

# TRANSRECTAL BIOPSY OF PROSTATE: IS IT OUR PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE?

**Khudaybergenov U.A.<sup>1,2</sup>, Ollayorov A.A.<sup>1,2</sup>, Shomarufov A.B.<sup>1,2</sup>, Kasimov S.S.<sup>1,2</sup>**

1 – Urology Department, Tashkent Medical Academy, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

2 – Polyclinics, Republican Specialized Scientific-Practical Medical Center of Urology, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2024.v19.i02.S1.pp47-49>

## KEYWORDS

*diagnostic  
 biopsy strategies  
 ultrasound-guided  
 antibiotic prophylaxis  
 transrectal biopsy  
 health  
 diagnostic methods*

Received on :

05.03.2024

Accepted on

21.05.2024

\*Corresponding  
 author

## ABSTRACT

Among diagnostic tools for the early detection of prostate cancer, transrectal biopsy of the prostate has emerged as a pivotal procedure, allowing clinicians to obtain tissue samples for pathological examination and subsequent treatment planning. This comprehensive literature review aims to delve into the historical evolution, current practices, complications, complication solutions, and future perspectives of transrectal prostate biopsy, synthesizing findings from a wide range of studies and contributing to the ongoing discourse in urological oncology.

## INTRODUCTION

Prostate cancer, a formidable health challenge globally, underscores the critical need for precise diagnostic methods to guide effective management strategies. Transrectal biopsy of the prostate stands out as a cornerstone in this diagnostic arsenal, enabling clinicians to procure tissue samples crucial for pathological analysis and tailored treatment plans. The journey of transrectal biopsy, from its historical roots to contemporary practices, reflects a quest for enhanced diagnostic accuracy and therapeutic efficacy.

Studies by Epstein JI et al. (2019) [1], Borboroglu PG et al. (2000) [2], and Presti JC Jr et al. (2000) [3] have significantly contributed to refining transrectal biopsy protocols. These studies have elucidated optimal sampling techniques, the role of advanced imaging modalities such as multiparametric MRI (mpMRI), and the utility of targeted biopsy strategies, leading to improved diagnostic yields and patient outcomes.

The landscape of transrectal biopsy is dynamic, marked by continuous advancements in biopsy protocols and imaging-guided techniques. Recent works by Ahmed HU et al. (2017) [4], Kasivisvanathan V et al. (2018) [5], and Valerio M et al. (2017) [6] emphasize the importance of optimizing biopsy techniques, including core sampling procedures, leveraging advanced imaging modalities such as multiparametric MRI (mpMRI), and employing targeted biopsy approaches. These innovations not only enhance diagnostic accuracy but also reduce unnecessary biopsies, fostering a patient-centered approach and evidence-based practices.

This review aimed to assess the historical development, current practices, complications, and future prospects of transrectal ultrasound-guided prostate biopsy.

## HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Transrectal biopsy of the prostate has a rich historical background, evolving from early blind biopsies to the sophisticated techniques used today. Early methods, relying solely on digital rectal examination (DRE) for biopsy guidance, often yielded inadequate samples and diagnostic accuracy. For example, a study by Hodge et al. (2003) [1] highlighted the limitations of blind biopsies, paving

the way for advancements in biopsy procedures.

The introduction of transrectal ultrasound (TRUS) in the 1980s marked a significant milestone in prostate biopsy techniques. TRUS allowed for real-time imaging of the prostate gland during biopsy, improving sampling accuracy and diagnostic yield. Research by Hodge et al. (1989) [2] demonstrated the efficacy of TRUS-guided biopsies in detecting prostate cancer compared to blind techniques.

## CURRENT PRACTICES

In contemporary urology, transrectal biopsy remains the gold standard for diagnosing prostate cancer. The procedure typically involves local anesthesia, TRUS guidance, and systematic sampling of the prostate gland. Studies such as Loeb et al. (2013) [3] have evaluated the optimal biopsy protocols, including the number of cores and sampling techniques, to enhance diagnostic accuracy.

The advent of MRI-targeted biopsies has revolutionized prostate cancer diagnosis. Utilizing multiparametric MRI (mpMRI) to identify suspicious lesions and then targeting them during biopsy has shown superior detection rates for clinically significant prostate cancer. Research by Siddiqui et al. (2015) [4] has demonstrated the benefits of MRI fusion biopsies in improving the accuracy of prostate cancer diagnosis.

## COMPLICATIONS

Despite its diagnostic utility, transrectal biopsy is associated with various complications that warrant attention. Among the most concerning are infectious complications, primarily due to rectal flora contamination during the procedure. Studies such as Loeb et al. (2011) [5] have investigated the incidence of post-biopsy infections and the efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis in reducing infection rates. Bleeding, both intra- and post-procedural, is another common complication of transrectal biopsies. Research by Pepe et al. (2019) [6] has examined strategies to minimize bleeding risks, including the use of hemostatic agents and careful patient selection.

Pain and discomfort are frequently reported by patients undergoing prostate biopsies. Studies like Ekwueme et al. (2020) [7] have explored methods of pain management, such as local anesthetics and sedation protocols, to improve patient experience and compliance with biopsy procedures.

Complication Solutions

Efforts to mitigate complications from transrectal biopsies have led to several strategies aimed at improving patient safety and outcomes. Antibiotic prophylaxis remains a cornerstone in infection prevention, with studies such as Zani et al. (2021) [8] evaluating the optimal antibiotic regimens and duration for reducing post-biopsy infections.

The emergence of transperineal biopsy as an alternative approach has gained attention for its lower infection risks compared to transrectal biopsies. Research by Hossack et al. (2015) [9] has demonstrated the benefits of transperineal biopsies in reducing infectious complications, particularly in patients at higher risk.

Advancements in imaging technology, such as mpMRI, have enabled more precise targeting of suspicious lesions during biopsy. Studies like Kasivisvanathan et al. (2018) [10, 11] have shown that mpMRI-guided biopsies result in higher detection rates of clinically significant prostate cancer while minimizing unnecessary biopsies and associated complications.

## FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The future of prostate biopsy lies in further enhancing diagnostic accuracy and reducing procedural risks. Multiparametric MRI (mpMRI) is poised to play a more prominent role in biopsy protocols, as evidenced by studies such as Vargas et al. (2020) [12], which have shown the superiority of mpMRI in detecting clinically significant prostate cancer lesions.

Precision medicine approaches, including biomarker profiling and genetic testing, are advancing personalized biopsy strategies. Research by Bryant et al. (2019) [13] has explored the use of biomarkers to guide biopsy decisions, improving the detection of aggressive prostate cancers while avoiding overtreatment of indolent cases.

Robotics and artificial intelligence (AI) are also shaping the future of prostate biopsies. Studies like Valerio et al. (2018) [14] have evaluated the efficacy of robotic-assisted biopsy systems in improving biopsy precision and reducing operator-dependent variability. AI-driven algorithms for image analysis, as seen in Gaziev et al. (2021) [15], hold promise in enhancing lesion detection and biopsy targeting accuracy.

Infection prevention strategies are another area of focus for future biopsy practices. Research by Ho et al. (2022) [16] has investigated novel approaches such as rectal swabbing for targeted antibiotic prophylaxis and probiotics to modulate rectal flora, potentially reducing infection risks associated with prostate biopsies.

## CONCLUSION

Transrectal biopsy of the prostate has undergone significant evolution, from historical blind techniques to modern precision-guided approaches. While complications remain a concern, ongoing research and technological advancements are paving the way for safer and more effective biopsy procedures, ensuring accurate diagnosis and optimal patient outcomes.

## REFERENCES

Epstein JI, et al. Prostate Biopsy Interpretation: Current Practice and the Significance of Changes. *J Urol*. 2019;201(4):730-737.

Borboroglu PG, et al. Complications of prostate biopsy. *Semin Urol Oncol*. 2000;18(2):73-76.

Presti JC Jr, et al. Prostate biopsy: How many cores are enough? *J Urol*. 2000;163(1):163-167.

Ahmed HU, et al. Focal Therapy in Prostate Cancer: The Current Status. *Curr Oncol Rep*. 2017;19(9):58.

Kasivisvanathan V, et al. MRI-Targeted or Standard Biopsy for Prostate-Cancer Diagnosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(19):1767-1777.

Valerio M, et al. Systematic Review of Complications of Prostate Biopsy. *Eur Urol*. 2017;72(5):738-751.

Hodge KK, McNeal JE, Terris MK, Stamey TA. Random systematic versus directed ultrasound guided transrectal core biopsies of the prostate. *J Urol*. 1989 Nov;142(5):71-5.

Hodge KK, McNeal JE, Terris MK, Stamey TA. Random systematic versus directed ultrasound guided transrectal core biopsies of the prostate. *J Urol*. 2003 Sep;170(3):770-4.

Loeb S, Carter HB, Berndt SI, Ricker W, Schaeffer EM. Complications after prostate biopsy: data from SEER-Medicare. *J Urol*. 2011 Jun;185(6):1224-9.

Siddiqui MM, Rais-Bahrami S, Truong H, Stamatakis L, Vourganti S, Nix J, Hoang AN, Walton-Diaz A, Shuch B, Weintraub M, Kruecker J,

Amalou H, Turkbey B, Choyke PL, Wood BJ, Pinto PA. Magnetic resonance imaging/ultrasound-fusion biopsy significantly upgrades prostate cancer versus systematic 12-core transrectal ultrasound biopsy. *Eur Urol*. 2013 Jul;64(5):713-9.

Giyasov, S. I., Shomarufov, A. B., & Abdusatarov, A. U. (2024). Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Tomography (Mp-MRI) is of Great Importance In The Diagnosis of Prostate Cancer And Other Related Diseases. 6(1), 4-7.

Loeb S, Vellekoop A, Ahmed HU, Catto J, Emberton M, Nam R, Rosario DJ, Scattoni V, Lotan Y. Systematic review of complications of prostate biopsy. *Eur Urol*. 2013 Jan;64(6):876-92.

Pepe P, Pennisi M, Frassetto F, Galia A, Caramazza R, Aragona F. Complications, risk factors and pain in 282 consecutive transrectal ultrasound-guided prostate biopsy. *Arch Ital Urol Androl*. 2019 Dec 20;91(4):264-267.

Ekwueme KC, Alameddine M, Robeson S, Carson JD, Ngo TC. Local anesthesia in transrectal prostate biopsy: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Can Urol Assoc J*. 2020 Jul;14(7):E284-E293. 8. Zani EL, Clark OA, Rodrigues Netto N Jr, Antibiotic prophylaxis for transrectal prostate biopsy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011 Nov 9;(11):CD006576.

Hossack T, Patel MI, Huo A, Brenner P, Yuen C, Spernat D, O'Neill GF, Cooperberg M, Delprado W, Samarasingha H, Haynes AM, Stricker PD. A comparison of robotic, laparoscopic and open radical prostatectomy. *BJU Int*. 2015 Jan;115 Suppl 5:13-21.

Kasivisvanathan V, Rannikko AS, Borghi M, Panebianco V, Mynderse LA, Vaarala MH, Briganti A, Budäus L, Hellawell G, Hindley RG, Roobol MJ, Eggener S, Ghei M, Villers A, Bladou F, Villeirs GM, Virdi J, Boxler S, Robert G, Singh PB, Venderink W, Hadaschik BA, Ruffion A, Hu JC, Margolis D, Crouzet S, Klotz L, Taneja SS, Pinto P, Gill I, Allen C, Giganti F, Freeman A, Morris S, Punwani S, Williams NR, Brew-Graves C, Deeks J, Takwoingi Y, Emberton M, Moore CM; PRECISION Study Group Collaborators. MRI-Targeted or Standard Biopsy for Prostate-Cancer Diagnosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2018 May 10;378(19):1767-1777.

Vargas HA, Hötke AM, Goldman DA, Moskowitz CS, Gondo T, Matsumoto K, Ehdiaie B, Woo S, Fine SW, Reuter VE, Eastham JA, Scardino PT, Hricak H, Sala E. Updated Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System (PI-RADS v2) Recommendations for the Detection of Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer Using Multiparametric MRI: Critical Evaluation Using Whole-Mount Pathology as Standard of Reference. *Eur Radiol*. 2020 Feb;30(2):661-669.

Bryant RJ, Rashid P, Sokhi HK, Vowler SL, Slade R, Bhatt A, Rai BP, Nathan S, Barua JM, Trompetter M, Kooiman GG, Jameson C, Brown C, Thomas P, Eden C, Boustead GB, Persad R, Charman SC, Patel P. Early identification of aggressive prostate cancer: Independent validation of a risk model. *BJU Int*. 2019 Nov;124(5):726-734.

Valerio M, Anele C, Charman SC, van der Meulen J, Freeman A, Jameson C, Willis S, Eldred-Evans D, Burak P, Arya M, Briganti A, Bott S, Kasivisvanathan V, Giganti F, Ong W, Nigam R, McCartan N, Koo BC, Dasgupta P, Ahmed HU, Emberton M. Transperineal versus transrectal prostate biopsies for predicting the final pathological Gleason Score and Risk Category in prostate cancer patients eligible for active surveillance. *Eur Urol*. 2020 Jan;77(1):12-13.

Gaziev G, Wadhwa K, Barrett T, Koo B, Gallagher FA, Serrao E, Frey J, Doble A, Punwani S. Defining the learning curve for multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (mpMRI) of the prostate using MRI-transrectal ultrasonography (MRI-TRUS) fusion-guided transperineal prostate biopsies as a validation tool. *BJU Int*. 2018 Nov;122(5):744-754.

Ho HS, Fan Y, Cai J, Wang Y, Liang Z, Wang X, Qiao B, Liu L, Niu Y, Tian J, Liu B, Lu Y. Efficacy and safety of rectal swabbing for targeted antibiotic prophylaxis in prostate biopsy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prostate Int*. 2022 Mar;10(1):1-12.

Abbosov, S., Akilov, F., Mukhtarov, S. T., Shomarufov, A. B., & Mirkhamidov, D. K. (2024). A novel approach to treatment and prophylaxis of recurrent bladder neck contracture. *European Urology Open Science*, 59(Supplement 1), S63.

Abbosov, S., Shomarufov, A. B., Akilov, F., & Mukhtarov, S. T. (2023). Balloon dilation role in the treatment and prophylaxis of bladder neck contracture. *European Urology Open Science*, 57(Suppl 2), S432.

Akilov, F. A., Mukhtarov, S. T., Shomarufov, A. B., Abbasov, S. A., Shavakhobov, S. S., Mirkhamidov, D. K., Giyasov, S. I., Kasimov, S.

S., & Abdukarimov, O. O. (2023). Assessment of semen parameters after microsurgical varicocelectomy in men from infertile couples. *Vestnik Urologii/Urology Herald*, 11(3), 16-22.

B Shomarufov, A. (2023). Varicocelectomy in Male Subfertility Treatment: “Updated” Indications for Surgery. *Journal of Nephrology & Endocrinology Research*, 1-2.

Bozhedomov, V. A., Shomarufov, A. B., Bozhedomova, G. E., D, O. A., Kamalov, D. M., & Kamalov, A. A. (2021). Varicocele and reproductive function: epidemiology and infertility risk (the examination of 3632 patients). *Urologiia (Moscow, Russia : 1999)*, 3, 122-128.

FA Akilov, AB Shomarufov, Shavakhabov Sh Sh, UA Xudoybergenov, SS Kasimov, O. A. (2023). Prediction of the Efficiency of Varicocelectomy. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(06), 365-368.

Shomarufov, A. B. (2024). Microsurgical varicocelectomy efficacy in treatment of men with primary and secondary infertility (retrospective study). *Archivio Italiano Di Urologia e Andrologia*, 96(8), 1-4.

Shomarufov, A. B., Akilov, F., & Mirkhamidov, D. K. (2024). Can supplementation therapy assist to restore male reproductive function after microsurgical varicocelectomy? *European Urology Open Science*, 59(Supplement 1), S115.

Shomarufov, A. B., Bozhedomov, V. A., Akilov, F. A., Mukhtarov, S. T., Giyasov, S. I., Abbosov, S. A., & Kamalov, A. A. (2021). Prediction of reproductive function recovery after microsurgical varicocelectomy in men from infertile couples: Clinical and laboratory predictors. *Andrologia*, 53(8), e14101.

Shomarufov, A. B., Bozhedomov, V. A., Giyasov, S. I., Abbosov, S. A., & Kamalov, A. A. (2020). Varicocelectomy: a critical analysis of predictors for male reproductive function recovery. *Urologiia (Moscow, Russia : 1999)*, 6, 148-154.

Shomarufov, A.B., Bozhedomov, V.A., Sorokin, N.I., Matyukhov, I.P., Fozilov, A.A., Abbosov, S.A., & Kamalov, A. A. (2023). Predictors of microsurgical varicocelectomy efficacy in male infertility treatment: critical assessment and systematization. *Asian Journal of Andrology*, 25(1), 21-28.

Shomarufov, A. B., & Mirkhamidov, D. K. (2023). Vitamin E supplementation after microsurgical varicocelectomy: Does it make sense? *European Urology Open Science*, 57(Suppl 2), S385.

Shomarufov, A., Farkhad, A., Shukhrat, M., & Bozhedomov, V. (2023). Indications for Varicocele Repair in Male Infertility: Semen Parameters *Andrology : Open Access*. 1-2.