Letter to the Editor

Positron emission tomography/computed tomography is superior to bone scan in the diagnosis of bone metastases of malignant prostate tumors

Yue Sun, Qin Wu, Lixuan Shen, Jiangfeng Wu

Department of Ultrasound, The Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, Dongyang, China

Correspondence to: Jiangfeng Wu. Department of Ultrasound, The Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, No. 60 Wuning West Road, Dongyang 322100, China. Email: wjfhospital@163.com.

Comment on: Wang J, Han Y, Lin L, *et al.* Systematic review & meta-analysis of positron emission tomography/computed tomography and bone scan in the diagnosis of prostate lesions. Transl Androl Urol 2021;10:4231-40.

Submitted Feb 20, 2022. Accepted for publication May 19, 2022.
doi: 10.21037/tau-22-132
View this article at: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-22-132

We read the recent published study in this journal of *Translational Andrology and Urology* by Wang and colleagues entitled "Systematic review & meta-analysis of positron emission tomography/computed tomography and bone scan in the diagnosis of prostate lesions" (1). They performed a meta-analysis to assess the value of positron emission tomography/computed tomography (PET/CT) and bone scan (BS) in the diagnosis of bone metastases of malignant prostate tumors. We appreciate Wang et al. for this significant study, whereas, some limitations should be noticed.

First, the meaning of the title shows that the aim of the study is to assess the value of PET/CT and BS in the diagnosis of prostate lesions. However, in this study, Wang *et al.* aimed to evaluate the performance of PET/CT and BS in the diagnosis of bone metastases of malignant prostate tumors. The diagnosis of prostate lesions and diagnosis of bone metastases of malignant prostate tumors are two significantly different concepts. Hence, we believe that the title of this article is not rational.

Second, in the statistical analysis section of the study, the authors mentioned the odds ratio (OR) was used as the dichotomous variable. However, it was not reported in the results. Therefore, we think that the irrelevant variable mentioned would lead to misunderstanding.

Finally, in the results section of the paper, the highest sensitivity and specificity were revealed. However, this study is a meta-analysis of diagnostic studies, so, the outcome indicators should be the pooled sensitivity and specificity not the highest sensitivity and specificity (2).

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was a standard submission to the journal. The article did not undergo external peer review.

Conflicts of Interest: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at https://tau.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/tau-22-132/coif). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

References

1. Wang J, Han Y, Lin L, et al. Systematic review & meta-analysis of positron emission tomography/computed tomography and bone scan in the diagnosis of prostate lesions. Transl Androl Urol 2021;10:4231-40.
2. Wu J, Sun Y, Wang Y, et al. Diagnostic value of endobronchial ultrasound elastography for differentiating benign and malignant hilar and mediastinal lymph nodes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Med Ultrason 2022;24:85-94.

Cite this article as: Sun Y, Wu Q, Shen L, Wu J. Positron emission tomography/computed tomography is superior to bone scan in the diagnosis of bone metastases of malignant prostate tumors. Transl Androl Urol 2022;11(6):902-903. doi: 10.21037/tau-22-132

