Radiat Oncol J 2012;30(4):173-181 http://dx.doi.org/10.3857/roj.2012.30.4.173 pISSN 2234-1900 · eISSN 2234-3156



# Prognostic value of <sup>18</sup>F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography, computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging in oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma with pathologically positive neck lymph node

Eunjin Jwa, MD<sup>1</sup>, Sang-Wook Lee, MD<sup>1</sup>, Jae-Seung Kim, MD<sup>2</sup>, Jin Hong Park, MD<sup>1</sup>, Su Ssan Kim, MD<sup>1</sup>, Young Seok Kim, MD<sup>1</sup>, Sang Min Yoon, MD<sup>1</sup>, Si Yeol Song, MD<sup>1</sup>, Jong Hoon Kim, MD<sup>1</sup>, Eun Kyung Choi, MD<sup>1</sup>, Seung Do Ahn, MD<sup>1</sup>

Departments of <sup>1</sup>Radiation Oncology and <sup>2</sup>Nuclear Medicine, Asan Medical Center, University of Ulsan College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

**Purpose:** To evaluate the prognostic value of preoperative neck lymph node (LN) assessment with <sup>18</sup>F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (<sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET), computed tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) in oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) patients with pathologically positive LN.

**Materials and Methods:** In total, 47 OSCC patients with pathologically positive LN were retrospectively reviewed with preoperative <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET and CT/MRI. All patients underwent surgical resection, neck dissection and postoperative adjuvant radiotherapy and/or chemotherapy between March 2002 and October 2010. Histologic correlation was performed for findings of <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET and CT/MRI.

**Results:** Thirty-six (76.6%) of 47 cases were correctly diagnosed with neck LN metastasis by <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET and 32 (68.1%) of 47 cases were correctly diagnosed by CT/MRI. Follow-up ranged from 20 to 114 months (median, 56 months). Clinically negative nodal status evaluated by <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET or CT/MRI revealed a trend toward better clinical outcomes in terms of overall survival, disease-free survival, local recurrence-free survival, regional nodal recurrence-free survival, and distant metastasis-free survival rates even though the trends were not statistically significant. However, there was no impact of neck node standardized uptake value (SUV<sub>max</sub>) on clinical outcomes. Notably, SUV<sub>max</sub> showed significant correlation with tumor size in LN (p < 0.01, R<sup>2</sup> = 0.62). PET and CT/MRI status of LN also had significant correlation with the size of intranodal tumor deposit (p < 0.05, R<sup>2</sup> = 0.37 and p < 0.01, R<sup>2</sup> = 0.48, respectively).

**Conclusion:** <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET and CT/MRI at the neck LNs might improve risk stratification in OSCC patients with pathologically positive neck LN in this study, even without significant prognostic value of SUV<sub>max</sub>.

Keywords: Oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma, Neck lymph node, Magnetic resonance imaging, X-ray computed tomography, <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET, Prognostic value

Received 6 September 2012, Revised 5 October 2012, Accepted 18 October 2012.

Correspondence: Sang-Wook Lee, MD, Department of Radiation Oncology, Asan Medical Center, University of Ulsan College of Medicine, 88 Olympic-ro 43-gil, Songpa-gu, Seoul 138-736, Korea. Tel: +82-2-3010-4435, Fax: +82-2-486-7258, E-mail: lsw@amc.seoul.kr

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by-nc/3.0/) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

www.e-roj.org

## Introduction

TNM stage, especially N stage, is considered the most important prognostic factor and the most important guide in treatment decisions in patients with oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) [1,2]. Many other prognostic factors such as extracapsular spread (ECS), tumor differentiation, pathologic tumor depth, pathologic resection margins, perineural invasion (PNI), microvascular invasion, and skin invasion have been investigated [3-5]. However, these pathological parameters frequently fail to predict the biological behavior of these tumors. To improve the clinical management of OSCC patients, there is a strong requirement for a more accurate assessment of the malignant properties of the individual lesion.

Computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is usually used for preoperative assessment of the primary tumor and cervical status of OSCC. Recently, <sup>18</sup>F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (<sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET) has been widely used in OSCC patients for pretreatment staging while increasing diagnostic accuracy combined with CT or MRI [6,7]. <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET has also contributed to identifying secondary tumors, detecting early recurrences, monitoring the therapeutic outcomes [8,9], and predicting patient survival [10-15]. Prognostic value of <sup>18</sup>F-FDG uptake in the primary tumor and neck lymph node has been reported, although the cutoff value of <sup>18</sup>F-FDG has still controversy [10-15].

In this study, we aimed to investigate whether pretreatment clinical neck lymph node status assessed by PET and CT/MRI may improve risk stratification in the pathologically node positive OSCC patients. Therefore, identification of reliable prognosticators in this patient group may enable future selection of optimal therapeutic planning.

# **Materials and Methods**

#### 1. Patients

The medical records of 47 consecutive patients meeting the following criteria comprised the study population. Patients had to have histologically proven lymph node positive OSCC without distant metastasis treated by curative resection, including neck lymph node dissections, and adjuvant radioor chemoradiotherapy between March 2002 and October 2010 at Asan Medical Center; no previous radiation on head and neck area; <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET scan and CT scan or MRI before surgery; and follow-up for survival analysis of at least 20 months. Those patients were identified through a search of the

#### Table 1. Clinicopathologic characteristics

Age (yr), median (range)       58 (22-74)         Gender       Male       31 (66)         Male       31 (66)         Female       16 (34)         Location       5 (11)         Buccal mucosa       5 (11)         Buccal mucosa       5 (11)         Retromolar trigone       3 (6)         Gingiva       3 (6)         Pathologic T stage       7         T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       11         III       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       2 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       Well         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9) <t< th=""><th>Characteristic</th><th>No. of patients (%)</th></t<>	Characteristic	No. of patients (%)
Gender       Male       31 (66)         Female       16 (34)         Location       10 (34)         Tongue       31 (66)         Mouth floor       5 (11)         Buccal mucosa       5 (11)         Retromolar trigone       3 (6)         Gingiva       3 (6)         Pathologic T stage       11         T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       19 (40)         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       11         III       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)	Age (yr), median (range)	58 (22-74)
Male       31 (66)         Female       16 (34)         Location       31 (66)         Mouth floor       5 (11)         Buccal mucosa       5 (11)         Retromolar trigone       3 (6)         Gingiva       3 (6)         Pathologic T stage       11         T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       11         III       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       7 (79)	Gender	
Female       16 (34)         Location       31 (66)         Mouth floor       5 (11)         Buccal mucosa       5 (11)         Retromolar trigone       3 (6)         Gingiva       3 (6)         Pathologic T stage       1         T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       19 (40)         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       11         III       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Megative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       4 (9) </td <td>Male</td> <td>31 (66)</td>	Male	31 (66)
Location         31 (66)           Mouth floor         5 (11)           Buccal mucosa         5 (11)           Retromolar trigone         3 (6)           Gingiva         3 (6)           Pathologic T stage         1           T1         5 (10)           T2         22 (47)           T3         4 (9)           T4         16 (34)           Pathologic N stage         1           N1         21 (45)           N2b         19 (40)           N2c         7 (15)           Pathologic AJCC stage         1           III         17 (36)           IV         30 (64)           No. of metastatic LN, median (range)         2 (1-17)           LN size (mm), median (range)         13 (1-40)           Extranodal extension         19 (40)           Megative         22 (47)           Positive         19 (40)           Unknown         6 (13)           Differentiation         19 (40)           Moderate         24 (51)           Poor         4 (9)           Lymphovascular invasion         37 (79)	Female	16 (34)
Tongue       31 (66)         Mouth floor       5 (11)         Buccal mucosa       5 (11)         Retromolar trigone       3 (6)         Gingiva       3 (6)         Pathologic T stage       7         T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       7         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       11         III       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	Location	
Mouth floor         5 (11)           Buccal mucosa         5 (11)           Retromolar trigone         3 (6)           Gingiva         3 (6)           Pathologic T stage         7           T1         5 (10)           T2         22 (47)           T3         4 (9)           T4         16 (34)           Pathologic N stage         7           N1         21 (45)           N2b         19 (40)           N2c         7 (15)           Pathologic AJCC stage         11           III         17 (36)           IV         30 (64)           No. of metastatic LN, median (range)         2 (1-17)           LN size (mm), median (range)         13 (1-40)           Extranodal extension         19 (40)           Negative         22 (47)           Positive         19 (40)           Unknown         6 (13)           Differentiation         19 (40)           Moderate         24 (51)           Poor         4 (9)           Lymphovascular invasion         37 (79)	Tongue	31 (66)
Buccal mucosa       5 (11)         Retromolar trigone       3 (6)         Gingiva       3 (6)         Pathologic T stage       1         T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       1         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       1         III       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	Mouth floor	5 (11)
Retromolar trigone       3 (6)         Gingiva       3 (6)         Pathologic T stage       1         T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       1         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       1         III       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Megative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	Buccal mucosa	5 (11)
Gingiva       3 (6)         Pathologic T stage       1         T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       16 (34)         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       11         III       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Megative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	Retromolar trigone	3 (6)
Pathologic T stage       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       16 (34)         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	Gingiya	3 (6)
T1       5 (10)         T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       11 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       11 (17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	Pathologic T stage	
T2       22 (47)         T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       16 (34)         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       19 (40)         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	T1	5 (10)
T3       4 (9)         T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       16 (34)         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       Negative         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	T2	22 (47)
T4       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       16 (34)         Pathologic N stage       19 (40)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       Negative         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       Well         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       Xegative         Negative       37 (79)	T3	4 (9)
Pathologic N stage       21 (45)         N1       21 (45)         N2b       19 (40)         N2c       7 (15)         Pathologic AJCC stage       17 (36)         IV       30 (64)         No. of metastatic LN, median (range)       2 (1-17)         LN size (mm), median (range)       13 (1-40)         Extranodal extension       Negative         Negative       22 (47)         Positive       19 (40)         Unknown       6 (13)         Differentiation       19 (40)         Well       19 (40)         Moderate       24 (51)         Poor       4 (9)         Lymphovascular invasion       37 (79)	T4	16 (34)
N121 (45)N2b19 (40)N2c7 (15)Pathologic AJCC stage17 (36)IV30 (64)No. of metastatic LN, median (range)2 (1-17)LN size (mm), median (range)13 (1-40)Extranodal extension19 (40)Negative22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation19 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	Pathologic N stage	
N121 (10)N2b19 (40)N2c7 (15)Pathologic AJCC stage17 (36)IV30 (64)No. of metastatic LN, median (range)2 (1-17)LN size (mm), median (range)13 (1-40)Extranodal extension19 (40)Negative22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation19 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	N1	21 (45)
N2c7 (15)Pathologic AJCC stage17 (36)IV30 (64)No. of metastatic LN, median (range)2 (1-17)LN size (mm), median (range)13 (1-40)Extranodal extension22 (47)Negative22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation19 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	N2h	19 (40)
Pathologic AJCC stage III 17 (36) IV 30 (64) No. of metastatic LN, median (range) 2 (1-17) LN size (mm), median (range) 13 (1-40) Extranodal extension Negative 22 (47) Positive 19 (40) Unknown 6 (13) Differentiation Well 19 (40) Moderate 24 (51) Poor 4 (9) Lymphovascular invasion Negative 37 (79)	N2c	7 (15)
III17 (36)IV30 (64)No. of metastatic LN, median (range)2 (1-17)LN size (mm), median (range)13 (1-40)Extranodal extension13 (1-40)Extranodal extension22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation19 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	Pathologic AICC stage	7 (13)
IV30 (64)No. of metastatic LN, median (range)2 (1-17)LN size (mm), median (range)13 (1-40)Extranodal extension13 (1-40)Extranodal extension22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation19 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	III	17 (36)
No. of metastatic LN, median (range)2 (1-17)LN size (mm), median (range)13 (1-40)Extranodal extension13 (1-40)Extranodal extension22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation19 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)		30 (64)
Inclusion (range)12 (117)LN size (mm), median (range)13 (1-40)Extranodal extension19 (40)Negative22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	No. of metastatic I.N. median (range)	2 (1-17)
EnvironmentTable (1997)Table (1997)Extranodal extensionNegative22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation19 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	IN size (mm) median (range)	$13(1_40)$
Negative22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation9 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	Extranodal extension	13 (1 40)
Negative22 (47)Positive19 (40)Unknown6 (13)Differentiation9 (40)Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	Negative	22 (17)
Unknown6 (13)DifferentiationWell19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasionNegative37 (79)	Positive	22 (47) 19 (40)
Differentiation Well 19 (40) Moderate 24 (51) Poor 4 (9) Lymphovascular invasion Negative 37 (79)	Unknown	6 (13)
Well19 (40)Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	Differentiation	0 (13)
Moderate24 (51)Poor4 (9)Lymphovascular invasion37 (79)	Well	19 (40)
Poor 4 (9) Lymphovascular invasion 37 (79)	Moderate	73 ( <del>4</del> 0) 24 (51)
Lymphovascular invasion Negative 37 (79)	Poor	24 (51) A (9)
Negative 37 (79)	lymphoyascular invasion	4 (5)
NCGative 37 (73)	Negative	37 (79)
Positive 9 (19)	Positive	9 (19)
1 (2)	Unknown	1 (2)
Perineural invasion	Perineural invasion	1 (2)
Negative 22 (47)	Negative	22 (17)
Positive $10(21)$	Positive	22 (47)
10(21)		10 (21)
Desection margin	Desection margin	13 (32)
Negative 20 (c0)	Negative	20 (60)
Desitive 28 (00)	Positivo	20 (00)
FUSILIVE 19 (40)	POSILIVE Neek dissection	19 (40)
Padical pack discontion (0)	Padical pack discostion	4 ( 0)
Nadified radiast neak discontian 21 (CC)	Nadified radial pack discostion	4 ( 3) 21 (CC)
woullet ratical neck dissection     31 (bb)       Suproproduced pack dissection     12 (25)	Suproproducid neck dissection	31 (00) 12 (25)
Supraction dose (Gy) median (range)     50.4 (23.4 GGG)	Badiation dose (Gy) median (range)	12 (20) 59 1 (22 1 66 6)

AJCC, American Joint Committee on Cancer; LN, lymph node.

database of radiation oncology department at Asan Medical Center. Patients' staging was performed according to the 2002 American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC), 6th edition, staging criteria [1].

# 2. <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET

All patients fasted for at least 6 hours before the PET examination and received an intravenous injection of 0.2 mCi/kg <sup>18</sup>F-FDG after initial preparation. PET acquisition using an axial collimation from the skull base to the proximal femurs was started 60 minutes after injection using an ECAT HR+ scanner (CTI/Siemens, Knoxville, TN, USA). Data were reconstructed into coronal, sagittal, and transverse sections and a 3-dimensional rotating projection. The standardized uptake value (SUV) was calculated from attenuation-corrected images, the amount of injected <sup>18</sup>F-FDG, the body weight of each patient, and the cross-calibration factors for <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET and the dose calibrator.

# 3. CT/MRI

CT of the head and neck was performed with a slice thickness of 3–5 mm. Patients were placed in the supine position, and

#### Table 2. Clinical lymph node characteristics

	1.1					
	<sup>18</sup> F-FD	)g pet	CT/MRI			
	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive		
N1	7 (14.9)	14 (29.8)	7 (14.9)	14 (29.8)		
N2	4 (8.5)	22 (46.8)	10 (21.3)	16 (34.0)		

Values are presented as number of patient (%).

<sup>18</sup>F-FDG, <sup>18</sup>F-fluorodeoxyglucose; PET, positron emission tomography; CT, computed tomography; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging. contrast-enhanced axial images were obtained parallel to the occlusal line from the skull base to the upper chest. In selected patients, direct coronal or coronal reconstruction images were also obtained.

MRI was performed with a 1.5-T or 3.0-T unit using spinecho technique. Slice thickness was 4–5 mm. T1-weighted images were acquired in the sagittal and axial planes. Axial and coronal T2-weighted fat-suppressed images were also obtained. Thereafter, T1-weighted postgadolinium with fatsuppressed images in axial and coronal projections were obtained sequentially. Positive result was selected, if both CT and MRI were performed and any difference between the result of CT and MRI existed.

#### 4. Image interpretation and analysis

PET results of pathologically positive lymph nodes were scored based on formal interpretations on a 5-point scale as follows: 0, no abnormal uptake; 1, benign; 2, probably benign; 3, probably malignant; and 4, definitely malignant. Scores of 4 to 5 were considered to be positive results for tumor involvement. CT/ MRI findings of pathologically positive lymph nodes were also categorized based on formal interpretations into a 2-point scale as follows: 0, negative and 1, positive.

The visual score of PET and CT/MRI were analyzed on neck level by level basis with pathologically positive node. The highest  $SUV_{max}$  were chosen among the  $SUV_{max}$  of pathologically positive nodes, in case of multiple node positive patient.

#### 5. Statistical analysis

Overall survival (OS) was defined as the time interval from date of curative resection until death as a result of any cause or date of last follow-up. Disease-free survival (DFS), local recurrence-free survival (LRFS), regional recurrence-free

Chausatavistia		PET		CT/MRI			
Characteristic	Negative	Positive	p-value	Negative	Positive	p-value	
Type of neck dissection, no (%)			0.019			0.021	
Radical neck dissection	0 (0)	4 (12)		0	4 (13)		
Modified radical neck dissection	6 (46)	24 (73)		8	23 (77)		
Supraomohyoid neck dissection	7 (54)	5 (15)		9	3 (10)		
SUV <sub>max</sub> , median (range)	1.5 (0-2.3)	3.45 (0.7-12)	0.000	1.6 (0-5.4)	3.45 (0-12)	0.001	
LN size (mm), median (range)	6.5 (2-18)	14.5 (1-40)	0.013	7 (1-15)	16 (5-40)	0.001	
Radiation dose (Gy) , median (range)	50.4 (23.4-66.6)	59.4 (46.0-66.6)	0.010	50.4 (23.4-66.6)	59.4 (50.4-66.6)	0.036	

PET, positron emission tomography; CT, computed tomography; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; SUV, standardized uptake value; LN, lymph node.

survival (RRFS), distant metastasis-free survival (DMFS) were defined as the time intervals from date of curative resection until any recurrence, local recurrence, regional lymph node recurrence, and distant metastasis, respectively. Survival probabilities were estimated by the method of Kaplan-Meier.

The log-rank test was used to assess the correlation of the clinical outcomes with SUV<sub>max</sub> of lymph nodes and clinical positivity of lymph node assessed by PET, CT or MRI. The student t-test and chi-square test were used to evaluate the difference in terms of clincopathologic factors between patients with clinically negative and positive neck node on PET and CT or MRI. A simple regression analysis was used to estimate relations between SUV<sub>max</sub> and size of tumor in neck node. In all analyses, values of p < 0.05 were considered to be statistically significant.

## **Results**

#### 1. Patient characteristics

From March 2002 to October 2010, 47 OSCC patients (31 men and 16 women) with pathologically positive node underwent adjuvant radiotherapy after radical surgery at Asan Medical Center. The median follow-up for surviving patients was 56 months (range, 20.1 to 114.3 months). The baseline characteristics of the study participants are shown in Table 1. The neck dissections were ipsilateral in 29 (62%) patients and bilateral in 18 (38%) patients. Only 2 (4%) patients had concurrent chemoradiotherapy with cisplatin, but the others underwent radiotherapy alone. At least 46 Gy of radiation dose delivered to all patients except one who received 23.4 Gy due to poor tolerance.

#### 2. Clinical lymph node findings and survival outcomes

Preoperative lymph node status assessed by PET and CT/MRI was depicted in Table 2. Compared to patients with a PET and CT/MRI-negative neck, those with a PET and CT/MRI-positive neck showed significant differences in type of neck dissection (ND), radiation dose, SUV<sub>max</sub>, and tumor size in lymph node among the clinicopathologic factors (i.e., age, gender, tumor location, pT, pN, pStage, lymphovascular invasion, PNI, tumor differentiation, resection margin, extranodal extension, number of metastatic node, tumor size in lymph node, ND, and radiation dose) (Table 3). Notably, SUV<sub>max</sub> showed significant correlation with tumor size in lymph node also had significant correlation with the size of intranodal tumor deposit (p <

Table 4.	Correlation	of SUV <sub>max</sub>	with	clnico	pathologic	factors
		111// 0				

Variable	$R^2$	p-value
LN positivity on PET	0.511	0.000
LN positivity on CT/MRI	0.468	0.001
T stage	0.082	0.591
N stage	0.424	0.004
Tumor size in LN	0.509	0.000
Lymphovascular invasion	-0.019	0.903
Differentiation	0.134	0.381

SUV, standardized uptake value; LN, lymph node; PET, positron emission tomography; CT, computed tomography; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging.

0.05,  $R^2 = 0.37$  and p < 0.01,  $R^2 = 0.48$ , respectively) (Table 4). Clinically negative nodal status evaluated by PET and CT/MRI revealed a trend toward better clinical outcomes in terms of OS (Figs. 1A and 2A), DFS (Figs. 1B and 2B), LRFS (Figs. 1C and 2C), regional nodal recurrence free survival (Figs. 1D and 2D), and DMFS rates (Figs. 1E and 2E) even though the trends were not statistically significant.

There was no impact of neck node  $SUV_{max}$  on clinical outcomes. Thirteen  $SUV_{max}$  values from 1 to 10, including median  $SUV_{max}$  value were evaluated by log-rank test to find a socalled best cutoff, none of them showed statistically significant difference in any survival outcomes.

#### 3. Univariate analyses

The results of univariate analyses of 5-year local and neck control, DMFS, DFS, and OS are shown in Table 5. Patients with pN1 stage had better 5-year OS rate than those with pN2 stage. Patients who had 5 or less metastatic lymph nodes showed significantly better OS, DFS, LRFS, and RRFS rates.

# **Discussion and Conclusion**

Our principal finding in this study was that clinical lymph node status on PET and CT/MRI might improve the risk stratification in pathologically lymph node positive OSCC patients, even without significant prognostic value of  $SUV_{max}$ .

Many investigators have suggested that high FDG uptake at primary tumor, which was obtained by  $SUV_{maxr}$  is associated with both poor response to and survival after several therapies in patients with various cancers, including OSCC [9-12,16-27]. Mostly, the prognostic value of a FDG uptake may be independent of the tumor stage. Nonetheless, a variety of standard cutoff value of  $SUV_{max}$  and way of choose the



standard cutoff value is suggested in each study. It has hampered the reliability of those investigations on the prognostic value of SUV<sub>max</sub>.

The presence of cervical metastases is the most important prognosticator for outcome in OSCC patients [2]. However, little has been reported about the prognostic significance of clinical findings in the neck lymph nodes on either PET or CT/ regional node recurrence-free survival, and (E) distant metastasisfree survival. MRI in patients with OSCC. A SUV<sub>max</sub> of 5.7 at lymph node was presented as an independent prognosticator for 5-year neck cancer control and survival rates in OSCC patients with

pathologically positive lymph nodes [13]. Liao et al. [14] showed PET findings of the neck lymph nodes may improve risk stratification beyond that of traditional risk factors in OSCC.

108 120

108 120

The present study is the first one to investigate the prognostic value of pretreatment lymph node status on both PET and CT/MRI in pathologically node positive OSCC patients. Patients with PET-negative neck revealed the trend toward better LRFS, RRFS, DMFS, and DFS rates than those with PETpositive neck. Survival graphs also showed better LRFS, DMFS, DFS, and OS rates in patients with negative neck node on CT/ MRI than those with CT/MRI-positive neck. These results were statistically insignificant. However, small number of patients could be one of the reasons for statistical insignificance. Therefore, neck status on PET and CT/MRI had the potential to improve risk stratification in node positive OSCC patients and were worthy of further investigations.

Pathological and biological mechanisms underlying correla-



Characteristic -	5-yr OS		5-yr DFS		5-yr LRFS		5-yr RRFS		5-yr DMFS	
	0/0	p-value	%	p-value	%	p-value	%	p-value	%	p-value
Pathologic T stage		0.531		0.917		0.113		0.162		0.705
T1	20		40		60		40		100	
T2	36		34		46		37		58	
T3	25		27		33		33		67	
T4	26		12		94		90		64	
Pathologic N stage		0.017		0.137		0.951		0.554		0.148
N1:N2	49:18		47:25		63:60		53:54		80:47	
No. of metastatic lymph		0.009		0.035		0.007		0.024		0.080
node										
≤5:>5	35:20		38:30		66:44		65:40		68:56	
Extranodal extension		0.874		0.714		0.378		0.432		0.049
(-):(+)	27:31		48:31		80:63		57:73		85:54	
Differentiation		0.123		0.066		0.364		0.529		0.003
Well	46		50		65		67		79	
Moderate	27		29		61		58		64	
Poor	25		0		50		50		0	
Lymphovascular invasion		0.074		0.170		0.013		0.328		0.095
(-):(+)	33:22		37:33		65:39		63:51		67:56	
Perineural invasion		0.696		0.330		0.839		0.239		0.011
(-):(+)	29:25		43:30		65:65		72:48		90:50	
Resection margin		0.288		0.904		0.901		0.963		0.451
(-):(+)	24:41		30:40		60:60		54:63		54:78	

**Table 5.** Univariate analyses for overall survival (OS), disease-free survival (DFS), local recurrence-free survival (LRFS), regional recurrence-free survival (RRFS), and distant metastasis-free survival (DMFS)

tion between SUV<sub>max</sub> and survival have not yet been fully investigated. High SUV<sub>max</sub> of primary tumor exhibited greater tumor thickness and depth of invasion than those with low SUV<sub>max</sub> [11,12,28]. Clinical significance of correlation between SUV<sub>max</sub> and Glut-1, one of the 13 glucose transporters, expression varied upon the different type of cancers [28-32]. Bcl-2, anti-apoptotic protein, expressed at high level in OSCC patients with high SUV<sub>max</sub> [28]. We found the patients with high SUV<sub>max</sub> at lymph node and PET, CT/MRI-positive neck had significantly larger size of intranodal tumor deposit diameter than those with low  ${\rm SUV}_{\rm max}$  and clinically negative neck. However, it couldn't fully explain the survival difference because the size of intranodal tumor deposit was not a significant prognosticator at univariate analyses. The biologic and pathologic mechanisms of correlation between clinical node status and survival should be investigated in the future. Two important limitations of our study were the small number of patients and its retrospective design.

In conclusion, pretreatment lymph node status evaluated by PET and CT/MRI may have the capacity to improve risk stratification for clinical outcomes in patients with pathologic node positive OSCC. It should be verified through the further prospective, large clinical trial.

# **Conflict of Interest**

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

#### References

- 1. Greene FL, Page DL, Fritz A, Balch CM, Haller DG, Morrow M. AJCC cancer staging manual. 6th ed. New York: Springer-Verlag; 2002.
- 2. Myers JN, Greenberg JS, Mo V, Roberts D. Extracapsular spread: a significant predictor of treatment failure in patients with squamous cell carcinoma of the tongue. Cancer 2001;92:3030-6.
- 3. Liao CT, Chang JT, Wang HM, et al. Analysis of risk factors of predictive local tumor control in oral cavity cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2008;15:915-22.
- 4. Liao CT, Wang HM, Chang JT, et al. Analysis of risk factors for distant metastases in squamous cell carcinoma of the oral

cavity. Cancer 2007;110:1501-8.

- Martinez-Gimeno C, Rodriguez EM, Vila CN, Varela CL. Squamous cell carcinoma of the oral cavity: a clinicopathologic scoring system for evaluating risk of cervical lymph node metastasis. Laryngoscope 1995;105:728-33.
- 6. Ng SH, Yen TC, Chang JT, et al. Prospective study of [18F] fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography and computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging in oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma with palpably negative neck. J Clin Oncol 2006;24:4371-6.
- Ng SH, Yen TC, Liao CT, et al. 18F-FDG PET and CT/MRI in oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma: a prospective study of 124 patients with histologic correlation. J Nucl Med 2005;46:1136-43.
- 8. Kunkel M, Forster GJ, Reichert TE, et al. Detection of recurrent oral squamous cell carcinoma by [18F]-2-fluorodeoxyglucosepositron emission tomography: implications for prognosis and patient management. Cancer 2003;98:2257-65.
- 9. Kunkel M, Forster GJ, Reichert TE, et al. Radiation response non-invasively imaged by [18F]FDG-PET predicts local tumor control and survival in advanced oral squamous cell carcinoma. Oral Oncol 2003;39:170-7.
- Hofele C, Freier K, Thiele OC, Haberkorn U, Buchmann I. High 2-[18F]fluoro-2-deoxy-d-glucose (18FDG) uptake measured by positron emission tomography is associated with reduced overall survival in patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma. Oral Oncol 2009;45:963-7.
- 11. Kim SY, Roh JL, Kim JS, et al. Utility of FDG PET in patients with squamous cell carcinomas of the oral cavity. Eur J Surg Oncol 2008;34:208-15.
- 12. Liao CT, Chang JT, Wang HM, et al. Pretreatment primary tumor SUVmax measured by FDG-PET and pathologic tumor depth predict for poor outcomes in patients with oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma and pathologically positive lymph nodes. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2009;73:764-71.
- 13. Liao CT, Chang JT, Wang HM, et al. Preoperative [18F]fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography standardized uptake value of neck lymph nodes predicts neck cancer control and survival rates in patients with oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma and pathologically positive lymph nodes. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2009;74:1054-61.
- 14. Liao CT, Wang HM, Huang SF, et al. PET and PET/CT of the neck lymph nodes improves risk prediction in patients with squamous cell carcinoma of the oral cavity. J Nucl Med 2011;52:180-7.
- 15. Suzuki H, Hasegawa Y, Terada A, et al. FDG-PET predicts survival and distant metastasis in oral squamous cell carcinoma. Oral Oncol 2009;45:569-73.
- 16. Berghmans T, Dusart M, Paesmans M, et al. Primary tumor standardized uptake value (SUVmax) measured on fluoro-

deoxyglucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) is of prognostic value for survival in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): a systematic review and meta-analysis (MA) by the European Lung Cancer Working Party for the IASLC Lung Cancer Staging Project. J Thorac Oncol 2008;3:6-12.

- 17. Halfpenny W, Hain SF, Biassoni L, Maisey MN, Sherman JA, McGurk M. FDG-PET: a possible prognostic factor in head and neck cancer. Br J Cancer 2002;86:512-6.
- Juweid ME. Utility of positron emission tomography (PET) scanning in managing patients with Hodgkin lymphoma. Hematology Am Soc Hematol Educ Program 2006:259-65, 510-1.
- Kang JK, Kim MS, Choi CW, et al. The usefulness of <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT for predicting the response of locally advanced rectal cancer to neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy. J Korean Soc Ther Radiol Oncol 2009;27:111-9.
- 20. Kidd EA, Siegel BA, Dehdashti F, Grigsby PW. The standardized uptake value for F-18 fluorodeoxyglucose is a sensitive predictive biomarker for cervical cancer treatment response and survival. Cancer 2007;110:1738-44.
- 21. Kim G, Kim YS, Han EJ, et al. FDG-PET/CT as prognostic factor and surveillance tool for postoperative radiation recurrence in locally advanced head and neck cancer. Radiat Oncol J 2011;29:243-51.
- 22. Kim SY, Roh JL, Kim MR, et al. Use of 18F-FDG PET for primary treatment strategy in patients with squamous cell carcinoma of the oropharynx. J Nucl Med 2007;48:752-7.
- 23. Kunkel M, Helisch A, Reichert TE, et al. Clinical and prognostic value of [(18)F]FDG-PET for surveillance of oral squamous cell carcinoma after surgical salvage therapy. Oral Oncol 2006; 42:297-305.
- 24. Maemura K, Takao S, Shinchi H, et al. Role of positron emission tomography in decisions on treatment strategies for pancreatic cancer. J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg 2006;13:435-41.
- 25. Okada J, Yoshikawa K, Itami M, et al. Positron emission tomography using fluorine-18-fluorodeoxyglucose in malignant lymphoma: a comparison with proliferative activity. J Nucl Med 1992;33:325-9.
- 26. Patronas NJ, Di Chiro G, Kufta C, et al. Prediction of survival in glioma patients by means of positron emission tomography. J Neurosurg 1985;62:816-22.
- 27. Swisher SG, Erasmus J, Maish M, et al. 2-Fluoro-2-deoxy-Dglucose positron emission tomography imaging is predictive of pathologic response and survival after preoperative chemoradiation in patients with esophageal carcinoma. Cancer 2004;101:1776-85.
- 28. Suzuki H, Fukuyama R, Hasegawa Y, et al. Tumor thickness, depth of invasion, and Bcl-2 expression are correlated with FDG-uptake in oral squamous cell carcinomas. Oral Oncol

# ROJ Radiation Oncology Journal Prognostic value of <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET, CT, MRI in pathologically LN positive oral cavity cancer

2009;45:891-7.

- 29. van Baardwijk A, Dooms C, van Suylen RJ, et al. The maximum uptake of (18)F-deoxyglucose on positron emission tomography scan correlates with survival, hypoxia inducible factor-1alpha and GLUT-1 in non-small cell lung cancer. Eur J Cancer 2007;43:1392-8.
- 30. Tian M, Zhang H, Nakasone Y, Mogi K, Endo K. Expression of Glut-1 and Glut-3 in untreated oral squamous cell carcinoma compared with FDG accumulation in a PET study. Eur J Nucl

Med Mol Imaging 2004;31:5-12.

- 31. Kunkel M, Reichert TE, Benz P, et al. Overexpression of Glut-1 and increased glucose metabolism in tumors are associated with a poor prognosis in patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma. Cancer 2003;97:1015-24.
- Kato H, Takita J, Miyazaki T, et al. Correlation of 18-F-fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) accumulation with glucose transporter (Glut-1) expression in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. Anticancer Res 2003;23:3263-72.