

28. Felker ER, Lee-Felker SA, Feller J, et al. In-bore magnetic resonance-guided transrectal biopsy for the detection of clinically significant prostate cancer. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2016; 41(5): 954–962.
29. Schimmöller L, Blondin D, Arsov C, et al. MRI-guided in-bore biopsy: differences between prostate cancer detection and localization in primary and secondary biopsy settings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2016; 206(1): 92–99.
30. Arsov C, Rabenalt R, Quentin M, et al. Comparison of patient comfort between MR-guided in-bore and MRI/ultrasound fusion-guided prostate biopsies within a prospective randomized trial. *World J Urol* 2016; 34(2): 215–220.
31. Haffner J, Lemaitre L, Puech P, et al. Role of magnetic resonance imaging before initial biopsy: comparison of magnetic resonance imaging-targeted and systematic biopsy for significant prostate cancer detection. *BJU Int* 2011; 108(8 Pt 2): E171–178.
32. Puech P, Rouvière O, Renard-Penna R, et al. Prostate cancer diagnosis: multiparametric MR-targeted biopsy with cognitive and transrectal US-MR fusion guidance versus systematic biopsy – prospective multicenter study. *Radiology* 2013; 268(2): 461–469.
33. Lee DJ, Recabal P, Sjoberg DD, et al. Comparative effectiveness of targeted prostate biopsy using magnetic resonance imaging ultrasound fusion software and visual targeting: a prospective study. *J Urol* 2016; 196(3): 697–702.
34. Oberlin DT, Casalino DD, Miller FH, et al. Diagnostic value of guided biopsies: fusion and cognitive-registration magnetic resonance imaging versus conventional ultrasound biopsy of the prostate. *Urology* 2016; 92: 75–79.
35. Oderda M, Faletti R, Battisti G, et al. Prostate cancer detection rate with koelis fusion biopsies versus cognitive biopsies: a comparative study. *Urol Int* 2016; 97(2): 230–237.
36. Delongchamps NB, Peyromaure M, Schull A, et al. Prebiopsy magnetic resonance imaging and prostate cancer detection: comparison of random and targeted biopsies. *J Urol* 2013; 189(2): 493–499.
37. Wysock JS, Rosenkrantz AB, Huang WC, et al. A prospective, blinded comparison of magnetic resonance (MR) imaging-ultrasound fusion and visual estimation in the performance of MR-targeted prostate biopsy: the PROFUS trial. *Eur Urol* 2014; 66(2): 343–351.
38. Kwak JT, Hong CW, Pinto PA, et al. Is visual registration equivalent to semiautomated registration in prostate biopsy? *Biomed Res Int* 2015; 2015: 394742.
39. Radtke JP, Teber D, Hohenfellner M, Hadaschik BA. The current and future role of magnetic resonance imaging in prostate cancer detection and management. *Transl Androl Urol* 2015; 4(3): 326–341.
40. Venderink W, de Rooij M, Sedelaar JPM, Huisman HJ, Fütterer JJ. Elastic versus rigid image registration in magnetic resonance imaging-transrectal ultrasound fusion prostate biopsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Urol Focus*. 2016, S2405–4569(16)30101–8.
41. Kaplan I, Oldenburg NE, Meskell P, et al. Real time MRI-ultrasound image guided stereotactic prostate biopsy. *Magn Reson Imaging* 2002; 20(3): 295–299.
42. Singh AK, Kruecker J, Xu S, et al. Initial clinical experience with real-time transrectal ultrasonography-magnetic resonance imaging fusion-guided prostate biopsy. *BJU Int* 2008; 101(7): 841–845.
43. Cash H, Maxeiner A, Stephan C, et al. The detection of significant prostate cancer is correlated with the Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System (PI-RADS) in MRI/transrectal ultrasound fusion biopsy. *World J Urol* 2016; 34(4): 525–532.
44. Le JD, Stephenson S, Brugger M, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging-ultrasound fusion biopsy for prediction of final prostate pathology. *J Urol* 2014; 192(5): 1367–1373.
45. Porpiglia F, DE Luca S, Passera R, et al. Multiparametric-magnetic resonance/ultrasound fusion targeted prostate biopsy improves agreement between biopsy and radical prostatectomy Gleason score. *Anticancer Res* 2016; 36(9): 4833–4839.