Relationship between pretreatment FDG-PET and diffusion-weighted MRI biomarkers in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma
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Abstract: The purpose of this study was to determine the correlation between the $^{18}$F-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) standardized uptake value (SUV) and the diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) in newly diagnosed diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL). Pretreatment FDG-PET and diffusion-weighted MRI of 21 patients with histologically proven DLBCL were prospectively analyzed. In each patient, maximum, mean and peak standardized uptake value (SUV) was measured in the lesion with visually highest FDG uptake and in the largest lesion. Mean ADC ($\text{ADC}_{\text{mean}}$, calculated with b-values of 0 and 1000 s/mm$^2$) was measured in the same lesions. Correlations between FDG-PET metrics ($\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{mean}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{peak}}$) and $\text{ADC}_{\text{mean}}$ were assessed using Pearson’s correlation coefficients. In the lesions with visually highest FDG uptake, no significant correlations were found between the $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{mean}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{peak}}$ and the $\text{ADC}_{\text{mean}}$ ($P=0.498$, $P=0.609$ and $P=0.595$, respectively). In the largest lesions, there were no significant correlations either between the $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{mean}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{peak}}$ and the $\text{ADC}_{\text{mean}}$ ($P=0.498$, $P=0.609$ and $P=0.595$, respectively). In the largest lesions, there were no significant correlations either between the $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{mean}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{peak}}$ and the $\text{ADC}_{\text{mean}}$ ($P=0.498$, $P=0.609$ and $P=0.595$, respectively). The results of this study indicate that the glycolytic rate as measured by FDG-PET and changes in water compartmentalization and water diffusion as measured by the ADC are independent biological phenomena in newly diagnosed DLBCL. Further studies are warranted to assess the complementary roles of these different imaging biomarkers in the evaluation and follow-up of DLBCL.
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Introduction

In 2013, an estimated number of 69,740 new cases will be diagnosed with non-Hodgkin lymphoma in the United States [1]. Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) is the most common subtype, representing approximately one third of all non-Hodgkin lymphomas [2]. $^{18}$F-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) plays an important role in the evaluation of DLBCL [3, 4]. Aggressive lymphomas such as DLBCL have an increased glycolysis (mainly due to the overexpression of glucose membrane transporters and increased hexokinase activity), and this forms the basis for PET imaging with FDG [5]. Pretreatment FDG-PET is recommended in DLBCL, both for improved staging and in view of the evaluation of treatment response according to the revised Cheson criteria [6-8]. Interestingly, the degree of pre-
FDG-PET and diffusion-weighted MRI biomarkers in DLBCL

The aim of this prospective study was therefore to determine the correlation between the FDG-PET standardized uptake value (SUV) and the diffusion-weighted MRI ADC in newly diagnosed DLBCL.

Materials and methods

Patients

Patients were recruited from a larger cohort of 135 patients with newly diagnosed lymphoma (various histopathological subtypes) who had been included in a prospective multicenter study in which the value of whole-body MRI, including diffusion-weighted MRI, was compared to computed tomography (CT) for staging lymphoma [18]. Institutional review board approval was obtained and all patients provided written informed consent. The parent(s) or guardian(s) of all patients under 18 years of age also provided written informed consent. Inclusion criteria for the present study were: patients aged 8 years or older with newly diagnosed histologically proven DLBCL and the availability of a (routine clinical) pretreatment FDG-PET that was randomly performed within 0-29 days of whole-body MRI. Exclusion criteria were: patients with other diagnoses than DLBCL, patients who had already received anticancer chemo- and/or immunotherapy, no residual tumor after diagnostic biopsy, non-diagnostic (diffusion-weighted) MRI quality, lack of b-values of 0 and 1000 s/mm² to create ADC maps, lack of pretreatment FDG-PET, incompatibility of FDG-PET data for Siemens Syngo workstation analysis, and lesions that were too small (i.e. diameter <1.5 cm) to obtain reliable ADC or SUV measurements.

FDG-PET

FDG-PET imaging was performed by using either a Biograph 40 True Point Siemens Healthcare PET-CT system (Meander Medical Center Amersfoort) or a Gemini TOF Philips PET-CT system (Academic Medical Center Amsterdam). Patients who were scanned with the former system (n=15) ingested an oral CT contrast agent before FDG-PET scanning, whereas those patients who were scanned with the latter system (n=6) received an i.v. CT contrast agent before FDG-PET scanning. Patients fasted for at least six hours before intravenous
injection of 2.0-3.7 MBq/kg body weight FDG. Blood glucose levels were checked to be less than 11 mmol/L (i.e. less than 198 mg/dL) before injection. Images were acquired between 60-75 minutes after FDG injection. PET images were acquired with a 3D acquisition from the base of the skull to the mid-femur in five to seven bed positions, 2-3 minutes per bed position. Low-dose CT (Biograph 40 True Point) or full-dose CT (Gemini TOF) was used for attenuation correction of the PET images. PET images were reconstructed by OSEM iterative reconstruction (reconstruction matrix 128 × 128) and axial, sagittal, coronal and maximum inten-
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Table 1. Baseline characteristics of included patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Max</td>
<td>30-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor stage*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Ann Arbor stage based on FDG-PET and bone marrow biopsy results.

Whole-body MRI

Whole-body MRI, including diffusion-weighted MRI, was performed using either a Philips Achieva 1.5 T system or a Magnetom Avanto Siemens 1.5 T system. First, coronal multi-shot turbo spin-echo T1-weighted (repetition time [TR] of 537 ms, echo time [TE] of 18 ms) and T2-weighted short inversion time inversion recovery (STIR) (TR of 2444 ms, TE of 64 ms, inversion time [TI] of 165 ms) turbo spin-echo whole-body images were acquired using either the built-in body coil (Achieva) or the phased-array surface coils (Magnetom Avanto) for signal reception. Second, axial single-shot spin-echo echo-planar imaging diffusion-weighted images (TR of 6962 or 8612 ms, TE of 78 ms, TI of 180 ms, slice thickness/gap of 4/0 mm, field of view of 450 x 360 mm², matrix of 128 x 81, b-values 0 and 1000 s/mm²) of the head/neck, chest, abdomen, and pelvis were acquired using phased-array surface coils for signal reception. Total actual data acquisition times were 12-15 minutes for T1-weighted images, 12-15 minutes for T2-weighted STIR images and 20-25 minutes for diffusion-weighted images with a total examination time of 45-55 minutes. ADC maps were created using b-values of 0 and 1000 s/mm².

Image analysis

All FDG-PET and magnetic resonance images were quantitatively assessed by one of the authors (AdJ), who was trained by two specialists in PET and diffusion-weighted MRI (both with >5 years of experience). Time interval between SUV and ADC measurements was at least 7 days, and the reviewer was blinded to ADCs when measuring SUVs (and vice versa). First, FDG-PET scans in each patient were reviewed to identify the malignant lesion with visually highest FDG uptake and the largest lesion. One single lesion could be identified as having both the visually highest FDG uptake and the largest size. In each patient, maximum SUV (SUV_max), mean SUV (SUV_mean), and peak SUV (SUV_peak), average SUV in 1 cm³ volume sphere centered around the hottest pixel) were measured in both the lesion with the visually highest FDG uptake and in the largest lesion. Mean ADC (ADC_mean) was measured in the same lesions (Figure 2). SUVs were based on body weight and measurements were executed using the Siemens Syngo workstation (version VA11A), whereas ADC measurements were made using OsiriX DICOM Viewer (version 5.5.1). All measurements were based on a single slice (taking into account the partial volume effect), transversal, manually drawn region of interest (ROI) ranging from 113 mm² to 1871 mm² with a minimum pixel count of 20.

Statistical analysis

The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to check whether the SUV and ADC measurements were normally distributed, with a W statistic <0.90 considered to be statistically significant.

Subsequently, correlations between FDG-PET metrics (SUV_max, SUV_mean, SUV_peak) and ADC_mean were assessed using Pearson’s correlation coefficients, with P-values <0.05 considered to be statistically significant. All data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 20.0 software (SPSS Inc., IL, USA).

Results

A total of 42 patients with newly diagnosed DLBCL were potentially eligible for inclusion. Ten of these patients were excluded because of the lack of pretreatment FDG-PET. One patient
was excluded because of non-diagnostic (diffusion-weighted) MRI quality, one patient was excluded because of tumor invisibility after diagnostic biopsy, six patients were excluded because lesions were too small (i.e. diameter <1.5 cm) to obtain reliable ADC measurements, and one patient was excluded because of the lack of b-values of both 0 and 1000 s/mm^2 to allow the creation of ADC maps. Finally, two patients were excluded because of incompatibility of FDG-PET data for Syngo workstation analysis. Thus, 21 patients with newly diagnosed DLBCL (14 men and 7 women, mean age: 59 years, range 30-75 years, scanned between August 2008 and November 2011) were finally included in this study (Figure 1). Patient characteristics are displayed in Table 1.

Shapiro-Wilk tests confirmed that the SUV\textsubscript{max}, SUV\textsubscript{mean}, SUV\textsubscript{peak}, and ADC\textsubscript{mean} (both in the visually most FDG avid lesion and in the largest lesion) were normally distributed (W-statistics ≥0.92 for all metrics). Mean±standard deviation (SD) of SUV\textsubscript{max}, SUV\textsubscript{mean}, SUV\textsubscript{peak}, and ADC\textsubscript{mean} (10^{-3} mm^2/s) in the visually most FDG avid lesion were 23.8±8.2, 16.9±6.6, 19.5±7.3 and 0.7±0.1 respectively (Table 2). Mean±SD of SUV\textsubscript{max}, SUV\textsubscript{mean}, SUV\textsubscript{peak}, and ADC\textsubscript{mean} (10^{-3} mm^2/s) in the largest lesion were 22.6±7.9, 16.2±6.4, 18.6±6.8 and 0.71±0.15 respectively (Table 2). In the lesions with visually highest FDG uptake, no significant correlations were found between the SUV\textsubscript{max}, SUV\textsubscript{mean}, SUV\textsubscript{peak} and the ADC\textsubscript{mean} (P=0.498, P=0.609 and P=0.595, respectively) (Figure 3). In the largest lesions, there were no significant correlations either between the SUV\textsubscript{max}, SUV\textsubscript{mean}, SUV\textsubscript{peak} and the ADC\textsubscript{mean} (P=0.992, P=0.843 and P=0.894, respectively) (Figure 3). Besides the correlation between FDG-PET and DWI-MRI we also evaluated the correlation between different FDG-PET biomarkers. In both the FDG most avid lesions as in the largest lesions there was a significant correlation between the SUV\textsubscript{max} and SUV\textsubscript{mean} (P=0.991 and P=0.953 respectively) (Figure 4).

### Table 2. FDG-PET metrics and ADC\textsubscript{mean} (10^{-3} mm^2/s) of included patients (mean±SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUV\textsubscript{max}</th>
<th>SUV\textsubscript{mean}</th>
<th>SUV\textsubscript{peak}</th>
<th>ADC\textsubscript{mean}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most FDG avid</td>
<td>23.8±8.2</td>
<td>16.9±6.6</td>
<td>19.5±7.3</td>
<td>0.7±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest lesion</td>
<td>22.6±7.9</td>
<td>16.2±6.4</td>
<td>18.6±6.8</td>
<td>0.71±0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

In this study, no correlations were found between the FDG-PET SUV and the diffusion-weighted MRI ADC in newly diagnosed DLBCL. The biological meaning of these findings, however, is still unclear. Although the FDG-PET SUV is generally thought to reflect tumor cellular proliferation [19], the biophysical basis of the ADC is less clear. Classically, the low ADCs found in most tumors have been attributed to their increased cellular density; however, this remains a point of contention because diffusivity can also be influenced by extracellular fibrosis, the shape and size of the intercellular spaces, and by other microscopic tissue/tumor organizational characteristics [14]. Interestingly, a recent study found no correlation between the ADC and cellularity of the tumor in DLBCL [20]. Thus, more histological and immunohistochemical studies are required to clarify the biophysical correlate(s) of the ADC in relationship to FDG-PET metrics. On a clinical level, pretreatment quantitative FDG-PET is emerging as a powerful predictor of outcome in DLBCL [9]. Although a similar role for pretreatment diffusion-weighted MRI still has to be established in DLBCL, a recent study in Hodgkin lymphoma reported the pretreatment ADC to be predictive of site-specific interim response to chemotherapy [15]. The lack of a relationship between pretreatment FDG-PET and diffusion-weighted MRI metrics might indicate a complementary role of these two imaging modalities for pretreatment risk stratification and early response assessment in DLBCL. Further studies are required to investigate these hypotheses.

Similar to our findings, a previous study by Wu et al. found no correlations between the pretreatment ADC\textsubscript{mean} and the SUV\textsubscript{max} or SUV\textsubscript{mean} in 15 DLBCL patients [16]. However, another study by the same research group did find a significant relationship between pretreatment FDG-PET and diffusion-weighted MRI metrics [17]. In eight patients with DLBCL, ADC\textsubscript{mean} correlated inversely with the SUV\textsubscript{max} (r=-0.74, P<0.05 when measuring in the center of pathological lymph nodes and r=-0.71, P<0.05 when measuring in the periphery of pathological lymph nodes). The low number of patients and the inclusion of both primary and relapsed DLBCL may have caused these conflicting
results. However, the present study indicates that such a relationship does not exist.

The present study had several limitations. First, the study population was relatively small. Nevertheless, it consisted of a prospectively recruited, homogeneous group of newly diagnosed DLBCL patients. Second, different PET-CT and MRI systems were used, which may have influenced SUV and ADC measurements. It is imperative for future studies to apply a standardized, minimum set of requirements for PET-CT and MRI scanning and continuing quality control. Of interest, although the recently introduced EARL FDG-PET/CT accreditation programme serves this purpose for quantitative PET-CT scanning [5], such an accreditation programme still has to be developed for ADC measurements. Third, only one reader performed all measurements, but blinding for both measurements was assured by introducing a time interval of at least 7 days between the

Figure 3. Scatter plots of FDG-PET metrics (SUV\textsubscript{max} (A, D), SUV\textsubscript{mean} (B, E) and SUV\textsubscript{peak} (C, F) versus ADC\textsubscript{mean} (in 10\textsuperscript{-3} mm\textsuperscript{2}/s) for the most FDG avid lesions (A-C) and largest lesions (D-F). No significant correlations were found (P≥0.498 for all comparisons).

Figure 4. Scatter plots of FDG-PET metrics SUV\textsubscript{max} and SUV\textsubscript{mean} for the most FDG avid lesions (A) and largest lesions (B) (P=0.991 and P=0.953 respectively).
FDG-PET and diffusion-weighted MRI biomarkers in DLBCL

SUV and ADC measurements. Interrater agreement analysis of SUV and ADC measurements, however, was not part of this study and needs further investigation. Fourth, SUV and ADC measurements could not be correlated to histological and immunohistochemical results because diagnostic lymph node excision had been performed before the FDG-PET and MRI examinations. In conclusion, the results of this study indicate that the glycolytic rate as measured by FDG-PET and changes in water compartmentalization and water diffusion as measured by the ADC are independent biological phenomena in newly diagnosed DLBCL. Further studies are warranted to assess the complementary roles of these different imaging biomarkers in the evaluation and follow-up of DLBCL.
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