Journal of Nuclear Medicine, published on December 1, 2016 as doi:10.2967/jnumed.116.187096

Prudence required when using ¹⁸F-FDG PET as reference standard for lymphoma detection

Running title: ¹¹C-MET and ¹⁸F-FDG PET in lymphoma

Hugo J.A. Adams MD, PhD¹

Thomas C. Kwee MD, PhD²

¹Department of Radiology and Nuclear Imaging, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands ²Department of Radiology, Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

Department of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht,

The Netherlands

Correspondence

Hugo J.A. Adams MD, PhD E-mail: h.j.a.adams@gmail.com Tel: +31 88 7556687 Fax: +31 30 2581098 University Medical Center Utrecht Department of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine Heidelberglaan 100 3584 CX Utrecht The Netherlands

Funding

None

Manuscript type

Letter to the Editor.

Potential conflicts of interest

None (all authors).

Author contributions

Hugo J.A. Adams: study design, article writing, final approval of the manuscript Thomas C. Kwee: study design, article writing, final approval of the manuscript

Prudence required when using ¹⁸F-FDG PET as reference standard for lymphoma detection

With interest we read the article by Kaste et al. (1) entitled "Comparison of ¹¹C-methionine and ¹⁸F-FDG PET-CT for staging and follow-up of pediatric lymphoma" that was recently published in the Journal. Kaste et al. (1) mention 18 F-FDG PET to be a valuable tool for staging and response monitoring in lymphoma, with a particular high sensitivity but limited specificity due to non-malignant etiologies that may mimic tumor uptake. Therefore, another tracer, ¹¹C-methionine (¹¹C-MET), was investigated and compared to ¹⁸F-FDG for both staging and monitoring response to therapy after treatment in 21 pediatric patients (19 with Hodgkin lymphoma, 2 with diffuse large B-cell lymphoma [DLBCL]). At staging, 3 nodal groups demonstrated discordant metabolic activity, whereas all others were found to have concordant metabolic activity. Eight weeks after treatment, paired ¹⁸F-FDG and ¹¹C-MET PET was available in 15 patients, of whom 14 (93.3%) had concordant ¹⁸F-FDG PET and ¹¹C-MET PET results. In the remaining patient, metabolic activity was minimally discordant: ¹⁸F-FDG PET had normalized, but the ¹¹C-MET PET study remained slightly positive. This particular patient remained well for more than 3 years from diagnosis without further treatment (i.e., false-positive end-of-treatment ¹¹C-MET PET). During follow-up, 3 patients developed disease relapse and 1 patient developed a secondary DLBCL (importantly, it was not reported how these events related to end-of-treatment ¹⁸F-FDG and ¹¹C-MET PET results) and no deaths occurred. Kaste et al. (1) concluded ¹¹C-MET uptake to be elevated in most regions involved with lymphoma, both at baseline and at end-of-treatment.

However, we disagree with Kaste et al.'s (*1*) conclusion. Their claim that increased ¹¹C-MET uptake is observed in most regions involved with lymphoma cannot be determined by a comparison with staging and response assessment ¹⁸F-FDG PET scans, due to a suboptimal sensitivity and specificity of this imaging modality. First, ¹⁸F-FDG can accumulate in many

3

different other cancers, and several benign alterations, particularly infections and (therapeutic lesions) as already noted by Kaste et al. (1) themselves. Studies have also shown that tumorassociated ¹⁸F-FDG uptake is not only due to viable tumor cells, but also due to a considerable proportion of non-neoplastic cellular elements (such as macrophages) (2). Particularly Hodgkin lymphoma is s an extreme example of this phenomenon, since malignant Reed-Sternberg tumor cells occupy only 0.1-1.0% of the pathological substrate, while the remainder of tissue consists of inflammatory cells. Also note that after start of chemotherapy, an increase in apoptotic and necrotic tumor fraction is followed by an early (4-6-days afterwards) influx of inflammatory cells that consume ¹⁸F-FDG (3). Therefore, ¹⁸F-FDG-avidity during or after treatment generally does not reflect lymphomatous tissue, as has already been shown by several studies that showed a high rate of biopsied false-positive FDG-avid residual lesions (4). On the other hand, negative ¹⁸F-FDG PET results cannot exclude lymphomatous tumor involvement, particularly after treatment. This has been convincingly shown by several studies reporting absence of ¹⁸F-FDG-avid bone marrow lesions in patients with lymphoma-positive bone marrow biopsies (5). Furthermore, antilymphoma therapy has been reported to reduce glucose uptake by malignant cells as a result of downregulation of glucose membrane transporters and/or hexokinase activity (6), generating false-negative results. Finally and most importantly, the spatial resolution of current PET systems is only 6-7 mm, as a result of which it cannot exclude presence involvement by small lymphomatous deposits (7). This hypothesis is supported by several findings such as the occurrence of disease relapse in large proportions of patients who acquired ¹⁸F-FDG PET negative status (8,9), a lower relapse rate in patients with negative ¹⁸F-FDG PET results after chemotherapy who were treated with additional radiation therapy compared to those who were treated with chemotherapy alone (10), and the fact that huge proportions of patients with incurable, indolent lymphomas treated with non-curative chemotherapy can acquire a negative

4

¹⁸F-FDG PET status after therapy. However, the latter does by no means imply the absence of residual lymphomatous disease after treatment.

In conclusion, caution is warranted when using staging and (particularly) response assessment ¹⁸F-FDG PET scans as reference standard for determining the presence or absence of lymphoma deposits throughout the body, since this test suffers from a non-negligible proportion of false-positives and false-negatives. Since Kaste et al. (*1*) reported ¹¹C-MET PET to closely match ¹⁸F-FDG PET results, they should have concluded that the former appears to be equally good or bad as the latter in terms of lymphoma detection, rather than that ¹¹C-MET uptake is elevated in most regions involved with lymphoma.

References

1. Kaste SC, Snyder SE, Metzger ML, et al. Comparison of 11C-methionine and 18F-FDG PET-CT for staging and follow-up of pediatric lymphoma. *J Nucl Med.* 2016.

2. Kubota R, Yamada S, Kubota K, Ishiwata K, Tamahashi N, Ido T. Intratumoral distribution of fluorine-18-fluorodeoxyglucose in vivo: high accumulation in macrophages and granulation tissues studied by microautoradiography. *J Nucl Med.* 1992;33:1972-1980.

3. Brepoels L, De Saint-Hubert M, Stroobants S, et al. Dose-response relationship in cyclophosphamide-treated B-cell lymphoma xenografts monitored with [18F]FDG PET. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2010;37:1688-1695.

4. Adams HJ, Kwee TC. Proportion of false-positive lesions at interim and end-of-treatment FDG-PET in lymphoma as determined by histology: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Radiol.* 2016;85:1963-1970.

5. Adams HJ, Nievelstein RA, Kwee TC. Opportunities and limitations of bone marrow biopsy and bone marrow FDG-PET in lymphoma. *Blood Rev.* 2015;29:417-425.

6. Banning U, Barthel H, Mauz-Korholz C, Kluge R, Korholz D, Sabri O. Effect of druginduced cytotoxicity on glucose uptake in Hodgkin's lymphoma cells. *Eur J Haematol.* 2006;77:102-108.

7. Adams HJ, Kwee TC. A negative 18F-FDG-PET scan can never exclude residual disease. *Nucl Med Commun.* 2016;37:102-103.

8. Adams HJ, Nievelstein RA, Kwee TC. Systematic review and meta-analysis on the prognostic value of complete remission status at FDG-PET in Hodgkin lymphoma after completion of first-line therapy. *Ann Hematol.* 2016;95:1-9.

9. Adams HJ, Nievelstein RA, Kwee TC. Prognostic value of complete remission status at end-of-treatment FDG-PET in R-CHOP-treated diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Haematol.* 2015;170:185-191.

10. Hu C, Deng C, Zou W, Zhang G, Wang J. The Role of Consolidative Radiotherapy after a Complete Response to Chemotherapy in the Treatment of Diffuse Large B-Cell Lymphoma in the Rituximab Era: Results from a Systematic Review with a Meta-Analysis. *Acta Haematol.* 2015;134:111-118.