



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1007/s00259-018-4050-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-018-4050-z)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Ilyas, H., Mikhaeel, N. G., Dunn, J. T., Rahman, F., Møller, H., Smith, D., & Barrington, S. F. (2018). Reply to the letter. *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-018-4050-z>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Dear Sir

Thank you for the opportunity to reply to the letter by Laffon and Marthan.

We disagree with their statement that the prognostic value of baseline metabolic tumour volume (MTV) depends on the outlining method. One of our study aims was to compare accuracy of various segmentation methods to predict survival [1]. We found in our cohort of 147 consecutive patients with diffuse large B cell lymphoma (DLBCL) treated at a single institution that all methods ($SUV \geq 2.5$, $SUV \geq 41\%$ of max SUV and $SUV \geq$ mean liver uptake) predicted progression free- and overall survival with similar accuracy. Instead, it was the optimal cut-offs for predicting survival that were dependent on the method, which is an important distinction.

This indicates that baseline MTV is a robust predictor of outcomes in DLBCL, but as stated in the discussion in our manuscript and reiterated by Laffon and Marthan, standardisation of the methodology used to measure MTV will be required. We believe this will need collaborative efforts to validate measurement of tumour burden in international patient datasets, in a manner previously adopted to standardise methods for response assessment in lymphoma, using the Deauville criteria [2-4].

Standardisation of the methodology should include the method used to segment the tumour volume and PET acquisition [5], including uptake time and reconstruction methods with which we concur with Laffon and Marthan.

Regarding the statistical analyses, none of the comparative combinations described by Laffon and Marthan revealed a normal distribution, so we remain convinced that a non-parametric approach was

more appropriate. In addition, the aim was to describe quantitative differences between the MTV methods rather than explore the relationships between them. With our study it would not be possible to explore in detail how agreement varies with MTV value, however, the large percentage variances calculated by Laffon and Marthan are based on median values, while the larger individual discrepancies contributing to the high upper limits of agreement in figures 1 and 3a in [1] appear well above the median (indicating a lower relative difference for those measurements). While we agree that the discrimination revealed by the ROC curves is fair but not strong, the survival analysis revealed highly significant differences between the between the high risk and low risk groups according to MTV for the cut-off values found for all methods.

We thank Laffon and Marthan for concluding that our work has addressed an important issue. We stand by the findings: that in our dataset, acknowledging the limitations discussed that the 2.5 method was the easiest to use and gave the best interobserver agreement, using 2 different softwares, although all methods were prognostic. The 400ml cut off using the $SUV \geq 2.5$ method was in line with cut-offs reported by an independent group using $SUV \geq 2.5$ in different populations of patients with DLBCL [6, 7]. It is a given that there will be more uncertainty about how MTV affects prognosis, for patients with data points that lie close to the 400ml cut off. This applies to any measurement that lies close to a binary threshold and refinement with larger datasets will reduce the degree of uncertainty.

Nonetheless measurement of disease burden remains an important parameter for study[8] and will no doubt become integrated into preclinical risk assessment of patients in the not too distant future.

Yours faithfully

Hajira Ilyas

N George Mikhaeel

Joel T Dunn

Fareen Rahman

Henrik Møller

Daniel Smith

Sally F Barrington

References

1. Ilyas H, Mikhaeel NG, Dunn JT, Rahman F, Moller H, Smith D, Barrington SF. Defining the optimal method for measuring baseline metabolic tumour volume in diffuse large B cell lymphoma. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2018.
2. Biggi A, Gallamini A, Chauvie S, Hutchings M, Kostakoglu L, Gregianin M, Meignan M, Malkowski B, Hofman MS, Barrington SF. International validation study for interim PET in ABVD-treated, advanced-stage hodgkin lymphoma: interpretation criteria and concordance rate among reviewers. J Nucl Med 2013;54:683-90.
3. Itti E, Meignan M, Berrilo-Riedinger A, Biggi A, Cashen AF, Vera P, Tilly H, Siegel BA, Gallamini A, Casasnovas RO, Haioun C. An international confirmatory study of the prognostic value of early PET/CT in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: comparison between Deauville criteria and DeltaSUVmax. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2013;40:1312-20.

4. Barrington SF, Kirkwood AA, Franceschetto A, Fulham MJ, Roberts TH, Almquist H, Brun E, Hjorthaug K, Viney ZN, Pike LC, Federico M, Luminari S, Radford J, Trotman J, Fossa A, Berkahn L, Molin D, D'Amore F, Sinclair DA, Smith P, O'Doherty MJ, Stevens L, Johnson PW. PET-CT for staging and early response: results from the Response-Adapted Therapy in Advanced Hodgkin Lymphoma study. *Blood* 2016;127:1531-8.
5. Boellaard R, Delgado-Bolton R, Oyen WJ, Giammarile F, Tatsch K, Eschner W, Verzijlbergen FJ, Barrington SF, Pike LC, Weber WA, Stroobants S, Delbeke D, Donohoe KJ, Holbrook S, Graham MM, Testanera G, Hoekstra OS, Zijlstra J, Visser E, Hoekstra CJ, Pruim J, Willemsen A, Arends B, Kotzerke J, Bockisch A, Beyer T, Chiti A, Krause BJ, European Association of Nuclear Medicine (EANM). FDG PET/CT: EANM procedure guidelines for tumour imaging: version 2.0. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2015;42:328-54.
6. Song MK, Yang DH, Lee GW, Lim SN, Shin S, Pak KJ, Kwon SY, Shim HK, Choi BH, Kim IS, Shin DH, Kim SG, Oh SY. High total metabolic tumor volume in PET/CT predicts worse prognosis in diffuse large B cell lymphoma patients with bone marrow involvement in rituximab era. *Leuk Res* 2016;42:1-6.
7. Song MK, Chung JS, Shin HJ, Lee SM, Lee SE, Lee HS, Lee GW, Kim SJ, Lee SM, Chung DS. Clinical significance of metabolic tumor volume by PET/CT in stages II and III of diffuse large B cell lymphoma without extranodal site involvement. *Ann Hematol* 2012;91:697-703.
8. Gallamini A, Kostakoglu L. Metabolic Tumor Volume: We Still Need a Platinum-Standard Metric. *J Nucl Med* 2017;58:196-7.