

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes
Positive margin						
Anastasiadis 2003 ¹²²				61/230 (26.5)	20/70 (28.6)	
Artibani 2003 ¹²³				21/71 (29.6)	12/50 (24.0)	
Barocas 2010 ¹⁰³			281/1413 (19.9)		148/491 (30.1)	
Brown 2004 ¹²⁵				10/59 (16.9)	12/60 (20.0)	
Dahl 2006 ¹⁴⁷				43/286 (15.0)	124/714 (17.4)	
Doumerc 2010 ¹⁰⁵	Total		45/212 (21.2)		84/502 (16.7)	
	PT2		17/212 (8.0)		33/502 (6.6)	
	PT3		28/212 (13.2)		51/502 (10.2)	
Drouin 2009 ¹⁰¹			12/71 (16.9)	16/85 (18.8)	15/83 (18.1)	
Ficarra 2009 ¹⁰⁶			35/103 (34.0)		21/105 (20.0)	
Fornara 2004 ¹²⁷				5/32 (15.6)	7/32 (21.9)	
Fracalanza 2008 ¹⁰⁷			10/35 (28.6)		6/26 (23.1)	
Greco 2010 ¹²⁹				12/150 (8.0)	17/150 (11.3)	PT2a/b/c
Guazzoni 2006 ⁹⁰				16/60 (26.7)	13/60 (21.7)	RCT Positive surgical margin was considered as any ink on the specimen section regardless of pathological stage
Jacobsen 2007 ¹³⁰				22/67 (32.8)	60/148 (40.5)	
Joseph 2007 ⁹⁴			99/754 (13.1)	246/800 (30.8)		Abstract
Jurczok 2007 ¹³¹	Total			63/163 (38.7)	104/240 (43.3)	% for pathological stage only reported in paper
	T2 a/b/c			16/163 (9.8)	30/240 (12.5)	
	T3 a/b			47/163 (28.8)	74/240 (30.8)	
Kim 2007 ¹³²				11/30 (36.7)	11/45 (24.4)	
Krambeck 2008 ¹⁰⁸			46/294 (15.6)		100/588 (17.0)	
Lama 2009 ¹³³				16/56 (28.6)	21/59 (35.6)	
Loeb 2010 ¹⁰⁹			22/152 (14.5)		25/137 (18.2)	
Martorana 2004 ¹³⁴	Total			12/50 (24.0)	13/50 (26.0)	
	T2			6/50 (12.0)	5/50 (10.0)	
	T3			6/50 (12.0)	8/50 (16.0)	
Menon 2002 ⁹⁵			7/40 (17.5)	10/40 (25.0)		

continued

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy (continued)

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes
Nadler 2010 ¹¹²	Total		5/50 (10.0)		12/50 (24.0)	
	PT2		2/43 (4.7)		3/33 (9.1)	
	PT3		3/7 (42.9)		9/17 (52.9)	
Ou 2009 ¹¹³			15/30 (50.0)		6/30 (20.0)	
Poulakis 2007 ¹³⁷				Group I: 15/72 (20.8)	16/70 (22.9)	Presence of tumour cells at the ink site of surgical specimen
				Group II: 14/132 (10.6)		
Raventos Busquets 2007 ¹³⁸				5.7%	16.5%	The sum of the malignant ... and malignant margin (unclear in translated version; Spanish paper)
Remzi 2005 ¹³⁹				Transperitoneal: 10/39 (25.6)	8/41 (19.5)	
				Extraperitoneal: 8/41 (19.5)		
Rocco 2009 ¹¹⁴			26/120 (21.7)		60/240 (25.0)	
Rozet 2007 ⁹⁶			26/133 (19.5)	21/133 (15.8)		
Salomon 2002 ¹⁴⁰				32/155 (20.6)	30/151 (19.9)	
Schroeck 2008 ¹¹⁵			106/362 (29.3)		122/435 (28.0)	
Silva 2007 ¹⁴¹				22/90 (24.4)	37/89 (41.6)	
Soric 2004 ¹⁴³				6/26 (23.1)	3/26 (11.5)	
Sundaram 2004 ⁹⁷			2/10 (20.0)	2/10 (20.0)		Abstract
Terakawa 2008 ¹⁴⁴				54/137 (39.4)	52/220 (23.6)	Presence of cancer at the inked margin of resection in the radical prostatectomy specimen
Tewari 2003 ¹¹⁶			18/200 (9.0)		23/100 (23.0)	
Touijer 2007 ¹⁴⁵				Overall rate: 11.3%	Overall rate: 11%	Presence of cancer at the inked margin of resection in the radical prostatectomy specimen regardless of whether or not additional tissue was resected
				Overall rate: 0.72 (0.56 to 0.89), $p=0.003$	Overall rate: 1.06 (0.94 to 1.21), $p=0.3$	
				Organ-confined disease: 0.60 (0.40 to 0.90), $p=0.01$	Organ-confined disease: 1.08 (0.80 to 1.46), $p=0.6$	
				Non-organ-confined disease: 0.26 (0.06 to 1.05), $p=0.061$	Non-organ-confined disease: 1.39 (0.75 to 2.44), $p=0.3$	
	Incidence of positive surgical margins over time, OR per 100 patients (95% CI)					

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy (continued)

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes
	Risk of positive surgical margins, OR (95% CI)			1.156 (0.792 to 1.686)		Laparoscopic compared with open, adjusted for organ-confined probability ($p=0.5$)
Trabulsi 2008 ⁹⁸			3/50 (6.0)	35/190 (18.4)		Used a whole-mount step section technique. Positive if tumour appeared at the inked margin
Wagner 2007 ¹⁴⁶				7/75 (9.3)	14/75 (18.7)	Extension of tumour to the inked surface of the resected specimen
White 2009 ¹¹⁸			11/50 (22.0)		18/50 (36.0)	Presence of tumour tissue on the inked surface of the specimen
Pathology stage						
Anastasiadis 2003 ¹²²	T2a			165/230 (71.7)	46/70 (65.7)	
	T3a			38/230 (16.5)	12/70 (17.1)	
	T3b			27/230 (11.7)	12/70 (17.1)	
Artibani 2003 ¹²³	T2			42/71 (59.2)	33/50 (66.0)	
	T3a			18/71 (25.4)	8/50 (16.0)	
	T3b			5/71 (7.0)	5/50 (10.0)	
	T4			4/71 (5.6)	2/50 (4.0)	
	N4			1/71 (1.4)	2/50 (4.0)	
Ball 2006 ⁹⁹	T2		58/82 (70.7)	96/124 (77.4)	86/135 (63.7)	
	T3/4		23/82 (28.0)	26/124 (21.0)	46/135 (34.1)	
	Unknown		1/82 (1.2)	2/124 (1.6)	3/135 (2.2)	
Barocas 2010 ¹⁰³	T0		7/1413 (0.5)		3/491 (0.6)	
	T2		1136/1413 (80.4)		342/491 (69.7)	
	T3		268/1413 (19.0)		144/491 (29.3)	
	T4		0/1413		2/491 (0.4)	
Bhayani 2003 ¹²⁴	T0			0/33	1/24 (4.2)	
	T2			26/33 (78.8)	14/24 (58.3)	
	T3a			6/33 (18.2)	6/24 (25.0)	
	T3b			1/33 (3.0)	3/24 (12.5)	
Brown 2004 ¹²⁵	T2a			14/59 (23.7)	13/60 (1.7)	
	T2b			34/59 (57.6)	39/60 (65.0)	
	T3a			8/59 (13.6)	4/60 (6.7)	
	T3b			2/59 (3.4)	3/60 (5.0)	
	T4			1/59 (1.7)	1/60 (1.7)	
Dahl 2006 ¹⁴⁷						Pathological stage for positive margins
	T0		0/0		8/714 (1.1)	T0 0/0 0/8
	T2		246/286 (86.0)		583/714 (81.7)	T2 32/246 (13.0) 77/583 (13.2)
	T3		40/286 (14.0)		123/714 (17.2)	T3 11/40 (27.5) 47/123 (38.2)

continued

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy (*continued*)

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes
Doumerc 2010 ¹⁰⁵	T2a		18/212 (8.5)		37/502 (7.4)	
	T2b		12/212 (5.7)		20/502 (4.0)	
	T2c		116/212 (54.7)		268/502 (53.4)	
	T3a		55/212 (25.9)		129/502 (25.7)	
	T3b		11/212 (5.2)		48/502 (9.6)	
Drouin 2009 ¹⁰¹	T2a		3/71 (4.2)	6/85 (7.1)	5/83 (6.0)	
	T2b		10/71 (14.1)	6/85 (7.1)	5/83 (6.0)	
	T2c		48/71 (67.6)	58/85 (68.2)	58/83 (69.9)	
	T3a		9/71 (12.7)	11/85 (12.9)	13/83 (15.7)	
	T3b		1/71 (1.4)	4/85 (4.7)	2/83 (2.4)	
Ficarra 2009 ¹⁰⁶	T2		60/103 (58.3)		49/105 (46.7)	
	T3a		39/103 (37.9)		42/105 (40.0)	
	T3b		4/103 (3.9)		14/105 (13.3)	
Fornara 2004 ¹²⁷	T2a			4/32 (12.5)	4/32 (12.5)	
	T2b			4/32 (12.5)	2/32 (6.3)	
	T2c			23/32 (71.9)	25/32 (78.1)	
	T3a			1/32 (3.1)	1/32 (3.1)	
Fracalanza 2008 ¹⁰⁷	T2a		4/35 (11.4)		3/26 (11.5)	
	T2c		19/35 (54.3)		8/26 (30.8)	
	T3a		11/35 (31.4)		11/26 (42.3)	
	T3b		1/35 (2.9)		4/26 (15.4)	
Greco 2010 ¹²⁹	T2a			120/150 (80.0)	118/150 (78.7)	Laparoscopic T2a reported as 129/150. Contacted author to clarify if this is a typo and should be 120 (<i>n</i> = 159 otherwise)
	T2b			15/150 (10.0)	17/150 (11.3)	
	T2c			12/150 (8.0)	10/150 (6.7)	
	T3a/3b			3/150 (2.0)	5/150 (3.3)	
Guazzoni 2006 ⁹⁰	T2			45/60 (75.0)	44/60 (73.3)	RCT
	T3a			12/60 (20.0)	14/60 (23.3)	
	T3b			3/60 (5.0)	2/60 (3.33)	
Jacobsen 2007 ¹³⁰	T0			1/67 (1.5)	1/148 (0.7)	Numbers for open add to 144 but <i>n</i> = 148 – 4 not reported
	T2a			7/67 (10.4)	16/148 (11.0)	
	T2b			1/67 (1.5)	4/148 (2.7)	
	T2c			39/67 (58.2)	78/148 (52.7)	
	T3a			6/67 (9.0)	30/148 (20.3)	
	T3b			3/67 (4.5)	15/148 (10.1)	
	T4			0/67	0/148	
Jurczok 2007 ¹³¹	T2a			26/162 (16.0)	45/240 (18.8)	Percentages only reported in paper. Laparoscopic percentages add up to 99%. No mention of withdrawals. Figures total 162 instead of total 163 patients in group
	T2b			44/162 (27.2)	53/240 (22.1)	
	T2c			38/162 (23.4)	60/240 (25.0)	
	T3a/b			54/162 (33.3)	82/240 (34.2)	
Kim 2007 ¹³²	T2			26/30 (86.7)	36/45 (80.0)	Laparoscopic T2 reported as 16/30 (86.7%). Presumed 16 is an error and actual figure is 26/30
	T3			4/30 (13.3)	5/45 (11.1)	
	T4			0/30	4/45 (8.9)	

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy (continued)

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes
Martorana 2004 ¹³⁴	T2			31/50 (62.0)	28/50 (56.0)	
	T3			19/50 (38.0)	22/50 (44.0)	
Menon 2002 ⁹⁵	T2a		9/40 (22.5)	7/40 (17.5)		
	T2b		24/40 (60.0)	30/40 (75.0)		
	T3a		4/40 (10.0)	2/40 (5.0)		
	T3b		3/40 (7.5)	0/40		
	T4a		0/40	1/40 (2.5)		
Nadler 2010 ¹¹²	T2		43/50 (86.0)		33/50 (66.0)	
	T3		7/50 (14.0)		17/50 (34.0)	
Namiki 2006 ¹³⁶	T2			53/64 (82.8)	200/283 (70.7)	
	T3			11/64 (17.2)	83/283 (29.0)	
Namiki 2005 ¹³⁵	T2			30/45 (66.7)	103/121 (85.1)	
	T3			15/45 (33.3)	17/121 (14.0)	
	T4			0/45	1/121 (0.8)	
Poulakis 2007 ¹³⁷	T2a			Group I: 3/72 (4.2)	Group II: 24/132 (18.2)	Groups I and II two age groups (data not combined)
	T2b			10/72 (13.9)	28/132 (21.2)	
	T2c			27/72 (37.5)	38/132 (28.8)	
	T3a			19/72 (26.4)	26/132 (19.7)	
	T3b			13/72 (18.1)	16/132 (12.1)	
Raventos Busquets 2007 ¹³⁸	T2			80%	70.90%	Laparoscopic: n= 105; open: n= 75
	T3			20%	29.10%	
Remzi 2005 ¹³⁹	T2			Trans-peritoneal 24/39 (61.5)	Extra-peritoneal 27/41 (65.9)	26/41 (63.4)
	T3			14/39 (35.9)	14/41 (34.1)	14/41 (34.1)
	T4			1/39 (2.6)	0	1/41 (2.4)
Rocco 2009 ¹¹⁴	T2		88/120 (73.3)		150/240 (62.5)	
	T3		29/120 (24.2)		85/240 (35.4)	
	T4		3/120 (2.5)		5/240 (2.1)	
Rozet 2007 ⁹⁶	T2a		16/133 (12.0)	11/133 (8.3)		
	T2b		2/133 (1.5)	6/133 (4.5)		
	T2c		92/133 (69.2)	86/133 (64.7)		
	T3a		16/133 (12.0)	22/133 (16.5)		
	T3b		7/133 (5.3)	8/133 (6.0)		
Salomon 2002 ¹⁴⁰	T2			126/155 (81.3)	Retropubic: 66/86 (76.7)	Figures presented in table 3 for perineal approach add to 100 instead of the 65 who received the procedure
	T3a			20/155 (12.9)	13/86 (15.1)	
	T3b			9/155 (5.8)	7/86 (8.2)	

continued

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy (*continued*)

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes
Silva 2007 ¹⁴¹	T2a			9/90 (10.0)	13/89 (14.6)	
	T2b			11/90 (12.2)	2/89 (2.2)	
	T2c			61/90 (67.8)	61/89 (68.5)	
	T3a			1/90 (1.1)	9/89 (10.1)	
	T3b			8/90 (8.9)	4/89 (4.5)	
Soderdahl 2005 ¹⁴²	T0			1/93 (1.1)	1/86 (1.2)	
	T2			73/93 (78.5)	55/86 (64.0)	
	T3/4			19/93 (20.4)	30/86 (34.9)	
Soric 2004 ¹⁴³	T1			9/26 (34.6)	6/26 (23.1)	
	T2			9/26 (34.6)	14/26 (53.8)	
	T3			6/26 (23.1)	5/26 (19.2)	
Terakawa 2008 ¹⁴⁴	T2			106/137 (77.4)	139/220 (63)	
	T3			31/137 (22.6)	81/220 (36.8)	
Tewari 2003 ¹¹⁶	T2a		30/200 (15.0)		18/100 (18.0)	
	T2b		144/200 (72.0)		75/100 (75.0)	
	T3a		14/200 (7.0)		4/100 (4.0)	
	T3b		12/200 (6.0)		3/100 (3.0)	
Touijer 2007 ¹⁴⁵	T0			3/485 (0.6)	8/692 (1.2)	
	T1			29/485 (6.0)	25/692 (3.6)	
	T2a			65/485 (13.4)	89/692 (12.9)	
	T2b			261/485 (53.8)	355/692 (51.3)	
	T3a			105/485 (21.6)	170/692 (24.6)	
	T3b			17/485 (3.5)	35/692 (5.1)	
	T4			5/485 (1.0)	10/692 (1.4)	
Trabulsi 2008 ⁹⁸	T0		0/50	1/190 (0.5)		
	T2a		12/50 (24.0)	40/190 (21.1)		
	T2b		0/50	2/190 (1.1)		
	T2c		31/50 (62.0)	119/190 (62.6)		
	T3a		5/50 (10.0)	12/190 (6.3)		
	T3b		2/50 (4.0)	6/190 (3.2)		
Truesdale 2010 ¹¹⁷	T2		71/99 (71.7)		136/217 (62.7)	% do not match those reported in paper
	T3		23/99 (23.2)		70/217 (32.3)	
	T4		4/99 (4.0)		7/217 (3.2)	
Wagner 2007 ¹⁴⁶	T0			1/75 (1.3)	1/75 (1.3)	
	T2			67/75 (89.3)	52/75 (69.5)	
	T3			7/75 (9.3)	21/75 (28.0)	
	T4			0/75	1/75 (1.3)	
White 2009 ¹¹⁸	T2a		12/50 (24.0)		12/50 (24.0)	
	T2c		35/50 (70.0)		35/50 (70.0)	
	T3a		3/50 (6.0)		3/50 (6.0)	

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy (continued)

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes															
Pathological Gleason score																					
Anastasiadis 2003 ¹²²				6.7, 1.1 (4–10)	6.9, 0.9 (5–10)	Mean, SD (range)															
Artibani 2003 ¹²³				6.4 (1.3)	6.3 (0.9)	Mean (SD)															
Barocas 2010 ¹⁰³	≤6		723/1413 (51.2)		221/491 (45.0)																
	7		588/1413 (41.6)		213/491 (43.4)																
	8–10		94/1413 (6.7)		54/491 (11.0)																
Dahl 2006 ¹⁴⁷	≤6		45/212 (21.2)		76/502 (15.2)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Biopsy Gleason score for positive margins</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0/0</td> <td>0/8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5–6</td> <td>20/192 (10.4)</td> <td>60/452 (13.3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>17/78 (21.8)</td> <td>48/199 (24.1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8–9</td> <td>6/16 (7.5)</td> <td>16/55 (29.1)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Biopsy Gleason score for positive margins			0	0/0	0/8	5–6	20/192 (10.4)	60/452 (13.3)	7	17/78 (21.8)	48/199 (24.1)	8–9	6/16 (7.5)	16/55 (29.1)
	Biopsy Gleason score for positive margins																				
	0	0/0	0/8																		
5–6	20/192 (10.4)	60/452 (13.3)																			
7	17/78 (21.8)	48/199 (24.1)																			
8–9	6/16 (7.5)	16/55 (29.1)																			
7		149/212 (70.3)		357/502 (71)																	
8–10		18/212 (8.5)		69/502 (13.7)																	
Doumerc 2010 ¹⁰⁵	≤6		45/212 (21.2)		76/502 (15.2)																
	7		149/212 (70.3)		357/502 (71)																
	8–10		18/212 (8.5)		69/502 (13.7)																
Fornara 2004 ¹²⁷				6.4	5.7	Median															
Jacobsen 2007 ¹³⁰				First half = 6.7 (0.61), Second half = 6.6 (0.74)	6.6 (0.9)	Mean (SD)															
Joseph 2007 ⁹⁴			6.5 (4–10)	6.9 (6–10)		Abstract Mean (range)															
Jurczok 2007 ¹³¹				6.4	5.7	Median															
Kim 2007 ¹³²				6.6 (0.8)	6.6 (0.7)	Mean (SD)															
Krambeck 2008 ¹⁰⁸	≤6		192/294 (65.3)		391/588 (66.5)																
	7		87/294 (29.6)		167/588 (28.4)																
	8–10		14/294 (4.8)		30/588 (5.1)																
Martorana 2004 ¹³⁴				6.10 (0.91)	6.16 (0.71)	Median (SD)															
Menon 2002 ⁹⁵			6.8 (0.82)	6.8 (0.82)		Mean (SD)															
Namiki 2005 ¹³⁵	6			19/45 (42)	48/121 (39.7)																
	7			26/45 (58)	73/121 (60.3)																
Namiki 2006 ¹³⁶	≤6			20/64 (31.3)	65/283 (23.0)																
	≥7			44/64 (68.8)	218/283 (77.0)																
Ou 2009 ¹¹³			7.2 (1.1)		6.7 (1.6)	Mean (SD)															

continued

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy (continued)

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes
Poulakis 2007 ¹³⁷				Group I: 7 (5–9) Group II: 6 (5–9)	7 (5–9)	Median (range). Groups I and II two age groups (data not combined)
Remzi 2005 ¹³⁹				Transperitoneal: 5.1 (2.0) Extraperitoneal: 5.5 (1.9)	4.7 (2.2)	Mean (SD)
Rocco 2009 ¹¹⁴			7 (4–9)		7 (3–9)	Median (range)
Rozet 2007 ⁹⁶			6.5 (5–9)	6.5 (5–9)		Mean (range)
Salomon 2002 ¹⁴⁰				6.6 (4–10)	Retropubic: 6.2 (3–10) Perineal: 6.1 (4–9)	Median (range)
Schroeck 2008 ¹¹⁵	≤6		168/362 (46.4)		177/435 (40.7)	
	7		176/362 (48.6)		199/435 (45.7)	
	8–10		18/362 (4.9)		59/435 (13.6)	
Silva 2007 ¹⁴¹			7	7		Median
Soric 2004 ¹⁴³				6.25 (4–9)	5.7 (4–7)	Median (range)
Tewari 2003 ¹¹⁶	≤6		87/200 (43.5)		42/100 (42.0)	
	7		80/200 (40.0)		38/100 (38.0)	
	8–10		21/200 (10.5)		20/100 (20.0)	
Touijer 2007 ¹⁴⁵	≤6			184/485 (38.0)	280/692 (40.5)	
	7			270/485 (55.7)	349/692 (50.4)	
	8–10			25/485 (5.2)	56/692 (8.1)	
	Missing			6/485 (1.2)	7/692 (1.0)	
Trabulsi 2008 ⁹⁸	≤6		33/50 (66.0)	109/190 (57.4)		
	7		15/50 (30.0)	67/190 (35.3)		
	≥8		2/50 (4.0)	8/190 (4.2)		
Truesdale ¹¹⁷	≤6		14/99 (14.1)		26/217 (12.0)	
	7		71/99 (71.7)		135/217 (62.2)	
	8–10		14/99 (14.1)		56/217 (25.8)	
White 2009 ¹¹⁸	≤6		25/50 (50.0)		35/50 (70.0)	
	7		24/50 (48.0)		15/50 (30.0)	
	8–10		1/50 (2.0)		0/50	
PSA recurrence						
Definition						
Artibani 2003 ¹²³		A: mean 10 (range 4–16) months B: mean 10 (range 4–18) months		12/63 (19.0)	5/44 (11.4)	PSA >0.3ng/ml

TABLE 55 Summary of outcomes: efficacy (*continued*)

Study	Subgroup	Timing	Robotic, n/N (%) ^a	Laparoscopic, n/N (%) ^a	Open, n/N (%) ^a	Notes
Barocas 2010 ¹⁰³		3 years postoperatively	181/425 (42.6)		155/257 (60.3)	PSA > 0.2 ng/ml on one or more assays, or when a patient received postoperative hormone therapy, radiation or chemotherapy in the face of an increasing PSA
Drouin 2009 ¹⁰¹		Mean 49.7 (range 18–103) months	7/71 (9.9)	10/85 (11.8)	12/83 (14.5)	A single measure of PSA > 0.2 ng/ml
Krambeck 2008 ¹⁰⁸		Median 1.3 years	14/248 (5.6)		32/492 (6.5)	PSA progression (no definition)
Lama 2009 ¹³³		6 months		6/56 (10.7)	6/59 (10.2)	Biochemical relapse (no definition)
		1 year		6/56 (10.7)	7/59 (11.9)	
		2 years		6/56 (10.7)	9/59 (15.2)	
		3 years		11/56 (19.6)	12/59 (20.3)	
Loeb 2010 ¹⁰⁹		Not reported				14/266 men with follow-up data had PSA > 0.2 ng/ml
Menon 2002 ⁹⁵				38/40 (95.0)	39/40 (97.5)	Undetectable postoperative PSA
Nadler 2010 ¹¹²		During 27.1 months of follow-up	4/50 (8.0)		3/50 (6.0)	During 27.1 months of follow-up 92% and 94% reported undetectable PSA defined as PSA ≤ 0.1 ng/ml
Ou 2009 ¹¹³		15 months	6/30 (20.0)		5/30 (16.7)	Two consecutive postoperative PSA > 0.2 ng/ml
Poulakis 2007 ¹³⁷		6 months		Group I: 10/72 (13.9) Group II: 7/132 (5.3)	11/70 (15.7)	PSA ≥ 0.1 ng/ml. Groups I and II two age groups (data not combined)
Salomon 2002 ¹⁴⁰		3-year actuarial PSA recurrence-free rate		86.2%	Retropubic: 89.3% Perineal: 89.2%	
Schroeck 2008 ¹¹⁵		A: mean 1.09 years B: mean 1.37 years	29/362 (8.0)		54/435 (12.4)	Adjusted hazard ratio for risk of PSA recurrence and <i>p</i> -values reported in paper
Tewari 2003 ¹¹⁶		A: mean 236 days B: mean 556 days	16/200 (8.0)		15/100 (15.0)	> 0.2 ng/ml (converted from undetectable PSA% data)
Local recurrence						
Krambeck 2009 ¹⁰⁸		Median 1.3 years	3/248 (1.2)		5/492 (1.0)	
Metastatic recurrence						
Krambeck 2009 ¹⁰⁸		Median 1.3 years	1/248 (0.4)		0/492	Reported as 'systematic progression'

^a Data presented as n/N (%) unless indicated otherwise.