

Adjvant and Salvage Radiotherapy after Prostatectomy: ASTRO/AUA Guideline Amendment 2018-2019



Thomas M. Pisansky, Ian M. Thompson, Richard K. Valicenti, Anthony V. D'Amico
and Shalini Selvarajah

From the American Urological Association Education and Research, Inc., Linthicum, Maryland and the American Society for Radiation Oncology, Arlington, Virginia

Purpose: The purpose of this amendment is to incorporate newly-published literature into the original ASTRO/AUA Adjvant and Salvage Radiotherapy after Prostatectomy Guideline and to provide an updated clinical framework for clinicians.

Materials and Methods: The original systematic review yielded 294 studies published between January 1990 and December 2012. In April 2018, the guideline underwent an amendment and incorporated 155 references that were published from January 1990 through December 2017. Two new key questions were added. One on the use of genomic classifiers and the other on the treatment of oligo-metastases with radiation post-radical prostatectomy.

Results: A new statement on the use of hormone therapy with salvage radiotherapy after radical prostatectomy was added and long-term data was used to update an existing statement on adjvant radiotherapy. The balance of the guideline statements were re-affirmed and references were added to the existing literature base. A discussion on the use of genomic classifiers as a risk stratification tool was added to the future research discussion. No relevant data on oligo-metastases was found.

Conclusions: Hormone therapy should be offered to patients who have had radical prostatectomy and who are candidates for salvage radiotherapy. The clinician should discuss possible short- and long-term side effects with the patient as well as the potential benefits of preventing recurrence. The decision to use hormone therapy should be made by the patient and a multi-disciplinary team of providers with full consideration of the patient's history, values, preferences, quality of life, and functional status.

Key Words: prostatic neoplasms, radiation, salvage therapy

Abbreviations and Acronyms

3D-CRT	= 3-dimensional conformal radiotherapy
ART	= adjvant radiotherapy
ASTRO	= American Society for Radiation Oncology
AUA	= American Urological Association
EORTC	= European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer
Gy	= gray
OS	= overall survival
PSA	= prostatic specific antigen
RCT	= randomized controlled trial
RP	= radical prostatectomy
RT	= radiotherapy
RTOG	= Radiation Therapy Oncology Group
SRT	= salvage radiotherapy

Accepted for publication April 17, 2019.

The complete unabridged version of the guideline amendment is available at <https://www.jurology.com>.

This document is being printed as submitted independent of editorial or peer review by the editors of *The Journal of Urology*®.

This article is also published in print and electronic format in *Practical Radiation Oncology*, ©2019 by the American Society for Radiation Oncology.

GUIDELINE PURPOSE

The purpose of this guideline is to provide direction to clinicians and patients regarding the use of radiotherapy (RT) after radical prostatectomy (RP) in the adjvant or salvage setting. The strategies and approaches recommended in the guideline were derived from evidence-based and consensus-based processes. This document constitutes a clinical strategy; therefore, the most

effective treatment approach for a particular patient is best determined by the patient, his family, and a multi-disciplinary team of providers using the shared decision-making model.

METHODOLOGY

For the original 2013 guideline, literature searches were performed on English-language publications using the PubMed, Embase and the Cochrane database for

Systematic Reviews from January 1990 to December 2012 (DOI: [10.1016/j.juro.2013.05.032](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2013.05.032)). Preclinical studies (e.g., animal models), commentaries and editorials were excluded. Only studies in which prostate-specific antigen (PSA) data were provided for 75% or more of patients were included. References from review articles were checked to ensure inclusion of all possibly relevant studies. Multiple reports on the same patient group were carefully examined to ensure inclusion of only non-redundant information. The original systematic review yielded an evidence base of 294 articles from which to construct a clinical framework for the use of RT after RP.

In April 2018, the guideline was amended to maintain currency through a process in which newly published high quality literature was identified, reviewed and integrated into the original 2013 guideline. For this amendment, an identical approach was implemented to examine peer-reviewed articles published and indexed between September 2012 and December 2017. The Panel also added two new key questions. One concerned the use of genomic classifiers to predict treatment outcomes in the RT after RP setting. The second focused on the treatment of oligo-metastases with RT post-RP (no relevant data on oligo-metastases was found). A new search strategy was developed to identify literature relevant to these two new key questions. This search was conducted from January 1990 to December 2017 to ensure uniformity with the search period used to explore the questions from the original guideline. Both searches yielded a total of 2,516 references of which 2,361 were excluded after deduplication and title and abstract review. Full texts were retrieved for 155 references for more detailed review. Using the best evidence approach, three randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were evaluated in detail to produce this amendment.

For a complete discussion of the methodology and evidence grading, please refer to the unabridged guideline amendment available at <https://www.jurology.com>.

LIMITATIONS OF THE LITERATURE

Limitations of the RT after RP literature included: few RCTs; lack of group equivalence in pathological risk factors in observational studies; variability in PSA assay sensitivity and failure criteria; heterogeneity of RT dose and methods; paucity of studies with follow-up duration longer than 60 months; and overwhelming focus on biochemical recurrence. Less information was available regarding metastatic recurrence, cancer-specific survival, and overall survival (OS). In addition, few studies focused on important quality of life outcomes such as voiding and erectile function.

BACKGROUND

Prevalence

In 2018, an estimated 164,690 men were diagnosed with prostate cancer.¹ RP constitutes a cure in approximately two-thirds of such men, but up to one-third of patients manifest recurrent disease

within 10 years.^{2–5} Recurrence risk is greater among men with adverse pathology such as positive surgical margins, seminal vesicle invasion, extra-prostatic extension, and higher Gleason scores.^{6–12}

Definitions

Adjuvant RT (ART) is the administration of RT post-RP to patients at a higher risk of recurrence because of adverse pathological features prior to evidence of disease recurrence (i.e., with an undetectable PSA). Salvage RT (SRT) is the administration of RT to the prostatic bed and possibly to the surrounding tissues, including lymph nodes, in the patient with PSA recurrence after surgery but no evidence of distant metastatic disease. Biochemical recurrence after surgery is defined as a detectable PSA level ≥ 0.2 ng/mL with a second confirmatory level > 0.2 ng/mL.

ART

The highest-quality evidence that addresses the use of RT after RP is provided by three RCTs with ten years of follow-up data that examined the effect of RT delivered primarily as ART. However, it is important to note that all three RCTs were powered for different primary outcomes. The primary outcome for the SWOG 8794 trial was metastases-free survival; the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) 22911 used clinical progression-free survival as the primary outcome; and biochemical progression-free survival was the primary endpoint in the ARO 96-02 trial.^{13–16}

ART vs. SRT

A pressing clinical question is whether it is better to administer RT in an ART context (before recurrence) after RP, or as SRT (after detection of recurrence). The use of ART involves irradiation of some patients who never would have had recurrent cancer, exposing them unnecessarily to the side effects of RT. Administering RT as SRT limits its use to patients with recurrence but, particularly in patients with high-risk disease, could theoretically allow progression to metastatic disease.

The Panel attempted to address this issue by examining observational studies that reported outcomes for ART and SRT patients. These studies lack randomization and differ in patient characteristics, RT protocols, failure definitions, and follow-up durations. In addition, most of the published literature reports findings from the use of older RT techniques, making it unclear whether newer techniques might result in fewer apparent differences between ART and SRT outcomes. Overall, the existing literature could not answer this question.

Radiotherapy Techniques

The Panel attempted to determine which RT techniques and doses produced optimal outcomes in the ART and SRT contexts. It was not possible to answer these questions from the available data.

Approximately one-third of the ART and SRT observational studies looked at patients treated with two-dimensional “conventional” methods, which have since been replaced by three-dimensional conformal RT (3D-CRT) or intensity-modulated RT. The published literature does not reflect implementation of these newer methods adequately. With regard to the RCTs of ART, SWOG 8794 and EORTC 22911 administered RT using “conventional” techniques;^{13,14} ARO 96-02 administered RT using 3D-CRT.^{15,16} The lack of high quality studies using newer RT methods made it difficult to definitively address the question of optimal methods and whether these might differ in the ART vs. SRT settings.

Among observational studies, RT doses ranged from 50-78 gray (Gy) where SRT studies administered somewhat higher dosages than ART studies. Although RT dose-escalation improves freedom from biochemical and (possibly) distant metastatic relapse when used as primary treatment for localized prostate cancer, RCTs have not reported the optimal post-RP RT dose. Clinical data suggest that doses above 65 Gy can be safely delivered and may lead to improved tumor control.¹⁷⁻²¹ In the SWOG 8794, EORTC 22911, and ARO 96-02 RCTs, the majority of patients were treated with 60 Gy.

In the Panel’s view, 64-65 Gy is the minimum dose that should be delivered post-RP but decisions regarding dose should be made by the treating physician who has full knowledge of the patient’s functional status, history, and toxicity tolerance. The Panel notes that there is controversy regarding RT targets and field size.²²⁻²⁵

Use of Hormone Therapy

A key question is whether, when, for how long, and in what form hormone therapy should be administered. The literature review attempted to address these questions by examining studies that focused on the use of hormone therapy in patients who underwent RP and then ART or SRT. Two RCTs evaluated the effects of hormone therapy on OS, and on biochemical and clinical progression-free survival among participants who received SRT after RP. The Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG) 9601 trial of SRT with or without 24 months of bicalutamide (150 mg daily) had 13 years of follow-up, while the GETUG-AFU 16 trial examined the effects of SRT with or without 10.8 mg subcutaneous goserelin acetate given on the first day of RT, and again 3 months later, had 5 years of

follow-up.^{26,27} Together, the Panel concluded that these provided sufficient evidence to develop a new statement (see Guideline Statement 9).

The Panel could not provide guidance on the use of hormone therapy in the ART setting given the methodological weaknesses of this literature. These weaknesses include non-randomized study designs, small sample sizes, lack of group equivalence on pathological risk factors, large variations in hormonal therapy protocols, primary focus on biochemical recurrence, and other differences relevant to efficacy such as differences in RT techniques, targets, and total dosage administered. RCTs in this area will be needed to provide definitive evidence.

Genomic Classifiers to Predict Treatment Effectiveness

For this amendment, the Panel examined a new question to determine if there are genomic classifiers that could predict treatment effectiveness in this patient population. There were six retrospective studies and one Markov decision analysis using the Decipher™ classifier demonstrating its prognostic association with disease progression, focusing particularly on distant metastases after RP (references 314-320 in unabridged guideline amendment, <https://www.jurology.com>). A 24-gene post-operative RT outcomes score (PORTOS) profile has also been described, as has a 50-gene (PAM50) molecular subtyping of basal and luminal cell lineage.^{28,29}

Further evaluation is needed to determine whether genomic classifiers are predictive of a particular treatment effect in a yet-to-be-treated patient, and the Panel concluded that the present level of evidence cannot discern whether genomic classifiers can predict the efficacy, or lack thereof, of ART or SRT after RP. The timing (ART, early SRT, late SRT), type, targeted volume, and dosage of RT, and the use and duration of hormonal therapy are confounding variables that limit certainty in the interpretation of the current literature.

GUIDELINE AMENDMENTS

The 2018 amendment literature search did not uncover additional information that would alter Statement 1, Statements 3-8, and Statement 10 (formerly Statement 9). They remain unchanged from the 2013 publication of this guideline; all new references have been added to the evidence base. The amended guideline focuses on Statement 2, which was revised to reflect the presence of 10-year data from ARO 96-02; only 5-year data was available from this trial during the publication of the original guideline. In addition, evidence from the RTOG 9601 and the GETUG-AFU 16 trials formed the evidence base to write a new guideline statement on the use of hormone therapy in patients

receiving SRT after RP. A discussion on the use of genomic classifiers as a risk stratification tool was added to the future research discussion.

Guideline Statement 2: Patients with adverse pathologic findings including seminal vesicle invasion, positive surgical margins, and extraprostatic extension should be informed that adjuvant radiotherapy, compared to radical prostatectomy only, reduces the risk of biochemical recurrence, local recurrence, and clinical progression of cancer. They should also be informed that the impact of adjuvant radiotherapy on subsequent metastases and overall survival is less clear; one of three randomized controlled trials that addressed these outcomes indicated a benefit but the other two trials did not demonstrate a benefit. However, these two trials were not designed to identify a significant reduction in metastasis or death with adjuvant radiotherapy. (Clinical Principle).

Patients should be counseled that high-quality evidence indicates that use of ART in patients with adverse pathology reduces the risk of biochemical recurrence, local recurrence, and clinical progression. Three RCTs (SWOG 8794, EORTC 22911, and ARO 96-02) with more than 10 years of follow-up evaluated the effects of ART among patients with adverse pathology. All trials documented significant improvements in biochemical recurrence-free survival with the use of ART compared to RP only (see figure). Patients should be informed that the impact of ART on metastases and OS is less clear, with benefits reported only in one of the three trials with long-term data on these outcomes.

Guideline Statement 9: Clinicians should offer hormone therapy to patients treated with salvage radiotherapy (postoperative PSA ≥ 0.20 ng/mL). Ongoing research may someday allow personalized selection of hormonal or other therapies within patient subsets. (Standard; Evidence Strength: Grade A).

Two RCTs (RTOG 9601 and GETUG-AFU 16) evaluated the effects of hormone therapy on OS and on biochemical and clinical progression among patients who received SRT after RP.^{26,27} RTOG 9601 reported longer term outcomes, and provided the opportunity to observe a significant advantage in OS at 12 years follow-up with 24-month duration of high-dose (150 mg daily) bicalutamide. The trial also reported reductions in the cumulative


incidences of distant metastasis, biochemical recurrence, and death attributed to prostate cancer. Improved survival outcomes were also observed in certain subgroups in RTOG 9601, namely in patients with higher Gleason score, trial entry PSA 0.7 ng/mL – 4.0 ng/mL, and those with positive surgical margins. However, RTOG 9601 was not designed to test the effect of bicalutamide in prespecified subgroups, so it is unknown whether there is lack of benefit in other subgroups.

GETUG-AFU 16 had a primary outcome of progression-free survival, mainly a biochemical recurrence-free survival endpoint, and documented significant improvements in freedom from disease progression, which was observed in all prognostic subgroups. There was however no difference in OS at five years, but the study was not designed to detect any difference until ten years of follow-up.

Based on findings from these two RCTs, the Panel recommends that clinicians offer hormone therapy to candidates for SRT, namely patients with postoperative PSA ≥ 0.2 ng/mL and no distant metastasis. When hormone therapy is offered, the clinician should discuss possible short- and long-term side effects with the patient as well as the potential benefits of preventing recurrence. The decision to use hormone therapy should be made by the patient and a multi-disciplinary team of providers using the shared decision-making model, taking into account the patient's history, values, preferences, quality of life, and functional status.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS: GENOMIC CLASSIFIERS

The Decipher™ genomics resource information database has been recently used to link genomic findings with clinical outcomes, as have other methods. A genomic classifier as a predictive marker will identify individuals in whom the effectiveness of a controlled treatment method varies as a direct result of the marker, and as it relates to a particular outcome. At present, there is ongoing recruitment to a RCT conducted by NRG Oncology (GU002) that uses Decipher™ as a pre-randomization stratification factor with participants categorized into low/intermediate genomic classifier score and high



Meta-analysis of biochemical recurrence data from SWOG 8794, EORTC 22911, and ARO 96-02

genomic classifier score. Participants are then randomized to receive either SRT with hormonal therapy or the same with chemotherapy. Treatment response by genetically defined subsets of patients will be used to assess whether the genomic classifier predicted response to chemotherapy.

DISCLAIMER

This document was written by the Prostate Guidelines Panel of the American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) and the American Urological Association Education and Research, Inc. (AUA). Both the Guidelines Committee of ASTRO and the Practice Guidelines Committee of the AUA selected the panel. Membership of the committee included urologists, radiation oncologists, and a medical oncologist, with specific expertise on this disorder. The mission of the committee was to develop recommendations that are analysis-based or consensus-based, depending on Panel processes and available data, for optimal clinical practices in the diagnosis and treatment of prostate cancer.

Funding of the committee was provided by ASTRO and the AUA. Committee members received no remuneration for their work. Each member of the committee provides an ongoing conflict of interest disclosure to ASTRO and the AUA.

While these guidelines do not necessarily establish the standard of care, ASTRO/AUA seek to recommend and to encourage compliance by practitioners with current best practices related to the condition being treated. As medical knowledge expands and technology advances, the guidelines will change. Today these evidence-based guidelines statements represent not absolute mandates but provisional proposals for treatment under the specific conditions described in each document. Furthermore, this Guideline should not be deemed inclusive of all proper methods of care or exclusive of other methods of care reasonably directed to obtaining the same results. The ultimate judgment and propriety of any specific therapy must be made by the physician and the patient in light of all the circumstances presented by the individual patient. For all these reasons, the guidelines do not preempt physician judgment in individual cases.

Treating physicians must take into account variations in resources, and patient tolerances, needs, and preferences. Conformance with any clinical guideline does not guarantee a successful outcome. The guideline text may include information or recommendations about certain drug uses ("off label") that are not approved by the Food and Drug Administration, or about medications or substances not subject to the Food and Drug Administration approval process. ASTRO/AUA urge strict compliance with all government regulations and protocols for

prescription and use of these substances. The physician is encouraged to carefully follow all available prescribing information about indications, contraindications, precautions and warnings. These guidelines and best practice statements are not intended to provide legal advice about use and misuse of these substances.

ASTRO/AUA assume no liability for the information, conclusions, and findings contained in the Guideline.

Although guidelines are intended to encourage best practices and potentially encompass available technologies with sufficient data as of close of the literature review, they are necessarily time-limited and are prepared on the basis of information available at the time the panel was conducting its research on this topic. Guidelines cannot include evaluation of all data on emerging technologies or management, including those that are FDA-approved, which may immediately come to represent accepted clinical practices. For this reason, ASTRO/AUA does not regard technologies or management which are too new to be addressed by this Guideline as necessarily experimental or investigational. In addition, this Guideline cannot be assumed to apply to the use of these interventions performed in the context of clinical trials, given that clinical studies are designed to evaluate or validate innovative approaches in a disease for which improved staging and treatment are needed or are being explored.

This Guideline presents scientific, health, and safety information and may to some extent reflect scientific or medical opinion. It is made available to ASTRO and AUA members, and to the public, for educational and informational purposes only. Any commercial use of any content in this Guideline without the prior written consent of ASTRO or AUA is strictly prohibited.

PANEL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

AUA/ASTRO would like to recognize the members of the Adjuvant and Salvage Radiotherapy after Prostatectomy: ASTRO/AUA Guideline panel for their contributions to the development of the original guideline that served as a basis for this amendment: Ian M. Thompson, Richard K. Valicenti, Peter Albertsen, Brian J. Davis, S. Larry Goldenberg, Carol Hahn, Eric Klein, Jeff Michalski, Mack Roach, Oliver Sartor, J. Stuart Wolf and Martha M. Faraday.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES

Consultant/Advisor: Ian Thompson, Threshold, Harvard University, Rapamycin Holdings. Scientific Study or Trial: Ian Thompson, SWOG, MagForce, Exosome Diagnostics.

REFERENCES

1. American Cancer Society: Key statistics for prostate cancer. 2018; <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/prostate-cancer/about/key-statistics.html>. Accessed September 25, 2018.
2. Amling CL, Blute ML, Bergstrahl EJ et al: Long-term hazard of progression after radical prostatectomy for clinically localized prostate cancer: continued risk of biochemical failure after 5 years. *J Urol* 2000; **164**: 101.
3. Chun FK, Graefen M, Zacharias M et al: Anatomic radical retropubic prostatectomy-long-term recurrence-free survival rates for localized prostate cancer. *World J Urol* 2006; **24**: 273.
4. Han M, Partin AW, Pound CR et al: Long-term biochemical disease-free and cancer-specific survival following anatomic radical retropubic prostatectomy. The 15-year Johns Hopkins experience. *Urol Clin North Am* 2001; **28**: 555.
5. Bianco FJ, Jr, Scardino PT and Eastham JA: Radical prostatectomy: long-term cancer control and recovery of sexual and urinary function ("trifecta"). *Urology* 2005; **66**: 83.
6. Stephenson AJ, Scardino PT, Eastham JA et al: Preoperative nomogram predicting the 10-year probability of prostate cancer recurrence after radical prostatectomy. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006; **98**: 715.
7. Swindle P, Eastham JA, Ohori M et al: Do margins matter? The prognostic significance of positive surgical margins in radical prostatectomy specimens. *J Urol* 2005; **174**: 903.
8. Kupelian PA, Katcher J, Levin HS et al: Stage T1-2 prostate cancer: a multivariate analysis of factors affecting biochemical and clinical failures after radical prostatectomy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1997; **37**: 1043.
9. Lee HM, Solan MJ, Lupinacci P et al: Long-term outcome of patients with prostate cancer and pathologic seminal vesicle invasion (pT3b): effect of adjuvant radiotherapy. *Urology* 2004; **64**: 84.
10. Ohori M, Wheeler TM, Kattan MW et al: Prognostic significance of positive surgical margins in radical prostatectomy specimens. *J Urol* 1995; **154**: 1818.
11. Lowe BA and Lieberman SF: Disease recurrence and progression in untreated pathologic stage T3 prostate cancer: selecting the patient for adjuvant therapy. *J Urol* 1997; **158**: 1452.
12. Pound CR, Partin AW, Eisenberger MA et al: Natural history of progression after PSA elevation following radical prostatectomy. *JAMA* 1999; **281**: 1591.
13. Thompson IM Jr, Tangen CM, Paradiso J et al: Adjuvant radiotherapy for pathologically advanced prostate cancer: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2006; **296**: 2329.
14. Bolla M, van Poppel H, Collette L et al: Post-operative radiotherapy after radical prostatectomy: a randomised controlled trial (EORTC trial 22911). *Lancet* 2005; **366**: 572.
15. Wiegel T, Bottke D, Steiner U et al: Phase III postoperative adjuvant radiotherapy after radical prostatectomy compared with radical prostatectomy alone in pT3 prostate cancer with post-operative undetectable prostate-specific antigen: ARO 96-02/AUO AP 09/95. *J Clin Oncol* 2009; **27**: 2924.
16. Wiegel T, Bartkowiak D, Bottke D et al: Adjuvant radiotherapy versus wait-and-see after radical prostatectomy: 10-year follow-up of the ARO 96-02/AUO AP 09/95 trial. *Eur Urol* 2014; **66**: 243.
17. Bernard JR, Jr, Buskirk SJ, Heckman MG et al: Salvage radiotherapy for rising prostate-specific antigen levels after radical prostatectomy for prostate cancer: dose-response analysis. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2010; **76**: 735.
18. Cozzarini C, Montorsi F, Fiorino C et al: Need for high radiation dose (>or=70 Gy) in early post-operative irradiation after radical prostatectomy: a single-institution analysis of 334 high-risk, node-negative patients. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2009; **75**: 966.
19. King CR and Spiotto MT: Improved outcomes with higher doses for salvage radiotherapy after prostatectomy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008; **71**: 23.
20. Siegmann A, Bottke D, Faehndrich J et al: Dose escalation for patients with decreasing PSA during radiotherapy for elevated PSA after radical prostatectomy improves biochemical progression-free survival: results of a retrospective study. *Strahlenther Onkol* 2011; **187**: 467.
21. Ohri N, Dicker AP, Trabulsi EJ et al: Can early implementation of salvage radiotherapy for prostate cancer improve the therapeutic ratio? A systematic review and regression meta-analysis with radiobiological modelling. *Eur J Cancer* 2012; **48**: 837.
22. Michalski JM, Lawton C, El Naqa I et al: Development of RTOG consensus guidelines for the definition of the clinical target volume for postoperative conformal radiation therapy for prostate cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2010; **76**: 361.
23. Sidhom MA, Kneebone AB, Lehman M et al: Post-prostatectomy radiation therapy: consensus guidelines of the Australian and New Zealand Radiation Oncology Genito-Urinary Group. *Radiother Oncol* 2008; **88**: 10.
24. Wiltshire KL, Brock KK, Haider MA et al: Anatomic boundaries of the clinical target volume (prostate bed) after radical prostatectomy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2007; **69**: 1090.
25. Poortmans P, Bossi A, Vandeputte K et al: Guidelines for target volume definition in post-operative radiotherapy for prostate cancer, on behalf of the EORTC Radiation Oncology Group. *Radiother Oncol* 2007; **84**: 121.
26. Shipley WU, Seiferheld W, Lukka HR et al: Radiation with or without antiandrogen therapy in recurrent prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2017; **376**: 417.
27. Carrie C, Hasbini A, de Laroche G et al: Salvage radiotherapy with or without short-term hormone therapy for rising prostate-specific antigen concentration after radical prostatectomy (GETUG-AFU 16): a randomised, multicentre, open-label phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2016; **17**: 747.
28. Zhao SG, Chang SL, Spratt DE et al: Development and validation of a 24-gene predictor of response to postoperative radiotherapy in prostate cancer: a matched, retrospective analysis. *Lancet Oncol* 2016; **17**: 1612.
29. Zhao SG, Chang SL, Erho N et al: Associations of luminal and basal subtyping of prostate cancer with prognosis and response to androgen deprivation therapy. *JAMA Oncol* 2017; **3**: 1663.