the ages and PSA scores vary significantly across the observations, etc.

Table 1: Description of variables in the data set.

Name	Description	Details
penetrate	Tumor penetration of prostatic capsule?	Yes, no
age	Patient age	Years
race	Patient race	Black, White
dre	Results of digital rectal exam	No nodule, unilobar left, unilobar right, bilobar
caps	Detection of capsular involvement?	Yes, no
psa	Prostatic Specific Antigen value	mg/ml
gleason	Total Gleason score	0-10

Table 2: Results of digital rectal exam vs. whether tumor penetration of prostatic capsule occurred, marginalized by the digital rectal exam results.

	DRE Result			
	no nodule	unilobar left	unilobar right	bilobar
No Penetration	80.8	63.4	47.4	34.6
Penetration	19.2	36.6	52.6	65.4

Information Criteria (AIC) as the model selection criterion. (variable name) is not significant at the 0.05 level so it is subsequently removed, along with its corresponding interaction terms.

Diagnostics take the form of examining explanatory variable patterns. also do blah test.

log odds ratios were calculated, and predictions were made. predictive power was examined through a confusion matrix. What's more important here, false negatives or false positives?

3 Analysis

3.1 Exploratory Analysis

We begin by inspecting tables of the categorical variables against whether tumor penetration has occurred. Rather than examining contingency tables of counts, we find it more informative to view tables marginalized by the covariates. This provides more context by allowing us to see, for example, the proportion of Black patients who had tumor penetration and the proportion who did not. Table 2 displays the proportion of patients who did and did not experience tumor penetration of the prostatic capsule grouped by the results of a digital rectal exam. It shows that the majority of patients who do not have a nodule have not experience tumor penetration. For those patients who did have a nodule, the rate of tumor penetration is reversed. The most pronounced difference is for patients who had a bilobar nodule with 65% experiencing tumor penetration. The relationship we see here tells us that DRE results will likely be a valuable predictor.

The relationship for the remaining categorical variables can be found in Tables 3 to 5 in the appendix. For detection of capsular involvement and Gleason score, we find a similar story as DRE results. For patients where capsular involvement was detected, tumor penetration occurred at more than twice the rate than patients where involvement was not detected (35% vs. 75%). As Gleason score

increases from zero to nine, the tumor penetration rate increases from zero to 92%. Where we do not see a significant change in the rate of tumor penetration is with race. Both Black and White patients have a tumor penetration rate of approximately 40%.

3.2 Modeling and Diagnostics

blah blah blah blah blah blah blah blah

4 Conclusion

Table 3: Race vs. whether tumor penetration of prostatic capsule has occurred, marginalized by race.

	Race	
	white	black
No Penetration	59.8	61.1
Penetration	40.2	38.9

Table 4: Detection of capsular involvement vs. whether tumor penetration of prostatic capsule occurred, marginalized by capsular involvement.

	Capsular Involvement	
	no	yes
No Penetration	64.1	25.0
Tumor Penetration	35.9	75.0

Appendix

A Exploratory Analysis

A.1 Tables

A.2 Figures

B Model Building and Diagnostics

B.1 Intermediate Models

B.2 Diagnostics

C R Code

Table 5: Total Gleason score vs. whether tumor penetration of prostatic capsule occurred, marginalized by Gleason score.

	Gleason Score						
	0	4	5	6	7	8	9
No Penetration	100.0	100.0	91.0	72.5	43.3	20.7	7.7
Tumor Penetration	0.0	0.0	9.0	27.5	56.7	79.3	92.3