more transparent on the units of the variables used in the paper. K_1 is indeed expressed in $mL \cdot cm^{-3} \cdot min^{-1}$ (essentially, min^{-1}), tissue activity concentration is in $kBq \cdot mL^{-1}$, and AUC is in $MBq \cdot s \cdot mL^{-1}$ (i.e., 10^6 disintegrations/mL), which makes the unit of SUV_{AUC} 10^{-3} s^{-1}. We have chosen these units so that the order of magnitude of the resulting values would be comparable to the commonly used SUV parameter. In this way, there would be a more intuitive understanding of high and low tracer uptake by the presented $SUV_{AUC,PP}$ data for all those readers who are used to SUV data. Of course, strictly speaking, the authors are correct with respect to using units consistently.

As the authors note, $SUV_{AUC,PP}$ can also be treated as a surrogate direct estimation of the rate constant K_1. Indeed, for a single-tissue-compartment irreversible model (1T1k) with negligible blood volume fraction, $K_1 = SUV_{AUC,PP}$ by definition. We agree with the authors that if $SUV_{AUC,PP}$ is to be used in this way, it is important to use comparable units, which can indeed be achieved by applying the correction factor of 60/1,000 as indicated by the authors.

We would like to point out, however, that in the paper, K_1 was derived with blood volume correction (1T1k + V_B), whereas $SUV_{AUC,PP}$ was not. Therefore, the definition $SUV_{AUC,PP} = K_1$ will not hold and should be replaced with $SUV_{AUC,PP} = V_B \frac{C_{WB}}{\int_0^t C_P dt} + (1 - V_B)K_1$, where C_{WB} is the whole-blood activity concentration, C_P is the metabolite-corrected activity concentration in plasma, and V_B is the blood volume parameter. We believe V_B to be responsible for part of the underestimation observed for SUV_{AUC} compared with K_1. We would also like to point out that in the paper, $SUV_{AUC,PP}$ (and K_1) represents a surrogate measure for K_i, that is, a combination of K_1, k_2, and k_3, and should not be viewed as a simple rate constant.

Despite the confusion regarding units, we hope we have shown that commonly used SUV metrics cannot be applied to quantify ^{18}F-fluoromethylcholine uptake reliably and that normalization of tracer uptake by the integral of the input function (as a surrogate of K_i) is, in our opinion, the best simplified approach.

REFERENCE

1. Verwer EE, Oprea-Lager DE, van den Eertwegh AJ, et al. Quantification of ^{18}F-fluorocholine kinetics in patients with prostate cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2015;56: 365–371.

Eline E. Verwer
Adriaan A. Lammertsma
Ronald Boellaard
VU University Medical Center
De Boelelaan 1117
Amsterdam 1081 HZ, The Netherlands
Email: e.verwer@vumc.nl

Published online Oct. 1, 2015.
DOI: 10.2967/jnumed.115.164087

Erratum

In the article "Significant Therapeutic Efficacy with Combined Radioimmunotherapy and Cetuximab in Preclinical Models of Colorectal Cancer," by Vassileva et al. (*J Nucl Med.* 2015;56:1239–1245), Author Jane Kinghorn of the Translational Research Office, University College London, was mistakenly mentioned in the Acknowledgments instead of the byline. The authors regret the error.