

Citation: Deng S-m, Zhang W, Zhang B, Chen Y-y, Li J-h, Wu Y-w (2015) Correlation between the Uptake of ¹⁸F-Fluorodeoxyglucose (¹⁸F-FDG) and the Expression of Proliferation-Associated Antigen Ki-67 in Cancer Patients: A Meta-Analysis. PLoS ONE 10(6): e0129028. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129028

Academic Editor: Elda Tagliabue, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, ITALY

Received: January 5, 2015

Accepted: May 4, 2015

Published: June 3, 2015

Copyright: © 2015 Deng et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the <u>Creative Commons Attribution License</u>, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Funding: This study was supported by the Open Program of Key Laboratory of Nuclear Medicine, Ministry of Health and Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Molecular Nuclear Medicine (KF201305 and KF201306), Science and Technology Development Program of Suzhou (SYSD2013076), Application Foundation Research Program of Suzhou (SYS201224). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Correlation between the Uptake of ¹⁸F-Fluorodeoxyglucose (¹⁸F-FDG) and the Expression of Proliferation-Associated Antigen Ki-67 in Cancer Patients: A Meta-Analysis

Sheng-ming Deng^{1,2}, Wei Zhang¹, Bin Zhang^{1,3*}, Yin-yin Chen⁴, Ji-hui Li¹, Yi-wei Wu¹

 Department of Nuclear Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, Suzhou, China,
 School of Radiation Medicine and Protection, Medical College of Soochow University, Suzhou, China,
 Key Laboratory of Nuclear Medicine, Ministry of Health, Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Molecular Nuclear Medicine, Jiangsu Institute of Nuclear Medicine, Wuxi, China, 4 Department of Radiology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, Suzhou, China

* <u>zbnuclmd@126.com</u>

Abstract

Objective

To study the correlation between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and cell proliferation in cancer patients by meta-analysis of published articles.

Methods

We searched PubMed (MEDLINE included), EMBASE, and Cochrane Database of Systematic Review, and selected research articles on the relationship between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and Ki-67 expression (published between August 1, 1994-August 1, 2014), according to the literature inclusion and exclusion criteria. The publishing language was limited to English. The quality of included articles was evaluated according to the Quality Assessment of Diagnosis Accuracy Studies-2 (QUADAS-2). The correlation coefficient (r) was extracted from the included articles and processed by Fisher's r-to-z transformation. The combined correlation coefficient (r) and the 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated with STATA 11.0 software under a random-effects model. Begg's test was used to analyze the existence of publication bias and draw funnel plot, and the sources of heterogeneity were explored by sensitivity and subgroup analyses.

Results

According to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 79 articles were finally included, including 81 studies involving a total of 3242 patients. All the studies had a combined r of 0.44 (95% Cl, 0.41-0.46), but with a significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 80.9\%$, *P*<0.01). Subgroup analysis for different tumor types indicated that most subgroups showed a reduced heterogeneity.



Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Malignant melanoma (n = 1) had the minimum correlation coefficient (-0.22) between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and Ki-67 expression, while the thymic epithelial tumors (TETs; n = 2) showed the maximum correlation coefficient of 0.81. The analytical results confirmed that correlation between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and Ki-67 expression was extremely significant in TETs, significant in gastrointestinal stromal tumors (GISTs), moderate in patients with lung, breast, bone and soft tissue, pancreatic, oral, thoracic, and uterine and ovarian cancers, average in brain, esophageal and colorectal cancers, and poor in head and neck, thyroid, gastric and malignant melanoma tumors. Subgroup analysis indicated that positron emission tomography (PET) or PET/CT imaging technology or Ki-67 and standardized uptake value (SUV) measurement technology did not significantly affect the results of r values, and Begg's test showed no significant publication bias.

Conclusion

In cancer patients, ¹⁸F-FDG uptake showed a moderate positive correlation with tumor cell proliferation. Different tumor types exhibited varied degree of correlation, and the correlation was significant in TETs and GSTs. However, our results need further validation by clinical trials with a large sample of different tumor types.

Introduction

Higher cell proliferation rate is one of the poor prognostic factors of cancer patients. Currently, various methods can be used to evaluate tumor cell proliferation, and immunohistochemical determination of the expression of the nuclear marker of proliferating cells, Ki-67, is considered to be a reliable means to monitor cell proliferation. Ki-67 is a cell cycle-related protein, expressed in each but the G0 phase of cell cycle [1]. The expression of Ki-67 in poorly differentiated carcinomas is significantly higher than that in well-differentiated ones, and tumors with higher Ki-67 expression display increased invasiveness. However, the expression of Ki-67 in different tumor regions is not completely uniform. Therefore, use of a small tumor block to detect the expression of Ki-67 may not be accurate and thus have certain application limitations [2].

PET is a molecular imaging technique that can noninvasively evaluate a variety of human physiological processes, including cell metabolism, angiogenesis, receptor expression, drug uptake, cell proliferation, etc. ¹⁸F-FDG is one of the most commonly used PET radionuclide imaging agents, widely used in cancer diagnosis, disease staging, biopsy target delineation, efficacy assessment, etc. However, its application has some limitations. For example, ¹⁸F-FDG is not a tumor-specific imaging agent, and it can also be absorbed by certain granulation tissues or inflammatory cells [<u>3</u>].

Currently, whether ¹⁸F-FDG PET or PET/CT imaging can reflect the existence of tumor cell proliferation remains controversial. Some studies found that ¹⁸F-FDG uptake showed a clear correlation with cell proliferation and differentiation markers [4–6], but others indicated no significant correlation between them [7–9]. Given the contradictory conclusions on this issue, we retrieved clinical studies on ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and cell proliferation and differentiation marker Ki-67, used meta-analysis methods to analyze the pooled data, and evaluated the correlation and the degree of correlation, in order to provide evidence-based references for clinical application.

Methods

Document retrieval

The EMBASE, PubMed (MEDLINE included), and Cochrane Library databases were searched by 2 researchers independently to screen for research articles on the relationship between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and the expression of cell proliferation marker Ki-67 published in English language between August 1, 1994-August 1, 2014. The searching terms and strategy were "positron emission tomography OR PET OR positron emission tomography/computed tomography OR PET/CT OR PET-CT OR positron emission tomography-computed tomography" AND "¹⁸F-FDG OR fluorodeoxyglucose OR FDG OR ¹⁸FDG OR FDG-F18" AND "ki67 OR ki-67 OR Ki 67 OR mitotic index OR proliferation index OR MIB1 OR MIB-1 OR mitosis index." To minimize the loss of literatures, we conducted manual searches simultaneously as well as secondary searches for the references cited in the included articles.

Document screening

Two reviewers independently screened the retrieved articles according to the literature inclusion and exclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria were as follows: 1) studies using PET or PET/ CT imaging to analyze the relationship between tumor ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and Ki-67 expression; 2) studies focusing on patients with malignant tumors, or although benign tumors were included, the vast majority of tumors were malignant; 3) tumors confirmed by cytopathology or histopathology; and 4) full-length articles published in peer-reviewed journals. The exclusion criteria included the following: 1) when data or part of the data published in separate articles, the one containing the latest and the most complete data was included; 2) animal experiments, reviews, case reports, abstracts, letters, reviews, commentary, cell experiments, and lectures; 3) articles on post-treatment patients only; 4) the number of patients was fewer than 10; and 5) articles did not provide a correlation coefficient or enough data to calculate the correlation coefficient. When the 2 independent researchers had disagreement over screened articles, the inclusion was decided by 3rd investigator.

Data extraction

The data were extracted from the included literatures by 2 investigators independently, and the extracted contents included the following: 1) basic information of the study, including the author, number of patients, tumor type, year of publication; 2) Ki-67 measurement techniques, including the specimen collection method (cell biopsy or surgery), counting method (manual or automatic counting), and labeling index (LI) calculation (Ki-67_{max} or Ki-67_{mean}; LI calculated in the tumor region with highest proliferation rate is considered as Ki-67_{max}, otherwise as Ki-67_{mean}); 3) count information of PET or PET/CT measurement of ¹⁸F-FDG, including imaging equipment (PET or PET/CT), ¹⁸F-FDG dose, imaging agent uptake time, emission scanning time, outlining method for tumor region of interest, uptake index (SUV_{max}, SUV_{mean} or other); and 4) correlation coefficient between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and Ki-67 expression, including the Spearman correlation coefficient, Pearson correlation coefficient, and r^2 . If the article did not directly report the value of correlation coefficient r, r value was calculated based on the raw data or scatter plot, using the free software Engauge Digitizer and the SPSS 18.0 software. This study selected Spearman correlation coefficient for analysis. Since the Spearman correlation coefficient has already been processed by logarithmic conversion, it does not need to undergo the conversion again. The Pearson correlation coefficients were converted to Spearman correlation coefficients for further analysis [10]. The sampling of Spearman correlation coefficient is not normally distributed. Because its CI depends on the value of correlation coefficient, we

converted the Spearman correlation coefficient by Fisher transformation, to obtain the z value with approximately normal distribution. The z value was then converted by inverse Fisher transformation, to obtain the Spearman correlation coefficient and related CI [11]. When there were multiple correlation coefficients calculated from several SUV or Ki-67 values, the highest value was chosen. When the 2 researchers had differences in data extraction process, a third investigator joined to form a committee to vote for a decision.

Evaluation of the literature quality

Two investigators independently assessed the quality of the articles according to the QUA-DAS-2 [12], the scale table of which consists of 2 parts of contents: "risk assessment" and "practical application." The former was assessed from 4 aspects as patient selection, reference standard, index test, and flow and timing, and the latter included 3 aspects as patient selection, reference standard, and index test.

To ensure that QUADAS-2 is applicable in the present study, we set the Ki-67 detection and ¹⁸F-FDG PET (or PET/CT) examination as "reference test" and "index test" respectively. In this study, we chose 4 weeks as the threshold interval between PET or PET/CT examination and Ki-67 detection. When there were assessing differences between the 2 researchers, they were determined by the 3rd researcher.

Meta-analysis

The combined correlation coefficient between ¹⁸F-FDG SUV and Ki-67 LI was calculated according to the values of correlation coefficient r provided in each article. Correlation coefficients were converted by the Fisher's r-to-z transformation to obtain approximately normally distributed z-values to further calculate the 95% CI. This study used a random effects model to pool and analyze. The r<0.21 indicated poor correlation; $0.21 \le r<0.41$ suggested average correlation; $0.41 \le r<0.61$ was considered moderate correlation; $0.61 \le r<0.81$ meant significant correlation; and $r \ge 0.81$ indicated strong correlation [13]. The existence of publication bias was assessed using the Begg's funnel plot and Begg's statistics.

The heterogeneity among r values of different studies was tested using Chi-square test and inconsistency index methods at the testing level of a = 0.05. The significance of heterogeneity was presented as *P* and I² values, and *P*<0.05 or I²>50% indicated the presence of significant heterogeneity [14]. In case of the existence of heterogeneity, the sources of heterogeneity were further explored by sensitivity analysis.

Subgroup analysis was grouped according to factors as the following: 1) tumor type, 2) Ki-67 LI measurement method (Ki- 67_{max} or Ki- 67_{mean}), 3) pathology collection methods (surgery or biopsy), 4) application of PET or PET/CT, and 5) SUV index (SUV_{max}) SUV_{mean}, etc.).

Statistical analysis was performed using STATA 11 software package (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX, USA). *P*<0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

The results of literature search and screening

A total of 1117 related articles were retrieved from the initial search (Fig 1). After removing the repetitive ones, the 856 remaining abstracts were further screened according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and 264 possibly eligible articles underwent full-text screening. A total of 185 articles were eventually excluded for reasons as the following: 1) the article did not involve the evaluation of the relationship between Ki-67 expression and ¹⁸F-FDG uptake (n = 134); 2) the number of cases studied was fewer than 10 (n = 17); 3) the original data in the

article failed to generate the correlation coefficient values (n = 27); 4) part of the data in the study appeared in other articles (n = 6); and 5) most of the cases studied were benign tumors (n = 1).

Ultimately, 79 articles were included in the present study [15-93]. One of them contained studies on 3 types of tumors and was counted as 3 studies. Therefore, the present analysis included a total of 81 studies.

Basic information of the included studies

All included articles were published between 2001–2014, involving a total of 3242 patients, and the median cases enrolled in each individual study were 30 (range, 10–213). In 3 studies, some patients received multiple examinations. Therefore, the present analysis included a total of 3246 examinations. The tumor types contained in various studies are shown in <u>S1 Table</u>.

In all studies included, the mostly involved tumor type was lung cancer, analyzed in a total of 17 studies, followed by breast cancer and lymphoma, in 13 and 12 studies respectively. Brain



PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram



Fig 1. Flow diagram of study selection.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129028.g001







Fig 2. Methodological quality of all eligible studies.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129028.g002

tumors were analyzed in 5 studies. Other tumor types included GISTs, bone and soft tissue sarcoma, malignant melanoma, head and neck cancer, as well as esophageal, pancreatic, gastric, colorectal, thyroid, ovarian, oral, thoracic, thymic, uterine, and hepatocellular cancers.

For the measurement of Ki-67 expression, the majority of studies used surgically-acquired specimens (37 studies) and manual count (53 studies), and calculated the expression of Ki-67 in the regions with highest proliferation rate (Ki-67_{max}, 29 studies).

For ¹⁸F-FDG scans, 39 studies used PET examination, while 35 used PET/CT; there were 6 studies used both PET and PET/CT, and 1 study did not report the instrument usage. While SUV_{max} was used to calculate r value in 52 studies, 12 and 17 studies used SUV_{mean} and other SUV values respectively to conduct the calculation (<u>S2 Table</u>).

The results of QUADAS-2 assessing the quality of the included articles

As shown in Fig 2, the results of QUADAS-2 assessing the quality of the included articles indicated that the results of 11 studies showed low risk of bias in all the aspects assessed. Among all the 81 studies, 11 in the aspect of patient selection, 8 in index text, 37 in reference standard, and 50 in flow and timing displayed unknown or high risk.

Lack of an explicit description of the time interval between the reference and index tests was a problem of most studies. A total of 42 studies did not provide the time interval between ¹⁸F-FDG PET (or PET/CT) examination and Ki-67 measurement, and another 8 studies were assessed as high risk for having time intervals over 4 weeks.

In 44 studies, the interpretation of reference standard was clearly stated as under unknown index test, while 37 studies did not state clearly.

In addition, patients enrolled in 2 studies were with recurred tumors, while cases in another study were patients with second primary tumors. In these 2 types of patients, whether the relationship between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and Ki-67 expression differs from that in patients with single primary tumor is unclear; therefore, the risk of case selection bias in the above 3 studies was considered high in the present analysis.

The results of meta-analysis of ¹⁸F-FDG/Ki-67 correlation and heterogeneity test

The data provided by the finally included studies all met the standard of meta-analysis. The r value for 1 study was calculated from the provided r^2 , and the r value for another study was

determined from the provided scatter plot. For another 6 studies, r values were calculated based on the provided raw data of corresponding Ki-67 and SUV.

The combined r value finally calculated from all the included articles was 0.44 (95% CI, 0.41–0.46), but the results of heterogeneity test indicated the presence of marked heterogeneity among studies ($I^2 = 80.9\%$, P < 0.01; Fig 3). We then conducted a sensitivity analysis, by excluding each article at a time to observe its effect on the final outcome, but the results showed that no individual study contributed more greatly to the total heterogeneity. The results of Begg's test indicated no significant publication deviation among the included articles (P > 0.05; Fig 4).

As shown in Fig 5, subgroup analysis for tumor types showed that the combined r for the 17 studies of lung cancer was 0.49 (95% CI, 0.44–0.54; P<0.01), and there was significant heterogeneity among the included studies ($I^2 = 64.7\%$, P < 0.01). Because the number of lung cancer is relatively larger, we further divided these studies into 4 subgroups as non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), adenocarcinoma, multiple tumor types, and other tumor types for analysis. The heterogeneity of NSCLC and adenocarcinoma subgroups decreased ($I^2 = 45.8\%$, P > 0.05 and $I^2 =$ 55.6%, P>0.05, respectively), but the change of the combined r value showed a different trend, increased in NSCLC subgroup (r = 0.55; 95% CI; 0.48–0.62) but declined in adenocarcinoma subgroup (r = 0.48; 95% CI, 0.40–0.55). The combined r values for the 13 studies on breast cancer and the 12 studies on lymphoma were 0.44 (95% CI, 0.38–0.50; P < 0.01; $I^2 = 45.2\%$, P < 0.05) and 0.41 (95% CI, 0.33–0.48; P < 0.01; I² = 74.8%, P < 0.01) respectively, and the latter displayed a higher heterogeneity. The combined r value for the subgroup of 5 studies on brain tumors was 0.35 (95% CI, 0.24–0.46; P < 0.01), without significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0.0\%$, P>0.05). The combined r values for the 4 studies on esophageal cancer and the 4 studies on head and neck cancer were 0.21 (95% CI, 0.03–0.39; P < 0.05; $I^2 = 48.5\%$, P > 0.05) and 0.13 $(95\% \text{ CI}, -0.07-0.32; P>0.05; \text{ I}^2 = 88\%, P<0.01)$ respectively, and the latter exhibited a significant heterogeneity. The combined r values for the 4 studies on GISTs and the 3 studies on bone and soft tissue sarcoma were 0.72 (95% CI, 0.58–0.85; P < 0.05; $I^2 = 58.3\%$, P > 0.05) and 0.50 $(95\% \text{ CI}, 0.39-0.61; P < 0.01; \text{ I}^2 = 76\%, P < 0.05).$

In addition, the results of subgroup analysis on the different measurement methods for ¹⁸F-FDG SUV and Ki -67 LI are shown in <u>Fig 6</u>.

Discussion

In recent years, a growing number of studies have focused on the relationship between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and Ki-67 expression, which was investigated in the present study using metaanalysis methods. We analyzed the differences in their correlation among different tumor types as well as explored the differences among various methods used in ¹⁸F-FDG SUV and Ki-67 LI measurements. Our results showed that in cancer patients, ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and tumor proliferation displayed a moderate correlation. Subgroup analysis on different ¹⁸F-FDG SUV and Ki-67 LI measuring methods indicated that the combined r values of subgroups did not show significant changes, and neither there were significant changes in heterogeneity. However, subgroup analysis of different tumor types indicated varied degrees of correlation among different tumor types.

In this study, we used QUADAS-2 as tool to assess the quality of included studies. In most studies, the time interval between ¹⁸F-FDG PET (or PET/CT) imaging and the acquirement of surgical pathology specimens was not clearly stated. Among the studies included in the present analysis, most the ¹⁸F-FDG PET (or PET/CT) imaging was prior to the detection of Ki-67; therefore, the interpretation of ¹⁸F-FDG PET or PET/CT imaging results was conducted under unknown Ki-67 test results. But the vast majority of the articles did not mention whether the

PLOS ONE

Folpe et al. (2000) 0.35 (0.15, 0.52) 2. Avril et al. (2001) 0.41 (0.11, 0.64) 1. Buck et al. (2001) 0.63 (0.45, 0.76) 1. Buck et al. (2003) 0.63 (0.45, 0.76) 1. Buck et al. (2003) 0.63 (0.45, 0.76) 1. Francis et al. (2003) 0.59 (0.26, 0.80) 0. Francis et al. (2004) 0.44 (-0.31, 0.82) 0. Chen et al. (2005) 0.83 (0.43, 0.96) 0. Kamiyama et al. (2005) 0.23 (-0.06, 0.49) 1. Van Westreenen et al. (2005) 0.23 (-0.06, 0.49) 1. Van Westreenen et al. (2005) 0.14 (-0.54, 0.71) 0.	68 23 71 43 94 62 80 31 52 43 31 45 31 31
Jacob et al. (2001) 0.7/ (0.40, 0.92) 0.63 (0.45, 0.76) 1. Buck et al. (2003) -0.03 (-0.47, 0.42) 0.63 (0.45, 0.76) 1. Buck et al. (2003) -0.03 (-0.47, 0.42) 0.59 (0.26, 0.80) 0.59 (0.26, 0.80) 0. Kurokawa et al. (2004) 0.40 (-0.31, 0.82) 0. 0.51 (-0.03, 0.82) 0. Kurokawa et al. (2005) 0.51 (-0.03, 0.82) 0. 0.51 (-0.03, 0.82) 0. Wam Vestreenen et al. (2005) 0.23 (-0.47, 0.49) 1. 0.14 (-0.54, 0.71) 0.14 (-0.54, 0.71)	.43 .94 .62 .80 .31 .52 .43 .31 .45 .31 .31
Buck et al. (2003) 0.59 (0.26, 0.80) 0. Francis et al. (2003) 0.40 (-0.31, 0.82) 0. Kurokawa et al. (2004) 0.46 (-0.03, 0.77) 0. Chen et al. (2005) 0.51 (-0.03, 0.82) 0. Kamiyama et al. (2005) 0.83 (0.43, 0.96) 0. Van Westreenen et al. (2005) 0.23 (-0.60, 0.49) 1. Van Westreenen et al. (2005) 0.14 (-0.54, 0.71) 0.	.80 .31 .52 .43 .31 .45 .31 .31 .31
Kurokawa et al. (2004) 0.46 (-0.05, 0.77) 0. Chen et al. (2005) 0.51 (-0.03, 0.82) 0. Kamiyama et al. (2005) 0.83 (0.43, 0.96) 0. Van Westreenen et al. (2005) 0.14 (-0.54, 0.71) 0.	.52 .43 .31 .45 .31 .31 .31
Kim et al. (2005) $0.23 (-0.06, 0.49)$ 1. van Westreenen et al. (2005) $0.14 (-0.54, 0.71)$ 0.	.45 .31 31
Buck at al. (2006) $0.52(-0.16(0.87)) = 0.52(-0.16(0.87))$.51
Dick et al. (2006) 0.52 (-0.10, 0.67) Tateishi et al. (2006) 0.75 (0.42, 0.90) 0.64 (0.47, 0.77) 0.64 (0.47, 0.77)	.52 .94
Watanabe et al. (2006) 0.42 (0.21, 0.59) 2. Yap et al. (2006) 0.27 (-0.28, 0.69) 0. Ikenage et al. (2007) 0.75 (-0.27, 0.27) 0.75 (-0.27)	.19 .46 .77
Nguyen et al. (2007) Shimoda et al. (2007) 0.46 (0.22, 0.65) 1. 0.50 (0.21, 0.71) 1. 0.50 (0.21, 0.71) 1.	.63 .14
Yamada et al. (2007) 0.52 (0.12, 0.78) 0.78 Yamamoto et al. (2007) 0.81 (0.55, 0.93) 0.81 (0.55, 0.93) Buchmann et al. (2008) 0.49 (-0.00, 0.79) 0.49 (-0.00, 0.79)	.55 .49
Kato et al. (2008) 0.42 (0.21, 0.60) 2. Vesselle et al. (2008) 0.51 (0.36, 0.64) 3. Han et al. (2000) 0.44 (0.12, 0.60) 4.	.16 .36
Kaira et al. (2009) 0.61 (0.12, 0.06) 1. Kaira et al. (2009) 0.61 (0.15, 0.78) 1. Construction 0.61 (0.15, 0.34) 0.	.14 .59
Lee et al. (2009) Nakamura et al. (2009) Shibata et al. (2009) 0.69 (0.43, 0.84) 0.69 (0.43, 0.84) 0.40 (0.27, 0.52) 0.52	.82 .92 .21
Tang et al. (2009) 0.40 (-0.01, 0.70) 0. Yamamoto et al. (2009) 0.22 (-0.18, 0.56) 0. Visco et al. (2009) 0.22 (-0.18, 0.56) 0.	.71 .80
Miyashita et al. (2010) 0.64 (0.33, 0.83) 0. Murakami et al. (2010) 0.55 (0.42, 0.65) 4.	.77 .31
Papaj ^{-ak} et al. (2011) Tchou et al. (2010) Watanabe et al. (2010) 0.49 (0.24, 0.55) 3. 0.49 (0.20, 0.69) 1. 0.47 (0.44, 0.82) 1.	.36 .23 11
Chihara et al. (2011) 0.41 (0.01, 0.70) 0.19 (-0.22, 0.54) 0.19	.74
$\begin{array}{c} -0.11(-0.45, 0.25) & 0.5 \\ \text{Kitamura et al. (2011)} \\ \text{Park et al. (2011)} \\ \text{Park et al. (2011)} \\ \end{array}$.96 .94 .80
Tsujikawa et al. (2011) 0.08 (-0.39, 0.51) 0. Walter et al. (2011) 0.69 (0.38, 0.86) 0. Change et al. (2012) 0.04 (-0.70) 0.070)	.59 .68 .83
Cochet et al. (2012) 0.69 (0.48, 0.82) 1. Garc ^{-*} a Vicente et al. (2012) 0.35 (0.12, 0.54) 2. Ubit of Cochet et al. (2012) 0.35 (0.12, 0.54) 2.	.23 .09
Kaira et al. (2012) 0.53 (-0.72, 0.22) 0. Koolen et al. (2012) 0.59 (0.22, 0.82) 0. 0.59 (0.22, 0.82) 0. 0.40 (0.28, 0.51)	.65 .56
Kurland et al. (2012) $-0.07 (-0.48, 0.36)$ Kuyumcu et al. (2012) $0.59 (0.21, 0.81)$ Leonard et al. (2012) $0.04 (-0.48, 0.36)$.68 .65 46
Minamimoto et al. (2012) Miyake et al. (2012) Miyake et al. (2012) Miyake et al. (2012)	.59
Park et al. (2012) 0.06 (0.45, 0.60) 1. Sauter et al. (2012) 0.61 (0.20, 0.84) 0.	.59 .55
Shou et al. (2012) 0.75 (0.56, 0.87) 1. Wu et al. (2012) 0.70 (0.29, 0.89) 0. Bai et al. (2013) 0.35 (0.15, 0.53) 2.	.11 .46 .50
Cheng et al. (2013) Hu et al. (2013) Motempto et al. (2013) Other and (2013)	.46
Tanaka et al. (2013) 0.75 (0.38, 0.60) 1. Yang et al. (2013) 0.36 (-0.13, 0.71) 0.	.96 .55
Y oshikawa et al. (2013) 0.66 (0.06, 0.91) 0. Zhang et al. (2013) 0.66 (0.06, 0.91) 0.	31 .11 .45
Garc ^{*a} a–Esquinas et al. (2014) Hirose et al. (2014) Humbert et al. (2014) 0.29 (0.06, 0.50) 2.	.32 .09 88
Kaida et al. (2014) $-0.02(-0.32, 0.06)$ 1. Kaida et al. (2014) $-0.38 (0.06, 0.63)$ 1.	.32
Kaida et al. (2014) 0.37 (0.07, 0.61) 1. Shimomura et al. (2014) 0.29 (-0.00, 0.54) 1. Suzuki et al. (2014) 0.40 (0.07, 0.65) 1.	23 39 .05
Viti et al. (2014) 0.90 (0.78, 0.96) 0. Overall (I-squared = 80.9%, p = 0.000) 0.44 (0.41, 0.46) 10	.71 00.00



Fig 3. Forest plots of the summary correlation coefficient (r) with corresponding 95% CIs for the correlation between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and tumor cell proliferation in all eligible studies.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129028.g003

test results of Ki-67 were interpreted blindly. In addition, some studies did not adequately address the inclusion criteria of patients. The above problems may increase the bias of study.

In recent years, ¹⁸F-fluorothymidine (FLT) as a proliferation imaging agent has drawn incredible attention. ¹⁸F-FLT is a thymidine analogue, the uptake of which is related to the activity of thymidine kinase-1 (TK-1), the specific enzyme in the S phase of the pyrimidine salvage pathway [94]. Some studies included in the present work compared the correlations of ¹⁸F-FLT and ¹⁸F-FDG uptakes with Ki-67 expression; part of them showed that the correlation between ¹⁸F-FLT SUV and Ki-67 index was higher than that between ¹⁸F-FDG SUV and Ki-67 index [21,24], whereas others suggested that neither ¹⁸F-FLT SUV nor ¹⁸F-FDG SUV had significant correlation with Ki-67 index [27,43,48,57]. One article indicated that ¹⁸F-FLT uptake was not only affected by cell proliferation, but also by other mechanisms such as nucleoside transporters, etc. [43]. Another article systematically assessing the relationship between ¹⁸F-FLT SUV and Ki-67 expression showed a combined correlation coefficient of 0.55 [14]. Although ¹⁸F-FDG SUV is not an indicator directly reflecting the cell proliferation, ¹⁸F-FDG uptake is closely related to cell proliferation, because that tumor cell proliferation depends mainly on glycolysis for energy, and many signal transduction pathways in the process of malignant transformation of the tumor cells are regulated by glycolytic metabolism [95]. The present



doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129028.g004





doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129028.g005





Fig 6. The combined correlation coefficient (r) with corresponding 95% CIs for the subgroup analysis based on sample, Ki-67 scoring method, Ki-67 imaging analysis, scanner and SUV.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129028.g006

study showed that the combined correlation coefficient between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and cell proliferation was 0.44, indicating a moderate positive correlation. This result suggested that ¹⁸F-FDG SUV can be used as an indicator in tumor diagnosis, to reflect the proliferation and invasiveness of tumor, and to assess the therapeutic efficacy.

In this study, we conducted subgroup analysis based on different tumor types. Previous subgroup analysis of ¹⁸F-FLT/Ki-67 relationship indicated that the correlation coefficient was independent of the pathological type of tumors [14]. But our findings revealed that some subgroups showed a declined heterogeneity, i.e., there were differences in the correlation between ¹⁸F-FDG SUV and cell proliferation among tumor types. Malignant melanoma displayed the lowest combined correlation coefficient value of -0.22 (n = 1), while the highest r (0.81, n = 2) was with the TETs. The correlation between ¹⁸F-FDG and Ki-67 was highly significant in TETs, significant in GISTs, moderate in lung, breast, bone and soft tissue, pancreatic, oral, thoracic, uterine, and ovary cancers, average in brain, esophageal and colorectal cancers, and poor in head and neck, thyroid, gastric and malignant melanoma tumors. One article included in the present study investigated the relationship between ¹⁸F-FDG uptake and various clinico-pathological factors in 3 tumor types that are distinct in pathological and biological manifestations, and showed that the biological factors affecting the SUV in different pathological types of tumors varied [90]. Therefore, in different tumor types, the molecular mechanisms affecting ¹⁸F-FDG uptake varies, and tumor differentiation is just one of the factors, which to certain extent explains why there are differences in Ki-67/SUV relationship among different tumor types, though this issue needs to be further explored with more experiments. Currently, many clinical applications of ¹⁸F-FDG PET, including the localization of biopsy sites, evaluation of therapeutic efficacy, determining target region for radiotherapy, grading malignancy, etc., all are based on the assumption that ¹⁸F-FDG PET can accurately reflect the growth of tumor cells. If our conclusion that the correlation between Ki-67 and SUV varies in different tumor types is proven true, it can guide the correct clinical application of ¹⁸F-FDG PET or PET/CT in certain tumors, or the correct interpretation of the results of ¹⁸F-FDG PET or PET/CT in

This study also analyzed other possible sources of heterogeneity including the PET or PET/ CT imaging technology and Ki-67 and SUV measurement methods. Our results showed that PET or PET/CT imaging technology and Ki-67 and SUV measurement methods in different institutions are different. However, results of subgroup analysis on these factors showed that no single factor was the main source leading to heterogeneity, and that the combined r values of different subgroups did not show a significant difference.

The present study has some potential limitations. First, although the numbers of patients and articles included in this study were large, they were relatively limited to a certain type of tumors, resulting in possible limitations in our inference based on the results of subgroup analysis on different tumor types. Further, the articles included in this study all directly provided correlation coefficient r values or the raw data that can be used to calculate r values. Moreover, articles reported positive or negative results without providing specific data were excluded from the present study, and this study was limited to literatures in English language, which may cause publication bias. However, the results of Begg's test showed no significant publication bias; moreover, we used a random effects model to reduce heterogeneity. Therefore, the results of the present study are reliable.

In short, although there are certain limitations in this study, our analysis indicated that in cancer patients, ¹⁸F-FDG uptake has a moderate positive correlation with tumor cell proliferation, and that the results of ¹⁸F-FDG may be used to assess tumor cell proliferation. The correlations between ¹⁸F-FDG and Ki-67 varied among different types of tumor, i.e., TETs and GISTs showed the more significant correlation, whereas head and neck, thyroid, gastric and malignant melanoma tumors exhibited a poor correlation; the degrees of correlation in rest the tumor types were moderate or average. Nonetheless, the results of the present work need further confirmation with large-sample, prospective studies.

Supporting Information

S1 PRISMA Checklist. PRISMA 2009 Checklist. (DOC) S1 Table. ¹⁸F-FDG PET scan characteristics. (DOCX)

S2 Table. Ki-67 immunohistochemistry characteristics, cancer types, and r values. (DOCX)

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: SMD BZ YWW. Performed the experiments: SMD BZ. Analyzed the data: SMD YYC JHL. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: SMD BZ WZ. Wrote the paper: WZ SMD.

References

- 1. Harris L, Fritsche H, Mennel R, Norton L, Ravdin P, Taube S, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology. American Society of Clinical Oncology 2007 update of recommendations for the use of tumor markers in breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2007; 25: 5287–5312. PMID: <u>17954709</u>
- Ueda S, Tsuda H, Saeki T, Omata J, Osaki A, Shigekawa T, et al. Early metabolic response to neoadjuvant letrozole, measured by FDG PET/CT, is correlated with a decrease in the Ki67 labeling index in patients with hormone receptor-positive primary breast cancer: a pilot study. Breast Cancer. 2011; 18: 299–308. doi: 10.1007/s12282-010-0212-y PMID: 20617404
- Kazama T, Faria SC, Varavithya V, Phongkitkarun S, Ito H, Macapinlac HA. FDG PET in the evaluation of treatment for lymphoma: clinical usefulness and pitfalls. Radiographics. 2005; 25: 191–207. PMID: <u>15653595</u>
- Cher LM, Murone C, Lawrentschuk N, Ramdave S, Papenfuss A, Hannah A, et al. Correlation of hypoxic cell fraction and angiogenesis with glucose metabolic rate in gliomas using 18F-fluoromisonidazole, 18F-FDG PET, and immunohistochemical studies. J Nucl Med. 2006; 47: 410–418. PMID: <u>16513609</u>
- Riedl CC, Akhurst T, Larson S, Stanziale SF, Tuorto S, Bhargava A, et al. 18F-FDG PET scanning correlates with tissue markers of poor prognosis and predicts mortality for patients after liver resection for colorectal metastases. J Nucl Med. 2007; 48: 771–775. PMID: <u>17475966</u>
- Takenaka T, Yano T, Ito K, Morodomi Y, Miura N, Kawano D, et al. Biological significance of the maximum standardized uptake values on positron emission tomography in non-small cell lung cancer. J Surg Oncol. 2009; 100: 688–692. doi: 10.1002/jso.21386 PMID: 19731260
- Buchmann I, Vogg AT, Glatting G, Schultheiss S, Möller P, Leithäuser F, et al. [18F]5-fluoro-2-deoxyuridine-PET for imaging of malignant tumors and for measuring tissue proliferation. Cancer Biother Radiopharm. 2003; 18: 327–337. PMID: <u>12954120</u>
- Westerterp M, Sloof GW, Hoekstra OS, Ten Kate FJ, Meijer GA, Reitsma JB, et al. 18FDG uptake in oesophageal adenocarcinoma: linking biology and outcome. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol. 2008; 134: 227–236. PMID: <u>17653575</u>
- Tsujikawa T, Yoshida Y, Kiyono Y, Kurokawa T, Kudo T, Fujibayashi Y, et al. Functional oestrogen receptor α imaging in endometrial carcinoma using 16α-[¹⁸F]fluoro-17β-oestradiol PET. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2011; 38: 37–45. doi: <u>10.1007/s00259-010-1589-8</u> PMID: <u>20717823</u>
- Rupinski MT, Dunlap WP. Approximating Pearson product-moment correlations from Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. Educational and psychological measurement. 1996; 56: 419–429.
- Chen L, Liu M, Bao J, Xia Y, Zhang J, Zhang L, et al. The correlation between apparent diffusion coefficient and tumor cellularity in patients: a meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2013 Nov 11; 8(11): e79008. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0079008 PMID: 24244402
- Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, et al. QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. Ann Intern Med. 2011; 155: 529–536. doi: <u>10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009</u> PMID: <u>22007046</u>
- Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics. 1977; 33: 159–174. PMID: 843571
- Chalkidou A, Landau DB, Odell EW, Cornelius VR, O'Doherty MJ, Marsden PK. Correlation between Ki-67 immunohistochemistry and 18F-fluorothymidine uptake in patients with cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Cancer. 2012; 48: 3499–3513. doi: <u>10.1016/j.ejca.2012.05.001</u> PMID: <u>22658807</u>
- Folpe AL, Lyles RH, Sprouse JT, Conrad EU 3rd, Eary JF. (F-18) fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography as a predictor of pathologic grade and other prognostic variables in bone and soft tissue sarcoma. Clin Cancer Res. 2000; 6: 1279–1287. PMID: 10778952
- Avril N, Menzel M, Dose J, Schelling M, Weber W, Jänicke F, et al. Glucose metabolism of breast cancer assessed by 18F-FDG PET: histologic and immunohistochemical tissue analysis. J Nucl Med. 2001; 42: 9–16. PMID: <u>11197987</u>
- Buck AC, Schirrmeister HH, Guhlmann CA, Diederichs CG, Shen C, Buchmann I, et al. Ki-67 immunostaining in pancreatic cancer and chronic active pancreatitis: does in vivo FDG uptake correlate with proliferative activity? J Nucl Med. 2001; 42: 721–725. PMID: <u>11337566</u>

- Jacob R, Welkoborsky HJ, Mann WJ, Jauch M, Amedee R. [Fluorine-18] fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography, DNA ploidy and growth fraction in squamous-cell carcinomas of the head and neck. ORL J Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec. 2001; 63: 307–313. PMID: <u>11528276</u>
- Buck A, Schirrmeister H, Kühn T, Shen C, Kalker T, Kotzerke J, et al. FDG uptake in breast cancer: correlation with biological and clinical prognostic parameters. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2002; 29: 1317–1323. PMID: <u>12271413</u>
- Buck AK, Halter G, Schirrmeister H, Kotzerke J, Wurziger I, Glatting G, et al. Imaging proliferation in lung tumors with PET: 18F-FLT versus 18F-FDG. J Nucl Med. 2003; 44: 1426–1431. PMID: <u>12960187</u>
- Francis DL, Freeman A, Visvikis D, Costa DC, Luthra SK, Novelli M, et al. In vivo imaging of cellular proliferation in colorectal cancer using positron emission tomography. Gut. 2003; 52: 1602–1606. PMID: <u>14570730</u>
- 22. Kitagawa Y, Sano K, Nishizawa S, Nakamura M, Ogasawara T, Sadato N, et al. FDG-PET for prediction of tumour aggressiveness and response to intra-arterial chemotherapy and radiotherapy in head and neck cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2003; 30: 63–71. PMID: <u>12483411</u>
- Kurokawa T, Yoshida Y, Kawahara K, Tsuchida T, Okazawa H, Fujibayashi Y, et al. Expression of GLUT-1 glucose transfer, cellular proliferation activity and grade of tumor correlate with [F-18]-fluorodeoxyglucose uptake by positron emission tomography in epithelial tumors of the ovary. Int J Cancer. 2004; 109: 926–932. PMID: 15027127
- Chen W, Cloughesy T, Kamdar N, Satyamurthy N, Bergsneider M, Liau L, et al. Imaging proliferation in brain tumors with 18F-FLT PET: comparison with 18F-FDG. J Nucl Med. 2005; 46: 945–952. PMID: 15937304
- Kamiyama Y, Aihara R, Nakabayashi T, Mochiki E, Asao T, Kuwano H, et al. 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography: useful technique for predicting malignant potential of gastrointestinal stromal tumors. World J Surg. 2005; 29: 1429–1435. PMID: <u>16222452</u>
- Kim S, Chung JK, Im SH, Jeong JM, Lee DS, Kim DG, et al. 11C-methionine PET as a prognostic marker in patients with glioma: comparison with 18F-FDG PET. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2005; 32: 52– 59. PMID: 15309332
- van Westreenen HL, Cobben DC, Jager PL, van Dullemen HM, Wesseling J, Elsinga PH, et al. Comparison of 18F-FLT PET and 18F-FDG PET in esophageal cancer. J Nucl Med. 2005; 46: 400–404. PMID: <u>15750150</u>
- Buck AK, Bommer M, Stilgenbauer S, Juweid M, Glatting G, Schirrmeister H, et al. Molecular imaging of proliferation in malignant lymphoma. Cancer Res. 2006; 66: 11055–11061. PMID: <u>17108145</u>
- 29. Cherk MH, Foo SS, Poon AM, Knight SR, Murone C, Papenfuss AT, et al. Lack of correlation of hypoxic cell fraction and angiogenesis with glucose metabolic rate in non-small cell lung cancer assessed by 18F-Fluoromisonidazole and 18F-FDG PET. J Nucl Med. 2006; 47: 1921–1926. PMID: <u>17138734</u>
- 30. Tateishi U, Yamaguchi U, Seki K, Terauchi T, Arai Y, Hasegawa T. Glut-1 expression and enhanced glucose metabolism are associated with tumour grade in bone and soft tissue sarcomas: a prospective evaluation by [18F] fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2006; 33: 683–691. PMID: <u>16506050</u>
- Watanabe K, Nomori H, Ohtsuka T, Naruke T, Ebihara A, Orikasa H, et al. [F-18]Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography can predict pathological tumor stage and proliferative activity determined by Ki-67 in clinical stage IA lung adenocarcinomas. Jpn J Clin Oncol. 2006; 36: 403–409. PMID: 16782729
- Yap CS, Czernin J, Fishbein MC, Cameron RB, Schiepers C, Phelps ME, et al. Evaluation of thoracic tumors with 18F-fluorothymidine and 18F- fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography. Chest. 2006; 129: 393–401. PMID: <u>16478857</u>
- Ikenaga N, Otomo N, Toyofuku A, Ueda Y, Toyoda K, Hayashi T, et al. Standardized uptake values for breast carcinomas assessed by fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography correlate with prognostic factors. Am Surg. 2007; 73: 1151–1157. PMID: <u>18092653</u>
- Nguyen XC, Lee WW, Chung JH, Park SY, Sung SW, Kim YK, et al. FDG uptake, glucose transporter type 1, and Ki-67 expressions in non-small-cell lung cancer: correlations and prognostic values. Eur J Radiol. 2007; 62: 214–219. PMID: <u>17239556</u>
- 35. Shimoda W, Hayashi M, Murakami K, Oyama T, Sunagawa M. The relationship between FDG uptake in PET scans and biological behavior in breast cancer. Breast Cancer. 2007; 14: 260–268. PMID: <u>17690502</u>
- Yamada M, Niwa Y, Matsuura T, Miyahara R, Ohashi A, Maeda O, et al. Gastric GIST malignancy evaluated by 18FDG-PET as compared with EUS-FNA and endoscopic biopsy. Scand J Gastroenterol. 2007; 42: 633–641. PMID: <u>17454885</u>

- Yamamoto Y, Nishiyama Y, Ishikawa S, Nakano J, Chang SS, Bandoh S, et al. Correlation of 18F-FLT and 18F-FDG uptake on PET with Ki-67 immunohistochemistry in non-small cell lung cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2007; 34: 1610–1616. PMID: <u>17530250</u>
- Buchmann I, Haberkorn U, Schmidtmann I, Brochhausen C, Buchholz HG, Bartenstein P, et al. Influence of cell proportions and proliferation rates on FDG uptake in squamous-cell esophageal carcinoma: a PET study. Cancer Biother Radiopharm. 2008; 23: 172–180. doi: <u>10.1089/cbr.2007.349</u> PMID: <u>18454686</u>
- Kato T, Shinoda J, Nakayama N, Miwa K, Okumura A, Yano H, et al. Metabolic assessment of gliomas using 11C-methionine, [18F] fluorodeoxyglucose, and 11C-choline positron-emission tomography. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2008; 29: 1176–1182. doi: <u>10.3174/ajnr.A1008</u> PMID: <u>18388218</u>
- Vesselle H, Salskov A, Turcotte E, Wiens L, Schmidt R, Jordan CD, et al. Relationship between nonsmall cell lung cancer FDG uptake at PET, tumor histology, and Ki-67 proliferation index. J Thorac Oncol. 2008; 3: 971–978. doi: 10.1097/JTO.0b013e31818307a7 PMID: 18758298
- Han B, Lin S, Yu LJ, Wang RZ, Wang YY. Correlation of ¹⁸F-FDG PET activity with expressions of survivin, Ki67, and CD34 in non-small-cell lung cancer. Nucl Med Commun. 2009; 30: 831–837. doi: <u>10.</u> <u>1097/MNM.0b013e32832dcfc4</u> PMID: <u>19734817</u>
- 42. Kaira K, Oriuchi N, Shimizu K, Ishikita T, Higuchi T, Imai H, et al. Correlation of angiogenesis with 18F-FMT and 18F-FDG uptake in non-small cell lung cancer. Cancer Sci. 2009; 100: 753–758. doi: <u>10.</u> <u>1111/j.1349-7006.2008.01077.x</u> PMID: <u>19141127</u>
- Kameyama R, Yamamoto Y, Izuishi K, Takebayashi R, Hagiike M, Murota M, et al. Detection of gastric cancer using 18F-FLT PET: comparison with 18F-FDG PET. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2009; 36: 382–388. doi: 10.1007/s00259-008-0970-3 PMID: 18985344
- Lee JW, Kang KW, Park SH, Lee SM, Paeng JC, Chung JK, et al. 18F-FDG PET in the assessment of tumor grade and prediction of tumor recurrence in intracranial meningioma. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2009; 36: 1574–1582. doi: 10.1007/s00259-009-1133-x PMID: 19377904
- 45. Nakamura H, Hirata T, Kitamura H, Nishikawa J. Correlation of the standardized uptake value in FDG-PET with the expression level of cell-cycle-related molecular biomarkers in resected non-small cell lung cancers. Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2009; 15: 304–310. PMID: <u>19901884</u>
- 46. Shibata H, Nomori H, Uno K, Iyama K, Tomiyoshi K, Nakashima R, et al. 11C-acetate for positron emission tomography imaging of clinical stage IA lung adenocarcinoma: comparison with 18F-fluorodeoxy-glucose for imaging and evaluation of tumor aggressiveness. Ann Nucl Med. 2009; 23: 609–616. doi: 10.1007/s12149-009-0278-9 PMID: 19562438
- Tang B, Malysz J, Douglas-Nikitin V, Zekman R, Wong RH, Jaiyesimi I, et al. Correlating metabolic activity with cellular proliferation in follicular lymphomas. Mol Imaging Biol. 2009; 11: 296–302. doi: <u>10</u>. 1007/s11307-009-0226-z PMID: 19430847
- Yamamoto Y, Kameyama R, Izuishi K, Takebayashi R, Hagiike M, Asakura M, et al. Detection of colorectal cancer using ¹⁸F-FLT PET: comparison with ¹⁸F-FDG PET. Nucl Med Commun. 2009; 30: 841– 845. doi: <u>10.1097/MNM.0b013e328330294d</u> PMID: <u>19773672</u>
- 49. Kim BH, Kim IJ, Kim SS, Kim SJ, Lee CH, Kim YK. Relationship between biological marker expression and fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose uptake in incidentally detected thyroid cancer. Cancer Biother Radiopharm. 2010; 25: 309–315. doi: <u>10.1089/cbr.2009.0636</u> PMID: <u>20578836</u>
- 50. Miyashita G, Higuchi T, Oriuchi N, Arisaka Y, Hanaoka H, Tominaga H, et al. ¹⁸F-FAMT uptake correlates with tumor proliferative activity in oral squamous cell carcinoma: comparative study with ¹⁸F-FDG PET and immunohistochemistry. Ann Nucl Med. 2010; 24: 579–584. doi: <u>10.1007/s12149-010-0398-2</u> PMID: <u>20652456</u>
- Murakami S, Saito H, Sakuma Y, Mizutani Y, Ishikawa Y, Kondou T, et al. Correlation of 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose uptake on positron emission tomography with Ki-67 index and pathological invasive area in lung adenocarcinomas 30 mm or less in size. Eur J Radiol. 2010; 75: e62–e66. doi: <u>10.1016/j.ejrad.</u> <u>2009.11.020</u> PMID: <u>20005653</u>
- Tchou J, Sonnad SS, Bergey MR, Basu S, Tomaszewski J, Alavi A, et al. Degree of tumor FDG uptake correlates with proliferation index in triple negative breast cancer. Mol Imaging Biol. 2010; 12: 657– 662. doi: <u>10.1007/s11307-009-0294-0</u> PMID: <u>20012701</u>
- 53. Watanabe R, Tomita N, Takeuchi K, Sakata S, Tateishi U, Tanaka M, et al. SUVmax in FDG-PET at the biopsy site correlates with the proliferation potential of tumor cells in non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Leuk Lymphoma. 2010; 51: 279–283. doi: 10.3109/10428190903440953 PMID: 20038236
- 54. Chihara D, Oki Y, Onoda H, Taji H, Yamamoto K, Tamaki T, et al. High maximum standard uptake value (SUVmax) on PET scan is associated with shorter survival in patients with diffuse large B cell lymphoma. Int J Hematol. 2011; 93: 502–508. doi: <u>10.1007/s12185-011-0822-y</u> PMID: <u>21512731</u>
- 55. Deron P, Vangestel C, Goethals I, De Potter A, Peeters M, Vermeersch H, et al. FDG uptake in primary squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck. The relationship between overexpression of glucose

transporters and hexokinases, tumour proliferation and apoptosis. Nuklearmedizin. 2011; 50: 15–21. doi: <u>10.3413/nukmed-0324-10-06</u> PMID: <u>21052609</u>

- 56. Hoshikawa H, Nishiyama Y, Kishino T, Yamamoto Y, Haba R, Mori N. Comparison of FLT-PET and FDG-PET for visualization of head and neck squamous cell cancers. Mol Imaging Biol. 2011; 13: 172– 177. doi: 10.1007/s11307-010-0331-z PMID: 20464518
- Kitamura K, Hatano E, Higashi T, Narita M, Seo S, Nakamoto Y, et al. Proliferative activity in hepatocellular carcinoma is closely correlated with glucose metabolism but not angiogenesis. J Hepatol. 2011; 55: 846–857. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2011.01.038 PMID: 21334407
- Papajík T, Mysliveček M, Sedová Z, Buriánková E, Procházka V, Koranda P, et al. Standardised uptake value of 18F-FDG on staging PET/CT in newly diagnosed patients with different subtypes of non-Hodg-kin's lymphoma. Eur J Haematol. 2011; 86: 32–37. doi: <u>10.1111/j.1600-0609.2010.01532.x</u> PMID: <u>20874822</u>
- Park JW, Cho CH, Jeong DS, Chae HD. Role of F-fluoro-2-deoxyglucose Positron Emission Tomography in Gastric GIST: Predicting Malignant Potential Pre-operatively. J Gastric Cancer. 2011; 11: 173– 179. doi: 10.5230/jgc.2011.11.3.173 PMID: 22076223
- 60. Tsujikawa T, Yoshida Y, Kiyono Y, Kurokawa T, Kudo T, Fujibayashi Y, et al. Functional oestrogen receptor α imaging in endometrial carcinoma using 16α-[¹⁸F]fluoro-17β-oestradiol PET. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2011; 38: 37–45. doi: <u>10.1007/s00259-010-1589-8</u> PMID: <u>20717823</u>
- Walter F, Federman N, Apichairuk W, Nelson S, Phelps ME, Allen-Auerbach M, et al. 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose uptake of bone and soft tissue sarcomas in pediatric patients. Pediatr Hematol Oncol. 2011; 28: 579–587. doi: 10.3109/08880018.2011.602180 PMID: 21936620
- 62. Chang CC, Cho SF, Chen YW, Tu HP, Lin CY, Chang CS. SUV on dual-phase FDG PET/CT correlates with the Ki-67 proliferation index in patients with newly diagnosed non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Clin Nucl Med. 2012; 37: e189–e195. doi: 10.1097/RLU.0b013e318251e16e PMID: 22785526
- Cochet A, Pigeonnat S, Khoury B, Vrigneaud JM, Touzery C, Berriolo-Riedinger A, et al. Evaluation of breast tumor blood flow with dynamic first-pass 18F-FDG PET/CT: comparison with angiogenesis markers and prognostic factors. J Nucl Med. 2012; 53: 512–520. doi: <u>10.2967/jnumed.111.096834</u> PMID: <u>22343501</u>
- 64. García Vicente AM, Castrejón ÁS, Relea Calatayud F, Muñoz AP, León Martín AA, López-Muñiz IC, et al. 18F-FDG retention index and biologic prognostic parameters in breast cancer. Clin Nucl Med. 2012; 37: 460–466. doi: <u>10.1097/RLU.0b013e31823926c9</u> PMID: <u>22475895</u>
- 65. Ishii Y, Tomita N, Sakata S, Takeuchi K, Tateishi U, Watanabe R, et al. Maximum standard uptake value at the biopsy site during (18)F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography does not predict the proliferation potential of tumor cells in extranodal natural killer/t cell lymphoma, nasal type. Acta Haematol. 2012; 128: 110–112. doi: 10.1159/000338263 PMID: 22760030
- 66. Kaira K, Serizawa M, Koh Y, Takahashi T, Hanaoka H, Oriuchi N, et al. Relationship between 18F-FDG uptake on positron emission tomography and molecular biology in malignant pleural mesothelioma. Eur J Cancer. 2012; 48: 1244–1254. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2012.01.016 PMID: 22330319
- 67. Koolen BB, Vrancken Peeters MJ, Wesseling J, Lips EH, Vogel WV, Aukema TS, et al. Association of primary tumour FDG uptake with clinical, histopathological and molecular characteristics in breast cancer patients scheduled for neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2012; 39: 1830–1838. doi: 10.1007/s00259-012-2211-z PMID: 22895862
- Kurland BF, Gadi VK, Specht JM, Allison KH, Livingston RB, Rodler ET, et al. Feasibility study of FDG PET as an indicator of early response to aromatase inhibitors and trastuzumab in a heterogeneous group of breast cancer patients. EJNMMI Res. 2012; 2: 34. doi: <u>10.1186/2191-219X-2-34</u> PMID: <u>22731662</u>
- Kuyumcu S, Adalet I, Sanli Y, Turkmen C, Ozkan ZG, Yilmazbayhan D. Somatostatin receptor scintigraphy with 111In-octreotide in pulmonary carcinoid tumours correlated with pathological and 18FDG PET/CT findings. Ann Nucl Med. 2012; 26: 689–697. doi: <u>10.1007/s12149-012-0628-x</u> PMID: <u>22802007</u>
- Leonard JP, LaCasce AS, Smith MR, Noy A, Chirieac LR, Rodig SJ, et al. Selective CDK4/6 inhibition with tumor responses by PD0332991 in patients with mantle cell lymphoma. Blood. 2012; 119: 4597– 4607. doi: <u>10.1182/blood-2011-10-388298</u> PMID: <u>22383795</u>
- Minamimoto R, Toyohara J, Seike A, Ito H, Endo H, Morooka M, et al. 4'-[Methyl-11C]- thiothymidine PET/CT for proliferation imaging in non-small cell lung cancer. J Nucl Med. 2012; 53: 199–206. doi: <u>10.</u> <u>2967/jnumed.111.095539</u> PMID: <u>22190643</u>
- 72. Miyake K, Shinomiya A, Okada M, Hatakeyama T, Kawai N, Tamiya T. Usefulness of FDG, MET and FLT-PET studies for the management of human gliomas. J Biomed Biotechnol. 2012; 2012: 205818. doi: <u>10.1155/2012/205818</u> PMID: <u>22577290</u>

- Nishiyama Y, Tateishi U, Kawai A, Chuman H, Nakatani F, Miyake M, et al. Prediction of treatment outcomes in patients with chest wall sarcoma: evaluation with PET/CT. Jpn J Clin Oncol. 2012; 42: 912– 918. PMID: 22850222
- 74. Park SG, Lee JH, Lee WA, Han KM. Biologic correlation between glucose transporters, hexokinase-II, Ki-67 and FDG uptake in malignant melanoma. Nucl Med Biol. 2012; 39: 1167–1172. doi: <u>10.1016/j.</u> nucmedbio.2012.07.003 PMID: 22901702
- Sauter AW, Winterstein S, Spira D, Hetzel J, Schulze M, Mueller M, et al. Multifunctional profiling of non-small cell lung cancer using 18F-FDG PET/CT and volume perfusion CT. J Nucl Med. 2012; 53: 521–529. doi: 10.2967/jnumed.111.097865 PMID: 22414637
- 76. Shou Y, Lu J, Chen T, Ma D, Tong L. Correlation of fluorodeoxyglucose uptake and tumor-proliferating antigen Ki-67 in lymphomas. J Cancer Res Ther. 2012; 8: 96–102. doi: <u>10.4103/0973-1482.95182</u> PMID: <u>22531522</u>
- Wu X, Pertovaara H, Korkola P, Vornanen M, Eskola H, Kellokumpu-Lehtinen PL. Glucose metabolism correlated with cellular proliferation in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma. Leuk Lymphoma. 2012; 53: 400– 405. doi: 10.3109/10428194.2011.622420 PMID: 21913807
- 78. Bai B, Huang HQ, Cai QC, Fan W, Wang XX, Zhang X, et al. Predictive value of pretreatment positron emission tomography/computed tomography in patients with newly diagnosed extranodal natural killer/ T-cell lymphoma. Med Oncol. 2013; 30: 339. doi: <u>10.1007/s12032-012-0339-0</u> PMID: <u>23329306</u>
- 79. Cheng J, Lei L, Xu J, Sun Y, Zhang Y, Wang X, et al. 18F-fluoromisonidazole PET/CT: a potential tool for predicting primary endocrine therapy resistance in breast cancer. J Nucl Med. 2013; 54: 333–340. doi: <u>10.2967/jnumed.112.111963</u> PMID: <u>23401605</u>
- Hu SL, Yang ZY, Zhou ZR, Yu XJ, Ping B, Zhang YJ. Role of SUV(max) obtained by 18F-FDG PET/CT in patients with a solitary pancreatic lesion: predicting malignant potential and proliferation. Nucl Med Commun. 2013; 34: 533–539. doi: 10.1097/MNM.0b013e328360668a PMID: 23503000
- Matsumoto I, Oda M, Takizawa M, Waseda R, Nakajima K, Kawano M, et al. Usefulness of fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography in management strategy for thymic epithelial tumors. Ann Thorac Surg. 2013; 95: 305–310. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2012.09.052 PMID: 23200236
- Tanaka R, Nakazato Y, Horikoshi H, Tsuchida S, Yoshida T, Nakazato Y, et al. Diffusion-weighted imaging and positron emission tomography in various cytological subtypes of primary lung adenocarcinoma. Clin Imaging. 2013; 37: 876–883. doi: <u>10.1016/j.clinimag.2013.06.001</u> PMID: <u>23849098</u>
- Yang Z, Sun Y, Xue J, Yao Z, Xu J, Cheng J, et al. Can positron emission tomography/computed tomography with the dual tracers fluorine-18 fluoroestradiol and fluorodeoxyglucose predict neoadjuvant chemotherapy response of breast cancer?—A pilot study. PLoS One. 2013 Oct 21; 8(10): e78192. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0078192 PMID: 24205151
- Yoshikawa K, Shimada M, Kurita N, Sato H, Iwata T, Morimoto S, et al. Efficacy of PET-CT for predicting the malignant potential of gastrointestinal stromal tumors. Surg Today. 2013; 43: 1162–1167. doi: <u>10.1007/s00595-012-0411-6</u> PMID: <u>23143169</u>
- Zhao Z, Yoshida Y, Kurokawa T, Kiyono Y, Mori T, Okazawa H. 18F-FES and 18F-FDG PET for differential diagnosis and quantitative evaluation of mesenchymal uterine tumors: correlation with immunohistochemical analysis. J Nucl Med. 2013; 54: 499–506. doi: <u>10.2967/jnumed.112.113472</u> PMID: <u>23471314</u>
- García García-Esquinas M, García-Sáenz JA, Arrazola García J, Enrique Fuentes Ferrer M, Furió V, Rodriguez Rey C, et al. 18F-FDG PET-CT imaging in the neoadjuvant setting for stages II-III breast cancer: association of loco-regional SUVmax with classical prognostic factors. Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2014; 58: 66–73. PMID: 24104854
- Hirose Y, Suefuji H, Kaida H, Hayakawa M, Hattori S, Kurata S, et al. Relationship between 2-deoxy-2-[(18)F]-fluoro-d-glucose uptake and clinicopathological factors in patients with diffuse large B-cell lymphoma. Leuk Lymphoma. 2014; 55: 520–525. doi: 10.3109/10428194.2013.807509 PMID: 23701133
- Humbert O, Berriolo-Riedinger A, Cochet A, Gauthier M, Charon-Barra C, Guiu S, et al. Prognostic relevance at 5 years of the early monitoring of neoadjuvant chemotherapy using (18)F-FDG PET in luminal HER2-negative breast cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2014; 41: 416–427. doi: <u>10.1007/s00259-013-2616-3</u> PMID: 24258007
- Kaida H, Kawahara A, Hayakawa M, Hattori S, Kurata S, Fujimoto K, et al. The difference in relationship between 18F-FDG uptake and clinicopathological factors on thyroid, esophageal, and lung cancers. Nucl Med Commun. 2014; 35: 36–43. doi: 10.1097/MNM.000000000000019 PMID: 24169686
- 90. Shimomura H, Sasahira T, Yamanaka Y, Kurihara M, Imai Y, Tamaki S, et al. [18F] fluoro-2- deoxyglucose-positron emission tomography for the assessment of histopathological response after preoperative chemoradiotherapy in advanced oral squamous cell carcinoma. Int J Clin Oncol. 2014; [Epub ahead of print] DOI <u>10.1007/s10147-014-0711-5</u>

- Suzuki S, Kaira K, Ohshima Y, Ishioka NS, Sohda M, Yokobori T, et al. Biological significance of fluorine-18-α-methyltyrosine (FAMT) uptake on PET in patients with oesophageal cancer. Br J Cancer. 2014; 110: 1985–1991. doi: <u>10.1038/bjc.2014.142</u> PMID: <u>24667647</u>
- 92. Viti A, Bertolaccini L, Cavallo A, Fortunato M, Bianchi A, Terzi A. 18-Fluorine fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography in the pretreatment evaluation of thymic epithelial neoplasms: a metabolic biopsy confirmed by Ki-67 expression. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2014; 46: 369–374; discussion 374. doi: 10.1093/ejcts/ezu030 PMID: 24585679
- Zhang J, Cui LB, Tang X, Ren XL, Shi JR, Yang HN, et al. DW MRI at 3.0 T versus FDG PET/CT for detection of malignant pulmonary tumors. Int J Cancer. 2014; 134: 606–611. doi: <u>10.1002/ijc.28394</u> PMID: <u>23893610</u>
- 94. Barthel H, Perumal M, Latigo J, He Q, Brady F, Luthra SK, et al. The uptake of 3'-deoxy-3'- [18F]fluorothymidine into L5178Y tumours in vivo is dependent on thymidine kinase 1 protein levels. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2005; 32: 257–263. PMID: <u>15791434</u>
- 95. Vander Heiden MG, Cantley LC, Thompson CB. Understanding the Warburg effect: the metabolic requirements of cell proliferation. Science. 2009; 324: 1029–1033. doi: <u>10.1126/science.1160809</u> PMID: <u>19460998</u>