Adding Maximum Standard Uptake Value of Primary Lesion and Lymph Nodes in ¹⁸F-Fluorodeoxyglucose PET Helps Predict Distant Metastasis in Patients with Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma



Qi Shi¹⁹, Zhongyi Yang²⁹, Yingjian Zhang²^{*}, Chaosu Hu¹*

1 Department of Radiation Oncology, Fudan University Shanghai Cancer Center, Department of Oncology, Shanghai Medical College, Fudan University, Shanghai, China, 2 Department of Nuclear Medicine, Fudan University Shanghai Cancer Center, Department of Oncology, Shanghai Medical College, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

Abstract

Objective: To find out the most valuable parameter of ¹⁸F-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography for predicting distant metastasis in nasopharyngeal carcinoma.

Methods: From June 2007 through December 2010, 43 non-metastatic NPC patients who underwent ¹⁸F-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computed tomography (PET/CT) before radical Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy were enrolled and reviewed retrospectively. PET parameters including maximum standardized uptake value (SUVmax), mean standardized uptake value (SUVmean), metabolic tumor volume (MTV), and total lesion glucose (TLG) of both primary tumor and cervical lymph nodes were calculated. Total SUVmax were recorded as the sum of SUVmax of primary tumor and cervical lymph nodes. Total SUVmean, Total MTV and Total TLG were calculated in the same way as Total SUVmax.

Results: The median follow-up was 32 months (range, 23–68 months). Distant metastasis was the main pattern of treatment failure. Univariate analysis showed higher SUVmax, SUVmean, MTV, and TLG of primary tumor, Total SUVmax, Total MTV, Total TLG, and stage T3-4 were factors predicting for significantly poorer distant metastasis-free survival (p=0.042, p=0.008, p=0.023, p=0.023, p=0.024, p=0.033, p=0.016, p=0.015). In multivariate analysis, Total SUVmax was the independent predictive factor for distant metastasis (p = 0.046). Spearman Rank correlation analysis showed mediate to strong correlationship between Total SUVmax and SUVmax-T, and between Total SUVmax and SUVmax-N(Spearman coefficient: 0.568 and 0.834; p = 0.000 and p = 0.000).

Conclusions: Preliminary results indicated that Total SUVmax was an independently predictive factor for distant metastasis in patients of nasopharyngeal carcinoma treated with Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy.

Citation: Shi Q, Yang Z, Zhang Y, Hu C (2014) Adding Maximum Standard Uptake Value of Primary Lesion and Lymph Nodes in ¹⁸F-Fluorodeoxyglucose PET Helps Predict Distant Metastasis in Patients with Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma. PLoS ONE 9(7): e103153. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103153

Editor: Jian Jian Li, University of California Davis, United States of America

Received February 25, 2014; Accepted June 25, 2014; Published July 28, 2014

Copyright: © 2014 Shi et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Funding: These authors have no support or funding to report.

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

* Email: profzhangyj@163.com (YZ); hucsu62@yahoo.com (CH)

• These authors contributed equally to this work.

Introduction

Nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC) is the one of the most endemic head and neck cancer in Southeast Asia and East Asia. The radiotherapy has been used as a treatment of the choice for NPC since the middle of the last century. With the advancing of the radiation technologies, such as Intensive-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT), and concurrent chemoradiotherapy, the locoregional control and survival of NPC[1,2] have improved significantly. It has also reduced the normal tissue toxicities as well. However, the distant metastasis is the main obstacle for further improving the treatment outcomes [3–5].

To date, the AJCC (American Joint Committee on Cancer) staging system has been considered as the most important prognostic factor [6–8]. However, this system is mainly based on the anatomic imaging studies and clinical physical examines. With the new diagnostic tools available, clinicians are looking for more prognostic factors which predict treatment outcome more accurately and guide the individualized treatments, and thus improve the prognosis.

¹⁸F-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (¹⁸F-FDG PET) has been wildly used in the initial diagnosis and staging workup for newly diagnosed malignancies, including NPC patients. It is still questionable that whether 18F-FDG PET is more valuable in detecting the primary tumor and cervical lymph nodes metastases of head and neck cancer comparing with computed tomography (CT) or other imaging studies [9-13]. A As a functional imaging study, ¹⁸F-FDG PET may have a predictive value in long-term prognosis. The studies [19–21] have found the prognostic value of ¹⁸F-FDG PET for head and neck cancer. Researches of its prognostic value for nasopharyngeal carcinoma have also been conducted recently. The relationship between SUVmax (maximum standardized uptake value) and prognosis of NPC is most interested. Some studies have suggested that higher uptake value is correlated with poorer DMFS (distant metastasis-free survival), DFS (disease-free survival) and OS (overall survival) [22–25]. In addition, MTV (metabolic tumor volume) and TLG (total lesion glucose) of primary tumor were observed to be negatively correlated with DFS and OS [26–28].

¹⁸F-FDG PET can provide more functional information by various parameters. The most clinical studies have only utilized the traditional factors such as SUVmax and MTV. In order to get the more benefits from the ¹⁸F-FDG PET, we measured SUVmax, SUVmean (mean standardized uptake value), MTV and TLG of primary tumor and metastatic lymph nodes. Total SUVmax, Total SUVmean, Total MTV and Total TLG, which represented the overall metabolic activity of both primary lesion and lymph nodes, were also been calculated.

Materials and Methods

Ethics Statement

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Fudan University Shanghai Cancer Center and was performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and all subsequent revisions. All patients provided their written informed consent to participate in the study.

Patients and pretreatment evaluation

From June 2007 to December 2010, 43 patients with NPC diagnosed and treated in our hospital were enrolled and reviewed retrospectively. The inclusion criteria were as following: (1) biopsyproven primary nasopharyngeal carcinoma; (2) with pretreatment magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the nasopharynx and neck, and whole-body ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT; (3) receiving radiotherapy in our institute; (4) the age was from 18 to 70 years old; (5) with completed medical history. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) with distant metastasis proven by clinical or radiologic evidence; (2) previously radiotherapy, chemotherapy or surgery of other anti-cancer treatment before undergoing whole-body ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT; (3) with any other primary malignant tumor previously diagnosed, or combined concurrently; (4) with diabetes mellitus. All patients were staged according to 2010 UICC/AJCC (Union for International Cancer Control/American Joint Committee on Cancer) staging system.

Pretreatment evaluation were composed of complete medical history, physical examination, indirect or fiberoptic endoscopic examination of nasopharynx, biopsy of the neoplasm in nasopharynx, MRI scans of nasopharynx and neck, and whole-body ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT.

PET/CT imaging and imaging interpretation

¹⁸F-FDG was produced by cyclotron (Siemens CTI RDS Eclips ST, Knoxville, Tennessee, USA) using Explora FDG4 module in our center. Radiochemical purity was over 95%.

All the patients were requested to fast at least 4 h before ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT scan. At the time of the tracer injection (dosage: 7.4MBq/kg), patients' serum glucose should be controlled between 3.9 mmol/L and 7.1 mmol/L. Before and after injection, patients were kept lying comfortably in a quiet, dimly lit room. Scanning was initiated 1 h after administration of the tracer. The images were obtained on a Siemens biograph 16HR PET/CT scanner (Knoxville, Tennessee, USA). The transaxial intrinsic spatial resolution was 4.1 mm (full-width at half-maximum) in the center of the field of view. The data acquisition procedure was as follows: CT scanning was first performed, from the proximal thighs to head, with 120 kV, $80 \sim 250$ mA, pitch 3.6, rotation time 0.5. Immediately after CT scanning, a PET emission scan that covered the identical transverse field of view was obtained. Acquisition time was $2 \sim 3$ min per table position. PET image data sets were reconstructed iteratively by applying the CT data for attenuation correction, and coregistered images were displayed on a workstation.

A multimodality computer platform (Syngo, Siemens, Knoxville, Tennessee, USA) was used for image review and manipulation. Two experienced nuclear medicine physician evaluated the images independently. The reviewers reached a consensus in cases of discrepancy.

Quantification of glucose metabolic activity was obtained using the Standardized Uptake Value (SUV) normalized to body weight. The maximum and mean SUV for primary tumor (SUVmax-T, SUVmean-T) and neck lymph nodes (SUVmax-N, SUVmean-N) were calculated. Besides, MTV was also recorded. The boundaries were drawn large enough to include the primary tumor within the nasopharynx or lymph nodes in the axial, coronal, and sagittal PET images. To define the contouring margins around the target, we used an SUV of 2.5 based on the experience of previous investigators [26,27,29,30]. The contour around the target lesion inside the boundaries was automatically produced and the voxels presenting SUV intensity of greater than 2.5 within the contouring margin were incorporated to define the MTV. TLG was calculated according to the following formula: TLG = SUVmean×MTV. MTV and TLG of primary tumor were recorded as MTV-T, TLG-T, and those of the sum of all neck lymph nodes were recorded as MTV-N, TLG-N. Total SUVmax were recorded as the sum of SUVmax of primary tumor and cervical lymph nodes. Total SUVmean, Total MTV and Total TLG were calculated in the same way as Total SUVmax. Parameters of retropharyngeal lymph nodes were calculated as those of cervical lymph nodes.

Radiotherapy

Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT). Patients were immobilized in the supine position with a thermoplastic mask. CT simulation was performed after immobilization, obtaining 3mm slices from the anterior clinoid process to the hyoid bone, and 5-mm slices from the hyoid bone to 2 cm below the sternoclavicular joint. The gross tumor volume (GTV) included primary tumor and enlarged RLNs. The clinical target volume (CTV) included bilateral coverage of levels II, III, VA and RLNs. The CTV should also cover the entire nasopharynx, parapharyngeal space, clivus, base of skull, pterygoid fossa, posterior half of ethmoidal sinus, inferior sphenoid sinus, and posterior third of nasal cavity and maxillary sinuses. A margin of 3-5 mm around GTV and CTV should be added to account for the patient motion and set-up error. The total dose to primary tumor was 66 Gy in 30 fractions for T1 or T2 disease, 70.4 Gy in 32 fractions for T3 or T4 lesion. A total dose of 60 Gy was delivered to the CTV in 30-32 fractions.

Boost. Residual disease diagnosed by clinical examination or MRI was boosted. Brachytherapy was used for superficial lesion, with a dose of 6–16 Gy in one or two weekly fractions. More advanced disease was boosted by small field, including IMRT, 3D-

Table1. Patient characteristics.

	Number of patients	%			
Age					
Median	45 (yeas)				
Range	18–69 (years)				
Sex					
Male	32	74.42			
Female	11	25.58			
Pathology					
WHO II	8	18.60			
WHO III	35	81.40			
AJCC stage					
1-11	11	25.58			
III-IV	32	74.42			
T stage					
T1-2	22	51.16			
T3-4	21	48.84			
N stage					
N0-1	17	39.53			
N2-3	26	60.47			
Concurrent chemotherapy					
Yes	19	44.19			
No	24	55.81			
Patterns of chemotherapy					
None	6	13.95			
NAC	6	13.95			
NAC+AC	12	27.91			
NAC+CCRT	19	44.19			

Abbreviation: NAC, neoadjuvant chemotherapy; AC, adjuvant chemotherapy; CCRT, concurrent chemoradiotherapy.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103153.t001

RT, 2D-RT and stereotactic radio-surgery and the dose was 6-8 Gy.

Chemotherapy

There were several regimens of neoadjuvant chemotherapy and adjuvant chemotherapy in our institution, including PF, TPF and GP. The TPF protocol consisted of docetaxel 75 mg/m² IV on day 1, cisplatin75 mg/m² IV on day 1, and 5-fu 500 mg/m² d continuously IV on day1–5. The PF protocol consisted of cisplatin 75 mg/m² IV on day 1 and 5-fu 500 mg/m² d continuously IV on day 1 and 5-fu 500 mg/m² d continuously IV on day 1 and 5-fu 500 mg/m² d continuously IV on day 1 and gemcitabine 1000 mg/m² IV on day 1, 8. Regimens were repeated every 3 weeks for 2 cycles as neoadjuvant chemotherapy. This was followed by cisplatin 40 mg/m² IV weekly during radiation. Adjuvant chemotherapy were repeated every 3–4 week for 3 cycles.

Follow-up

The follow-up period was from the first day of initiation of treatment until death or last visit. The median follow-up period was 32 months (range, 23–68 months).

Patients were followed every 3 months in the first two year, then every 6 months in the following three years and then, once a year thereafter. In each visit, medical history was collected, physical examinations including nasopharyngoscopy were performed. Nasopharyngeal MRI was performed 3 months and 1 year after completion of radiotherapy, and every 6 months in the second to fifth year, and then yearly thereafter. The following tests were done at least once a year: chest CT or X-ray, abdominal sonography, and bone scan when clinically indicated. Late toxicities were evaluated according to the toxicity criteria of the RTOG [6].

Statistical analysis

All analyses were performed by using the SPSS software, version 19.0. The actuarial rates were estimated by the Kaplan-Meier method [31]. The primary endpoint was DMFS, and the secondary endpoints were PFS (progression-free survival) and OS. All the endpoints were defined as the interval from the date of initiation of treatment to the date of the failure or death, or last follow-up. Disease progression was defined as the developing of local or regional recurrence, or distant metastasis. The parameters of FDG PET used in statistical analysis included: SUVmax-T, SUVmean-T, MTV-T, TLG-T, SUVmax-N, Total SUVmax, Total SUVmean, Total MTV and Total TLG. The best cut-off values of SUVmax, SUVmean, MTV and TLG, which showed the best trade-off between sensitivity and specificity for DMFS, were determined by receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis following the method of Metz [32]. The survival curves were compared with the log-rank test. Independent sample T test

was used to test whether there were significant differences in the value of above PET parameters between patients of different clinical stages, and Mann-Whitney test was used when heterogeneity of variance existed. Multivariate analyses with the Cox proportional hazards model [33] were used to test for independent significance by backward elimination of insignificant explanatory variables of the different parameters.

Results

Patient characteristics and treatment outcome

There were 43 patients enrolled in this study. The patient characteristics are listed in Table 1. At the time of this study, 4 patients had died and 39 were alive, 4 experienced local recurrence and 2 experienced nodal recurrence, and distant metastases occurred in 8 patients (Table 2). Distant metastasis is the main treatment failure, and the common sites of distant failure were liver, lung and bone. The 3-year DMFS, PFS, and OS were 81.0%,69.1% and 83.2%, respectively.

Differences in PET parameters between patients with different characteristics

MTV-T, TLG-T, Total SUVmax, Total SUVmean, Total MTV and Total TLG of patients with stage III-IVB (according to 2010 AJCC staging system) diseases were significantly higher than those with stage I-II diseases (p value were 0.001, 0.001, 0.022, 0.008, 0.000 and 0.016, respectively). MTV-T, SUVmax-N, Total SUVmax, Total SUVmean, Total MTV and Total TLG of patients with N2-3 diseases were also higher than those with N0-1 diseases (p = 0.029, p = 0.002, p = 0.000, p = 0.000, p = 0.000 and p = 0.002, respectively). Patients with T3-4 diseases showed higher MTV-T, TLG-T and Total MTV than those with T1-2 diseases (p = 0.000, p = 0.000 and p = 0.007, respectively). There was no difference was observed in PET parameters among sex, age or pathology. Figure 1 showed the PET/CT images of two different patients.

Cut-off values of PET parameters

As DMFS was the primary endpoint, we took the values of PET parameters showing the best trade-off between sensitivity and specificity for DMFS as the best cut-off values, which were determined by receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis. The best cut-off values of SUVmax-T, SUVmean-T, MTV-T, TLG-T, SUVmax-N, MTV-N, TLG-N, Total SUVmax, Total SUVmean, Total MTV, Total TLG were 8.70, 4.30, 12.71, 58.08, 6.40, 27.14, 16.04, 49.79 and 235.46, respectively.

Univariate analysis of factors for survival

The summarized results of univariate analysis were listed in Table 3. Patients met any of the following factors including lower



Figure 1. (a) and (b) were PET image and PET/CT infusion image respectively, showing the primary lesion of a patient with T3N1M0 disease, with SUVmax-T (maximal standardized uptake value of primary tumor) of 20.30 and Total SUVmax (sum of maximal standardized uptake value of primary tumor and cervical lymph nodes) of 58.73. This patient developed liver metastasis 8 months after treatment. (c) and (d) were PET image and PET/CT infusion image respectively, showing the primary lesion of a patient with T1N0M0 disease, with both SUVmax-T and Total SUVmax of 6.71. Neither recurrence nor distant metastasis has happened in this patient till now. The arrows pointed after the primary lesions with increasing uptake of FDG. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103153.g001

SUVmax-T (SUVmax-T≤8.70), SUVmean-T (SUVmean-T≤ 4.30), MTV-T (MTV-T≤12.71), TLG-T (TLG-T≤58.08), Total SUVmax (Total SUVmax≤27.14), Total MTV (Total MTV≤ 49.79) or Total TLG (Total TLG≤235.46) had a better DMFS statistically (p = 0.042, p = 0.008, p = 0.023, p = 0.023, p = 0.024, p = 0.033, p = 0.016)(Figure 2). Patients with a lower Total SUVmean (Total SUVmean≤16.04) only showed a trend of better DMFS (p = 0.074). Those with SUVmean-T ≤ 4.30 had a better PFS (p = 0.027), but patients with Total TLG ≤ 235.46 were observed only a trend of better PFS (p = 0.084). In addition, patients with a lower SUVmean-T (SUVmean-T≤4.30) or MTV-T (MTV-T ≤ 12.71) had a relatively higher OS (p=0.079, p = 0.073). Those with a lower SUVmax-N (SUVmax-N ≤ 6.40) showed no change in DMFS, PFS and OS. Among other clinical and pathological factors including sex, age (age>41.5 vs age≤ 41.5), T stage, N stage, overall stage, receiving concurrent

Tak	ble	2.	Patterns	of	failure.

Failure	Number of patients	%
Local recurence	2	4.65
Nodal recurrence	2	4.65
Distant metastasis	6	13.95
Local recurrence & distant metastasis	2	4.65
Death	4	9.30

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103153.t002



Figure 2. Distant metastasis-free survival by: (a) maximal standardized uptake value of primary tumors (SUVmax-T), (b) mean standardized uptake value of primary tumors (SUVmean-T), (c) metabolic tumor volume of primary tumors (MTV-T), (d) total lesion glucose of primary tumors (TLG-T), (e) sum of maximal standardized uptake value of primary tumors and cervical lymph nodes (Total SUVmax), (f) sum of metabolic tumor volume of primary tumors and cervical lymph nodes (Total SUVmax), (f) sum of metabolic tumor volume of primary tumors and cervical lymph nodes (Total SUVmax), (g) sum of total lesion glucose of primary tumors and cervical lymph nodes (Total TLG), (h) T stage of primary tumors. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103153.g002

chemoradiotherapy or not, and patterns of chemoradiotherapy, only patients with T1-2 diseases had a better DMFS (p = 0.015) and OS (p = 0.035) than T3-4 patients, and showed a trend of better PFS (p = 0.085).

Multivariate analysis of independent factors for survival

Factors including SUVmax-T, SUVmean-T, MTV-T, TLG-T, Total SUVmax, Total MTV, Total TLG, T stage, which were proved by univariate analysis to have the potential affecting DMFS were included in the Cox proportional hazard model. Hazard ratio (represented by EXP(B) in Table 4) of SUVmean-T, MTV-T, Total SUVmax and Total TLG were larger than 1. But only Total SUVmax had a p value less than 0.05 (p = 0.046). Thus, the result indicated that Total SUVmax is the independently predictive factor for DMFS (Hazard ratio: 2.623, Confidence interval of hazard ratio: 1.018 - 6.755, p = 0.046) (Table 4). Similarly, SUVmean-T, the potential factor proved by univariate analysis, and Total TLG and T stage, which led to trends of changes in PFS were included into the Cox proportional hazard model, and SUVmean-T were showed to be the independently predictive factor for PFS (Hazard Ratio: 1.499, Confidence interval of hazard ratio: 1.049 - 2.144, p = 0.026) (Table 4). Factors leading to trends of differences in OS including SUVmean-T, MTV-T and T stage were also included into the COX model, and the result indicated SUVmean-T to be the independent factor for OS (Hazard Ratio: 2.028, Confidence interval of hazard ratio: 1.052 - 3.911, p = 0.035) (Table 4).

Spearman Rank correlation analysis

Total SUVmax showed moderate to strong correlation with SUVmax-T and SUVmax-N (Spearman Rank coefficient:0.568 and 0.834, respectively; p = 0.000 and p = 0.000, respectively). But it only had mild correlation with stage of disease (Spearman Rank

coefficient: 0.399, p = 0.008). There was especially strong correlationship between SUVmean-T and SUVmax-T (Pearson coefficient:0.905, p = 0.000), and moderate to strong correlationship was observed between SUVmean-T and MTV-T, or between SUVmean-T and TLG-T (Pearson coefficient:0.474 and 0.621, respectively; p = 0.001 and p = 0.000, respectively).

Discussion

The prognostic factors for malignant tumor have always been attracting a lot of attention, for their potential of guiding the clinicians to conduct personalized treatments for every patients. ¹⁸F-FDG PET, as a functional imaging, is promising to provide the bio-metabolic information of the tumor to clinical doctors. The FDG PET is considered as a non-invasive functional imaging study. It could provide more biological characters of tumors, such as cell viability, proliferative activity, hypoxia, low apoptosis rate, and p53 over-expression [34].

Our study has utilized the metabolic information of FDG PET, and tried to find the most valuable parameters for treatment outcome of nasopharyngeal carcinoma from SUVmax-T, SUVmean-T, MTV-T and TLG-T of primary tumor, SUVmax-N of metastatic lymph nodes, and Total SUVmax, Total SUVmean, Total MTV and Total TLG.

There were several studies focusing on the predictive value of FDG PET for distant metastasis of NPC after treatment. These studies limited by analyzing no more than two PET parameters, and always focused on traditional parameters. Among the parameters, SUVmax received the most attention. Lee analyzed 41 patients of NPC who had received radical radiotherapy and found that those with lower SUVmax had better DFS(disease-free survival) [22]. The research conducted by Xie also indicated a similar conclusion that the higher the SUVmax of primary tumor, the lower the DFS and OS [24]. However, the two studies failed to

With the control of the contro of the control of the contro of the control of the contro	P 3-year PFS(%) P 0.491 67.5 0.574 0.491 67.8 0.574 0.880 78.1 0.574 0.380 78.1 0.192 0.380 78.1 0.192 0.367 72.7 0.986 0.367 72.7 0.986 0.367 72.7 0.986 0.015 81.3 0.085 0.014 70.6 0.147 0.142 61.4 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 100 0.194 100	3-year OS(%) P 89.9 0.88 89.9 0.88 76.5 0.08 76.5 0.08 90.9 0.02 77.3 0.02 77.3 0.02 77.3 0.02 77.3 0.02 77.3 0.02 85.9 0.05 78.7 0.05 78.4 0.05 78.4 0.05 78.4 0.05 78.4 0.25 66.7 73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 9.22 92.2 0.11 92.2 0.11
Age =45 22 773 0491 673 Act 24 20 80 64 64 Act 24 21 80 64 64 Kern 16 11 813 645 64 Act 19 11 81 90 937 731 Act 17 23 73 73 73 73 Act 17 23 73 73 73 Act 17 23 73 73 73 Act 17 23 73 73 73 Act 73 24 73 73 74 Act 76 73 74 74 74 Act 76 74 74 74 74 Act 76 76 74 74 74 Act 76 76 74 74 Act 76	0.491 67.5 0.574 64.8 64.8 0.192 0.880 781 0.192 0.367 781 0.192 0.367 72.7 0.986 67.6 72.7 0.986 0.367 72.7 0.986 67.6 67.6 0.085 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.745 61.4 0.720 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 65.5 0.147 0.557 46.9 0.203 0.657 84.6 0.203 0.042 84.6 0.205 0.0042 89.5 0.0205	89.9 0.8 73.3 76.5 0.8 90.9 90.9 100 0.2 77.3 100 0.6 85.9 0.6 88.4 0.8 88.4 0.8 78.7 78.7 0.8 78.7 0.8 78.7 0.8 78.6 0.2 65.6 0.2 92.2 0.1
>45 51 50 66 68 68 68 Famile 1 84 68 68 68 68 68 68 68 68 68 68 68 68 68 68 734 68 734 68 734 735	64.8 64.8 0.880 78.1 0.192 0.367 72.7 0.986 0.367 72.7 0.986 0.367 72.7 0.986 0.015 81.3 0.096 0.015 81.3 0.096 0.015 67.6 0.096 0.014 67.8 0.020 0.745 61.4 0.720 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 <td>73.3 73.3 0.88 90.9 90.9 0.02 100 0.2 0.2 77.3 0.02 0.6 77.3 0.05 0.6 77.3 0.05 0.6 77.9 88.4 0.8 78.7 88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 0.6 78.4 0.3 0.5 66.7 73.7 0.5 65.6 0.2 0.2 92.2 92.2 0.1 100 0.1 0.1</td>	73.3 73.3 0.88 90.9 90.9 0.02 100 0.2 0.2 77.3 0.02 0.6 77.3 0.05 0.6 77.3 0.05 0.6 77.9 88.4 0.8 78.7 88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 0.6 78.4 0.3 0.5 66.7 73.7 0.5 65.6 0.2 0.2 92.2 92.2 0.1 100 0.1 0.1
Set Me 2 60 080 54 Finale 1 9 9 24 45 Finale 1 9 9 3 45 Hermite 11-1 9 95 95 55 Ti-12 2 95 56 55 55 Nor 11-1 2 95 50 55 Nor 10 12 86 95 55 Nor 10 12 86 70 55 Nor 10 12 86 70 55 Nor 10 12 10 10 55 Nor 10 12 10 10 55 Nor 10 10 10 10 10 Nor 10 10 10 10 10 Nor 10 10 10 10 10 Nor 10 10	0.880 78.1 0.192 41.6 41.6 0.986 0.367 72.7 0.986 0.367 72.7 0.986 0.367 81.3 0.085 0.015 81.3 0.085 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.147 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.195 13.3 0.203 0.0042 84.6 0.203 0.0042 84.6 0.205 0.0057 89.5 0.205	76.5 0.8: 90.9 0.0: 100 0.2: 77.3 0.0: 77.3 0.0: 77.3 0.0: 77.3 0.0: 77.3 0.0: 78.7 0.6: 78.7 0.6: 78.7 0.6: 78.4 0.8: 78.4 0.8: 78.4 0.8: 78.4 0.3: 66.7 0.5: 65.6 0.2: 92.2 0.1: 100 0.1:
Fande 11 81.8 41.6 MC Gage H 11 23 73.4 73.5 H H 11-12 23 73.4 73.5 T-1-12 23 73.4 73.5 73.5 T-1-12 17-12 21 65 60.7 63.5 T-1-12 17-12 21 65 61.5 55.6 Nor 24 23 67.5 61.6 62.5 Nor 24 25.6 61.7 62.5 61.6 Nor 24 25.6 61.7 62.5 63.5 Nor 24 25.6 25.6 63.5 63.5 Nor 24 26.6 26.6 27.5 65.7 Nor 25 26.6 27.5 65.7 65.7 Nor 26.6 27.6 27.6 27.5 65.7 Nor 26.6 27.6 27.6 27.4 27.4 Nor	41.6 0.367 727 0.986 0.367 727 0.986 67.6 67.8 0.085 0.015 81.3 0.085 0.249 70.6 0.050 0.349 70.6 0.720 0.745 61.4 0.598 0.745 61.4 0.598 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147	90.9 100 0.22 77.3 0.22 67.9 0.66 85.9 0.66 78.4 0.8 88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 73.7 0.20 65.6 0.20 92.2 0.20
MC stage H 11 00 037 727 1HvB 11 2 65 60 65 11-12 2 65 6 65 55 17-14 21 6 6 0.94 55 17-14 21 6 6 0.94 56 N2vB N2vB 6 0.94 0.94 56 Nortext 16 0.9 20 0.94 56 Nortext 6 0.9 0.9 56 56 Patens of chemotherapy Nore 6 0.9 56 56 Nortext 6 0.9 0.9 56 56 Nortext 58.9 0.9 0.9 56 56 <tr< td=""><td>0.367 72.7 0.986 67.6 67.6 0.085 6.015 81.3 0.085 0.0145 81.3 0.085 0.049 70.6 0.720 0.745 67.8 0.720 0.745 61.4 0.598 0.745 61.4 0.598 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.557 65.7 0.147 0.657 46.9 0.203 0.642 84.6 0.203 0.042 84.6 0.203 0.043 84.6 0.203 0.043 84.6 0.203</td><td>100 0.2: 77.3 0.2: 67.9 0.6: 85.9 0.6: 78.7 0.8 88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 73.7 0.5 65.5 0.20 92.2 0.1!</td></tr<>	0.367 72.7 0.986 67.6 67.6 0.085 6.015 81.3 0.085 0.0145 81.3 0.085 0.049 70.6 0.720 0.745 67.8 0.720 0.745 61.4 0.598 0.745 61.4 0.598 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.557 65.7 0.147 0.657 46.9 0.203 0.642 84.6 0.203 0.042 84.6 0.203 0.043 84.6 0.203 0.043 84.6 0.203	100 0.2: 77.3 0.2: 67.9 0.6: 85.9 0.6: 78.7 0.8 88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 73.7 0.5 65.5 0.20 92.2 0.1!
III-10 32 77.4 6.7.6 11-12 2 65 607 613 11-12 2 65 607 613 11-12 2 64 756 756 11-12 2 67 67 55 10 12 64 756 67 10 12 24 20 73 67 11 10 24 10 73 73 11 10 24 10 73 73 11 11 12 12 73 73 12 11 12 12 12 73 13 10 12 12 12 73 14 13 14 14 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 14 14 14 14 14 16 14 14	67.6 0.015 81.3 0.085 55.6 5.6 0.085 55.6 5.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.147 67.8 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.193 0.194 100 0.203 0.004 89.5 0.027	77.3 100 0.0 67.9 67.9 85.9 0.6 78.7 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 73.7 65.6 0.2 92.2 100 0.1
11-12 22 95 61 63 63 13-14 21 6 6 55 55 NoN 71 7 6 55 55 NoN 7 7 55 55 55 Non 7 7 55 55 55 Concurrent chemotherapy Yes 24 56 51 74 No No 6 78 56 51 74 No No 6 7 52 74 53 No No 6 76 74 74 No 16 76 74 54 55 No 17 74 74 55 55 No 17 17 56 55 No 17 17 56 55 No 17 16 17 57 No 17 17 57 <t< td=""><td>0015 81.3 0.085 55.6 55.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.147 61.4 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.042 846 0.203 0.023 0.027 0.027</td><td>100 0.0 67.9 85.9 0.65 78.7 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 0.10</td></t<>	0015 81.3 0.085 55.6 55.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.949 70.6 0.720 0.147 61.4 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.195 100 0.147 0.042 846 0.203 0.023 0.027 0.027	100 0.0 67.9 85.9 0.65 78.7 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 0.10
13-14 21 6 55 NOMI 17 824 0.949 705 NAN 73 3 9 705 715 NAN 73 3 9 705 715 715 Concurrent chemothemapy Na 19 26 0.94 705 715 Actor 10 24 100 0.134 100 73 Nuccurrent chemothemapy None 6 100 101 74 743 Nuccurrent chemothemapy Nuccurrent chemothemapy Nuccurrent chemothemapy 8 100 743 743 Nuccurrent chemothemapy Nuccurrent chemothemapy 8 75 763 763 Nuccurrent chemothemapy MHO II 3 743 743 743 743 Nuccurrent chemothemapy MHO II 3 743 743 743 743 Nuccurrent chemothemapy MHO II 3 743 743 743 743 743	55.6 57.6 0.949 70.6 0.720 67.8 67.8 0.730 0.745 61.4 0.598 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.146 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.146 0.194 100 0.146 0.194 100 0.146 0.194 100 0.146 0.194 100	67.9 85.9 0.65 78.4 0.8 88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 73.7 66.7 7.3.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 0.11
New1 17 82.4 0.346 76 Accurate themothenapy Yes 26 67 67 Noncent themothenapy Yes 29 78 73 Accurate themothenapy Nonc 24 26 73 Pattens of chemothenapy Nonc 6 100 73 Pattens of chemothenapy Nonc 6 73 26 Naccurat Naccurat 10 73 26 Naccurat Naccurat 10 73 26 Modely Non-Hort 10 73 26 Modely See 10 73 26 Modely See 10 26 26 Submaxit See 24 26 26 Modely See 10 26 26 Submaxit See 26 26 26 Modely See 26 26 26 Submaxit See 26	0.949 70.6 0.720 67.8 67.8 0.598 0.745 61.4 0.598 74.2 74.2 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 6.5 6.5 0.147 76.7 65.7 0.147 0.657 46.9 0.203 0.042 84.6 0.203 0.043 84.6 0.203 0.043 84.6 0.203 0.043 84.6 0.203	85.9 0.61 78.7 0.8 88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.5 66.7 0.5 65.6 0.20 92.2 0.11
N2N3 26 60 Concurrent chemothenapy Yes 73 673 No 24 826 0.045 614 No 24 826 0.045 614 No No 6 100 0.144 10 No No 6 100 0.147 10 No No 6 100 0.147 10 No No 16 100 0.14 10 No No 16 100 0.14 10 No 100 10 10 10 10 No 101 35 10 10 10 No 101 10 10 10 10 No 10	67.8 67.8 0.745 61.4 0.598 74.2 74.2 0.548 0.194 100 0.147 6.5 6.5 6.4 0.55 6.5 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.195 6.67 0.147 76.7 76.7 0.203 0.657 46.9 0.203 0.042 84.6 0.203 0.042 84.6 0.205 0.008 89.5 0.027	78.7 88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.5 62.5 66.7 73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 0.11
Concurrent chemothenayy (s) (1)	0.745 61.4 0.598 74.2 74.2 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.194 100 0.147 0.042 84.6 0.205 0.008 89.5 0.027	88.4 0.8 78.4 0.8 78.4 0.5 62.5 62.5 65.6 0.2 92.2 0.1
No 24 25 72 Patterns of chemotheopy Noc 6 100 104 100 NAC NAC 6 100 0194 100 65 NAC+ORT 12 65 100 65 65 65 NAC+ORT 19 73 65 75 65 75 NAC+ORT 869 13 73 75 73 75 SUMmarT 5869 13 70 74 73 73 SUMmarT 5869 13 70 74 73 73 SUMmarT 5869 13 70 74 73 73 SUMmarT 54.29 74 74 74 73 73 SUMmarT 54.29 74 74 74 74 74 SUMmarT 54.29 74 74 74 74 74 SUMmarT 54.29 74 74 74	74.2 0.194 100 0.147 62.5 65.7 66.7 76.7 0.557 46.9 0.042 84.6 0.043 89.5 0.027	78.4 100 0.55 6.7 66.7 73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 100 0.11
Patterns of chemotherapy None 6 10 10 Nucc 6 100 6.5 6.5 Nucc 12 6.5 6.5 6.5 Nucc 12 6.5 6.5 6.5 Nucc 13 6.3 6.5 6.5 Nucc 8 13 2.8 6.5 7.5 Nucc 8.60 13 2.4 7.3 7.3 SUNnaxT 8.69 13 0.0 2.4 6.5 7.3 SUNnaxT 8.69 13 0.0 2.4 6.5 7.3 SUNnaxT 8.69 13 0.0 2.4 6.5 7.3 SUNnaxT 8.429 13 0.0 0.0 7.4 7.4 SUNnaxT 8.12,0 14 0.0 0.0 7.4 7.4 SUNnaxT 8.12,0 14 0.0 0.0 7.4 SUNnaxT 8.12,0 10 0.0 0.0	0.194 100 0.147 6.2.5 6.2.5 6.6.7 6.6.7 6.6.7 0.203 0.657 46.9 0.293 0.042 84.6 0.205 0.008 89.5 0.027	100 0.5: 6.2.5 6.6.7 7.3.7 6.5.6 0.20 9.2.2 100 0.1!
NAC 6 100 2.5 NAC+ACK 12 6.3 5.5 NAC+CCK 19 7.89 5.67 NAC+CCK 19 7.89 5.67 NAC+CCK 19 7.89 5.67 NAC+CCK 19 7.89 5.67 NAC+CCK 8 19 5.69 5.7 WHO II 3 7.8 5.3 5.3 WHO II 5.869 13 100 6.07 6.05 SUMmarc 5.429 19 100 6.07 6.05 SUMmarc 5.429 16 6.07 5.3 5.3 SUMmarc 5.1270 16 6.07 5.3 5.3 MU-T 5.1270 16 6.07 5.3 5.3 MU-T 5.1270 10 6.07 5.3 5.3 MU-T 5.1270 10 6.07 5.3 5.3 SUMmarc 5.58.08 10 6.07	62.5 66.7 76.7 76.7 76.7 73.3 73.3 84.6 60.6 60.6 89.5 0.027	62.5 66.7 73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 100 0.11
NGC+AC 12 636 MC-ACRT 19 789 767 NGC+CCRT 19 789 757 757 NGC+CCRT 849 75 0.657 459 Patholoyy WHOII 35 73 733 Patholoyy WHOII 35 824 733 Virance 869 13 100 2023 845 SUbmaxer 886 10 724 733 733 SUbmaxer 8439 19 100 2023 845 MUVT 512/0 24 10 00 734 MUVT 512/0 24 10 73 734 MUVT 512/0 26 70 73 73 MUVT 512/0 26 70 73 73 MUVT 512/0 26 70 73 73 MUVT 512/0 26 74 73 MUVT <	66.7 76.7 0.657 46.9 0.293 73.3 73.3 84.6 0.205 60.6 89.5 0.027	66.7 73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 100 0.1!
NAC+GCRT 10 78.9 76.7 76.7 Pathology WHO II 8 75 0.657 6.6 WHO II 35 82.4 75 0.657 6.6 WHO II 35 82.4 73 733 SUVmaxT 58.69 13 100 0.02 8.6 SUVmaxT 58.69 30 72.4 73 73 SUVmaxT 58.69 30 72.4 6.6 86 VIVT 51270 16 100 0.03 73 73 MIVT 51270 16 100 0.02 73 73 UG5 512 16 100 0.02 73 73 MIVT 51270 16 100 0.02 73 73 UG5 5808 15 70 100 100 100 100 LG-L 5808 563 73 73 73 100 <t< td=""><td>76.7 76.9 0.657 46.9 0.293 73.3 73.3 84.6 0.205 60.6 89.5 0.027</td><td>73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 100 0.1</td></t<>	76.7 76.9 0.657 46.9 0.293 73.3 73.3 84.6 0.205 60.6 89.5 0.027	73.7 65.6 0.20 92.2 100 0.1
Pathology WHO II 8 75 665 645 WHO II 35 82.4 7.3 7.3 WHO II 36.69 13 0.0 84.6 7.3 WHO II 58.69 13 0.0 84.6 7.3 SUMmaxT 58.69 13 0.0 0.02 84.6 SUMmaxT 58.69 30 7.2 6.0 84.6 SUMmaxT 54.29 16 100 0.02 83.5 7.3 MTVT 512.70 24 16 100 0.02 7.3 MTVT 512.70 28.0 16 100 0.02 7.3 MTVT 512.70 28 70 100 7.3 7.3 MTVT 58.00 16 7.0 100 100 10.1 17.4 MTVT 58.00 28 7.0 100 10.1 10.1 10.1 10.1 MTVT 56.30 27.1	0.657 46.9 0.293 73.3 73.3 0.205 84.6 0.205 60.6 0.205 89.5 0.027	65.6 0.20 92.2 100 0.1
WHO III 35 82.4 733 SUVmaxT ≤8.69 13 100 2.042 846 >8.69 30 72.4 606 607 606 SUVman-T ≤4.29 19 100 2.042 895 SUVman-T ≤4.29 19 100 2.046 895 SUVman-T ≤12.70 13 100 2.047 53.8 VUV-T ≤12.70 16 100 2.023 70.4 VUV-T ≤12.70 28 70.4 71.4 71.4 VUV-T ≤12.70 28 70.4 71.4 71.4 VUV-T ≤12.70 28 70.4 71.4 71.4 VUV-T ≤10 27 70.4 71.4 71.4 VUV-T ≤58.08 26 70.4 71.4 71.4 VUV-T ≤63 27 70.4 71.4 71.4 VUV-T ≤63 27 72.4 71	73.3 0.042 84.6 0.205 60.6 0.007	92.2 100 0.15
SUVmarT ≤8.69 13 100 6.042 846 >8.69 30 724 6.06 6.0 6.00 6.	0.042 84.6 0.205 60.6 60.5 0.027	100 0.15
>8.69 30 72.4 60.6 SUVmen-T ≤4.29 19 100 6.03 835 MTV-T >4.29 24 6.67 2.38 835 MTV-T ≤12.70 15 100 6.03 53.8 MTV-T ≤12.70 15 100 6.02 73.4 MTV-T ≤12.70 15 100 6.02 73.4 MTV-T ≤12.70 28 70.4 71.4 71.4 Ut-T ≤58.08 15 70.4 71.4 74.1 Ut-T 558.08 27.1 27.1 88.5 70.4 74.1 Ut-T 56.39 16 68.5 71.7 61.1 71.1 Ut-T 56.39 27.13 21.3 70.4 71.1 71.1 Ut-T 56.39 27.13 27.13 70.4 71.1 71.1 Ut-T 56.34 21.3 70.4 71.1 71.1 71.1	60.6 0.008 89.5 0.027	
SUVmean-T ≤4.29 19 100 0.008 895 Nutv-T >4.29 24 66.7 538 538 MtV-T ≤12.70 15 100 0.023 70 MtV-T ≤12.70 28 704 71 714 MtV-T ≤58.08 15 704 71 714 UtG-T ≤58.08 28 704 71 714 UtG-T ≤58.08 28 704 71 714 UtG-T 55.08 28 704 71 71 UtG-T 56.39 27 88.5 0.117 74 74 UtG-SUMax-N ≤6.39 27 27 87 74 74 Utg-SUMax-N ≤104 27 913 913 913	0.008 89.5 0.027	75.9
>4.29 24 667 538 MV-T ≤1270 15 100 0.023 53 MV-T ≤1270 28 704 71.4 >12.70 ≤58.08 15 704 71.4 TG-T ≤58.08 15 704 71.4 VM-T ≤58.08 15 704 71.4 VM-T ≤58.08 28 704 71.4 VM-T ≤58.08 28 704 61.7 VM-MAXN ≤6.39 27 68.5 711 61.7 VM-MAXN ≤6.39 27 68.5 711 61.1 VM-MAXN ≤7.13 21 61.5 61.7 61.4 Votal SUVmax ≤16.04 27 61.2 61.3 61.4 Votal SUVmax ≤16.04 19 61.3 61.4 61.6 Votal SUVmax ≤49.7 29 92.3 92.3 71 61.9		100 0.01
MV-T ≤12.70 15 100 0.023 70 >12.70 >12.70 28 70.4 71.4 >14.7 >58.08 15 100 0.023 79.4 TG-T >58.08 15 100 0.023 79.4 TG-T >58.08 16 88.5 0.117 6.1 VM-MA-V ≤6.39 27 88.5 0.117 6.1 Vot 2713 21 95.2 6.0 6.1 6.1 Vot 2713 21 95.2 6.1 6.1 6.1 Vot 21 10 91.3 0.074 7.1 6.1 Vot	53.8	73.5
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	0.023 70 0.472	100 0.01
TG-T ≤ 80.06 15 100 0.023 794 > >80.08 >80.06 >80.06 62.5 62.5 SUVmax-N ≤ 6.39 27 88.5 0.117 62.5 SUVmax-N ≤ 6.39 27 88.5 0.117 62.5 SUVmax-N ≤ 6.39 27 88.5 0.117 74.1 Value >6.39 27 88.5 0.117 74.1 Value ≤ 27.13 21 95.2 0.024 77.1 Value ≥ 277.13 22 66.7 0.024 77.1 Value ≤ 27.13 22 66.7 0.024 77.1 Value ≤ 27.13 22 66.7 0.024 77.1 Value ≤ 16.64 19.3 0.074 55.6 Value ≤ 49.79 29.2 0.074 51.6	71.4	70.6
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	0.023 79.4 0.218	100 0.09
UVmax-N $\leq .39$ 27 88.5 0.117 74.1 Number Num Number Num Num Number Number Num Num Num Number Number Num Num	62.5	73.2
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	0.117 74.1 0.252	91.9 0.57
Total SU/max ≤ 27.13 21 95.2 0.024 77.1 Total SU/mean ≥ 27.13 22 66.7 6.2 6.2 Total SU/mean ≤ 16.04 24 91.3 0.074 75.8 Total SU/mean ≥ 16.04 24 91.3 0.074 75.8 Total SU/mean ≥ 16.04 19 62.9 62.9 62.9 Total SU/mean ≤ 16.04 24 91.3 0.074 75.8 Total NU/mean ≤ 49.79 29 92.0 0.033 72.1	61.1	68.2
>27,13 22 66.7 6.2.9 Total SUVmean ≤16.04 24 91.3 0.074 75.8 Total SUVmean >16.04 19 68.4 75.8 61.6 Total MTV ≤49.79 25 92.0 60.3 72.1	0.024 77.1 0.182	94.1 0.33
Total SU/mean ≤16.04 24 91.3 0.074 75.8 >16.04 19 68.4 76.04 7	62.9	73.7
$>16.04 \qquad 19 \qquad 68.4 \qquad 61.6$ Total MTV $\leq 49.79 \qquad 25 \qquad 92.0 \qquad 0.033 \qquad 72.1$	0.074 75.8 0.224	91.0 0.76
Total MTV ≤49.79 25 92.0 0.033 72.1	61.6	73.3
	0.033 72.1 0.299	91.4 0.53
>49,79 18 64.7 66.7	66.7	60.0
Total TLG ≤235.46 22 95.5 0.016 77.7	0.016 77.7 0.084	94.7 0.23
>235.46 21 65.0 61.1	61.1	69.7
Bold numbers, indicated there was statistically significant difference (p value <0.05). doi:10.1371/iournal.nova.0103153.4003		

PLOS ONE | www.plosone.org

6

Endpoint	Variable	*В	P value	[#] EXP(B)	95% CI for EXP(B)
DMFS	SUVmax-T	-9.221	0.055	0.000	0.000–1.196
	SUVmean-T	59.839	0.055	9.725E25	0.301-3.142E52
	MTV-T	3.946	0.061	51.703	0.840–3182.561
	TLG-T	-0.861	0.61	0.423	0.172–1.039
	Total SUVmax	0.964	0.046	2.623	1.018–6.755
	Total MTV	-1.118	0.065	0.327	0.100-1.072
	Total TLG	0.187	0.066	1.206	0.988–1.473
	T stage	-164.227	0.059	0.000	0.000–368.385
PFS	SUVmean-T	0.405	0.026	1.499	1.049–2.144
	Total TLG	0.000	0.891	1.000	0.997–1.002
	T stage	-1.854	0.089	0.157	0.019–1.326
OS	SUVmean-T	0.707	0.035	2.028	1.052–3.911
	MTV-T	-0.022	0.495	0.979	0.919–1.042
	T stage	-11.991	0.952	0.000	0.000-1.30E163

Table 4. Summary of multivariate analysis.

^{*} B represented the regression coefficient for each variable in Cox model.

[#]EXP(B) represented the hazard ratio (HR) of each variable

Bold numbers, indicated there was statistically significant difference (p value <0.05).

Abbreviation: CI, Confidence Interval.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103153.t004

point out the definite pattern of treatment failure (for example, local recurrence or distant metastasis). These studies were limited by unable to guide treatments. Chan and Hung conducted further studies and found that SUVmax was correlated with DMFS. The results of Chan indicated that the 5-year DMFS in stage IVa-b patients with SUVmax >12.0 was significantly lower than that in stage I–III patients with SUVmax ≤ 12 (p=0.0001) [23]. The conclusion of Hung showed that both SUVmax of the primary tumor and that of neck lymph nodes were independent prognostic factors for DMFS in NPC patients treated with IMRT [25]. Nevertheless, our study revealed that SUVmax-T, SUVmean-T, MTV-T, TLG-T, Total SUVmax, Total MTV, Total TLG and T stage were all proved to be potential factors negatively affected the 3-year DMFS in univariate analysis, after included into Cox proportional hazards model, only Total SUVmax was the independently prognostic factor for DMFS. Moreover, in Spearman Rank correlation analysis, Total SUVmax, as a parameter reflecting total tumor burdon, showed moderate to strong correlation with SUVmax-T and SUVmax-N. So it is reasonable to hypothesize that Total SUVmax was the parameter most directly correlated with DMFS. As none of previous studies included Total SUVmax into analysis, they finally drew conclusion that SUVmax of primary tumor or cervical lymph nodes was the most valuable predictive parameter of patients with NPC, and might have been insufficient. The result of our study indicates that patients with higher Total SUVmax may have higher risk of developing distant metastasis, and need more aggressive systematic treatment.

The multivariate analysis from this study also discovered that mean standardized uptake value of primary tumor (SUVmean-T) was independent factor for PFS and OS. However, this result should be interpreted with caution, as all of optimal cut-off values of PET parameters by ROC analysis were based on the best tradeoff between sensitivity and specificity for DMFS, not for PFS or OS.

In our study, all patients were treated with IMRT, and half of the patients received concurrent chemoradiotherapy. The distant

metastasis remained the main pattern of treatment failure. It confirmed the previous studies that IMRT and concurrent chemotherapy have greatly improved the local-regional control of NPC, without a major impact on distant metastasis [3-5]. There was a randomized phase II trial reported the results in stage III-IVB NPC patients, comparing CCRT with or without neoadjuvant docetaxel and cisplatin. This clinical trial confirmed that the neoadjuvant chemotherapy is beneficial for improving DMFS and OS [35]. Meanwhile, there are several studies having similar conclusion. The treatment related toxicities were tolerable [36,37]. In addition to chemotherapy, biological target therapy is newer type of systematic treatment. The Radiation Therapy Oncology Group have conducted a study of concurrent chemoradiotherapy followed by adjuvant chemotherapy with bevacizumab (RTOG 0615). The results indicated that the therapy is feasible and may delay the progression of subclinical distant disease [38]. Another phase II clinical trial of cetuximab with concurrent chemoradiotherapy in locoregionally advanced NPC also showed that the strategy is feasible. The preliminary rate was favorable comparing with historic data [39]. It is our opinion that should the patients with high risk of distant metastasis be predicted by Total SUVmax of FDG PET, more aggressive systematic treatment could be considered in these patients.

There are still limitations in this study. As it is a retrospective study, there exist defects in data completeness and comparability. The total amount of patients enrolled in was relatively small. With the accumulation of patients and follow-up period, we will conduct further analysis with more patients and longer follow-up period on the basis of the current preliminary results. It is possible that we may find more valuable parameters of FDG PET for the predicting the prognosis of NPC patients, and thus help to guide personalizing treatment of NPC better.

In conclusion, the preliminary results of our study showed that Total SUVmax was an independently predictive factor for distant metastasis in NPC patients. This may assist the clinicians to conduct personalized treatment that is more aggressive in these patients.

Acknowledgments

We thank our colleagues in Department of Radiation Oncology and Department of Nuclear Medicine of Fudan University Shanghai Cancer Center for helpful comments and other assistance.

References

- Liu MT, Hsieh CY, Chang TH, Lin JP, Huang CC, et al. (2003) Prognostic factors affecting the outcome of nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Jpn J Clin Oncol 33(10): 501–508.
- Mao YP, Liang SB, Liu LZ, Chen Y, Sun Y, et al. (2008) The N staging system in nasopharyngeal carcinoma with radiotherapy oncology group guidelines for lymph node level based on magnetic resonance imaging. Clin Cancer Res 14(22):7497–7503.
- Lee N, Xia P, Quivey JM, Sultanem K, Poon I, et al. (2002) Intensitymodulated radiotherapy in the treatment of nasopharyngeal carcinoma: an update of the UCSF experience. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 53(1):12–22.
- Kam MK, Teo PM, Chau RM, Cheung KY, Choi PH, et al. (2004) Treatment of nasopharyngeal carcinoma with intensity-modulated radiotherapy: the Hong Kong experience. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 60(5):1440–1450.
- Lee N, Harris J, Garden AS, Straube W, Glisson B, et al. (2009) Intensitymodulated radiation therapy with or without chemotherapy for nasopharyngeal carcinoma: radiation therapy oncology group phase II trial 0225. J Clin Oncol 27(22):3684–3690.
- Edge SB, Byrd DR, Compton CC, Fritz AG, Greene FL, et al. (2009) AJCC Cancer Staging Manual, 7th edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven. pp. 6–8.
- Ho JH (1978) Stage classification of nasopharyngeal carcinoma: a review. IARC Sci Publ (20):99–113.
- Min H, Hong M, Ma J, Zhang E, Zheng Q, et al. (1994) A new staging system for nasopharyngeal carcinoma in China. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 30(5):1037–42.
- Kitagawa Y, Nishizawa S, Sano K, Ogasawara T, Nakamura M, et al. (2003) Prospective Comparison of ¹⁸F-FDG PET with Conventional Imaging Modalities (MRI, CT, and 67Ga Scintigraphy) in Assessment of Combined Intraarterial Chemotherapy and Radiotherapy for Head and Neck Carcinoma. J Nucl Med 44(2): 198–206.
- Jeong HS, Back CH, Son YI, Ki Chung M, Kyung Lee D, et al. (2007) Use of integrated ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT to improve the accuracy of initial cervical nodal evaluation in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. Head Neck 29(3): 203–210.
- Daisne JF, Duprez T, Weynand B, Lonneux M, Hamoir M, et al. (2004) Tumor volume in pharyngolaryngeal squamous cell carcinoma: comparison at CT, MR imaging, and FDG PET and validation with surgical specimen. Radiology 233(1):93–100.
- Dammann F, Horger M, Meuller-Berg M, Schlemmer H, Claussem CD, et al. (2005) Rational Diagnosis of Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Head and Neck Region: Comparative Evaluation of CT, MRI, and ¹⁸FDG PET. AJR AM J Roentgenol 184(4): 1326–1331.
- Ng SH, Yen TC, Chang JT, Chan SC, Ko SF, et al. (2006) 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 24(27): 4371–4376.
- Ng SH, Chan SC, Liao CT, Chang JT, Ko SF, et al. (2008) Distant metastases and synchronous second primary tumors in patients with newly diagnosed oropharyngeal and hypopharyngeal carcinomas: evaluation of ¹⁸F-FDG PET and extended-field multi-detector row CT. Neuroradiology 50(11):969–979.
- Haerle SK, Schmid DT, Ahmad N, Hany TF, Stoeckli SJ (2011) The value of ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT for the detection of distant metastases in high-risk patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. Oral Oncol 47(7): 653–659.
- Krabbe CA, Pruim J, van der Laan BF, Rödiger LA, Roodenburg JL (2009) FDG-PET and detection of distant metastases and simultaneous tumors in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: A comparison with chest radiography and chest CT. Oral Oncol 45(3): 234–240.
- Uyl-de Groot CA, Senft A, de Bree R, Leemans CR, Hoekstra OS (2010) Chest CT and Whole-Body ¹⁸F-FDG PET Are Cost-Effective in Screening for Distant Metastases in Head and Neck Cancer Patients. J Nucl Med 51(2): 176–182.
 Xu GZ, Guan DJ, He ZY (2011) ¹⁸FDG-PET/CT for detecting distant
- Xu GZ, Guan DJ, He ZY (2011) ¹⁸FDG-PET/CT for detecting distant metastases and second primary cancers in patients with head and neck cancer. A meta-analysis. Oral Oncol 47(7): 560–565.
- Allal AS, Dulguerov P, Allaoua M, Haenggeli CA, El-Ghazi el A, et al. (2002) Standardized uptake value of 2-[(18)F] fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose in predicting outcome in head and neck carcinomas treated by radiotherapy with or without chemotherapy. J Clin Oncol 20(5):1398–1404.
- Allal AS, Slosman DO, Kebdani T, Allaoua M, Lehmann W, et al. (2004) Prediction of outcome in head-and-neck cancer patients using the standardized

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: YZ CH. Performed the experiments: QS ZY. Analyzed the data: QS. Contributed reagents/ materials/analysis tools: QS. Wrote the paper: QS ZY.

uptake value of 2-[18F]fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 59(5):1295–1300.

- 21. Liao CT, Chang JT, Wang HM, Ng SH, Hsueh C, et al. (2009) 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 74(4):1054–61.
- Lee SW, Nam SY, Im KC, Kim JS, Choi EK, et al. (2008) Prediction of prognosis using standardized uptake value of 2-[18F] fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography for nasopharyngeal carcinomas. Radiotherapy and Oncol 87(2): 211–216.
- Chan SC, Chang JY, Wang HM, Lin CY, Ng SH, et al. (2009) Prediction for distant failure in patients with stage M0 nasopharyngeal carcinoma: The role of standardized uptake value. Oral Oncol 45(1): 52–58.
- Xie P, Yue JB, Fu Z, Feng R, Yu JM (2010) Prognostic value of ¹⁸F-FDG PET/ CT before and after radiotherapy for locally advanced nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Ann Oncology 21(5): 1078–1082.
- Hung TM, Wang HM, Kang CJ, Huang SF, Liao CT, et al. (2013) Pretreatment ¹⁸F-FDG PET standardized uptake value of primary tumor and neck lymph nodes as a predictor of distant metastasis for patients with nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Oral Oncol 49 (2): 169–174.
- Xie P, Yue JB, Zhao HX, Sun XD, Kong L, et al. (2010) Prognostic value of ¹⁸F-FDG PET-CT metabolic index for nasopharyngeal carcinoma. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol 136(6):883–889.
- Chan SC, Chang JT, Lin CY, Ng SH, Wang HM, et al. (2011) Clinical utility of ¹⁸F-FDG PET parameters in patients with advanced nasopharyngeal carcinoma: predictive role for different survival endpoints and impact on prognostic stratification. Nucl Med Commun 32(11): 990–996.
- Chang KP, Tsang NM, Liao CT, Hu CL, Chung MJ, et al. (2012) Prognostic Significance of F-¹⁸-FDG PET Parameters and Plasma Epstein-Barr Virus DNA Load in Patients with Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma. J Nucl Med 53(1): 21–28.
- Chung MK, Jeong HS, Park SG, Jang JY, Son YI, et al. (2009) Metabolic tumor volume of [18F]-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computed tomography predicts short-term outcome to radiotherapy with or without chemotherapy in pharyngeal cancer. Clin Cancer Res 15(18):5861–8.
- Seol YM, Kwon BR, Song MK, Choi YJ, Shin HJ, et al. (2010) Measurement of tumor volume by PET to evaluate prognosis in patients with head and neck cancer treated by chemo-radiation therapy. Acta Oncol 49(2):201–8.
- Kaplan EL, Meier P (1958) Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. J Am Stat Assoc 53(282):457–481.
- Metz CE (1986) ROC methodology in radiologic imaging. Invest Radiol 21(9):720–733.
- Cox DR (1972) Regression models and life tables. JR Stat Soc Ser B 34(2):187– 220.
- Allal AS, Slosman DO, Kebdani T, Allaoua M, Lehmann W, et al. (2004) Prediction of outcome in head-and-neck cancer patients using the standardized uptake value of 2-¹⁸F-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 59(5):1295–1300.
- Hui EP, Ma BB, Leung SF, King AD, Mo F, et al. (2009) Randomized phase II trial of concurrent cisplatin-radiotherapy with or without neoadjuvant docetaxel and cisplatin in advanced nasopharyngeal carcinoma. J Clin Oncol 27(2):242– 249.
- Kong L, Lu JJ, Hu C, Guo Y, Niu X, et al. (2012) Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy With TPF Regimen Followed by Concurrent Chemoradiation for Locoregionally Advanced Stage Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 84 (3): 487.
- 37. Zhong Y, Zhou Y, Xie C, Wang X, Zhou F, et al. (2012) Phase II Trial of Docetaxel and Cisplatin Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy Followed by Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy With Concurrent Cisplatin in Advanced Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 84(3): 207.
- Lee NY, Zhang Q, Pfister DG, Kim J, Garden AS, et al. (2012) Addition of bevacizumab to standard chemoradiation for locoregionally advanced nasopharyngeal carcinoma (RTOG 0615): a phase 2 multi-institutional trial. Lancet Oncol 13(2):172–180.
- Ma BB, Kam MK, Leung SF, Hui EP, King AD, et al. (2012) A phase II study of concurrent cetuximab–cisplatin and intensity-modulated radiotherapy in locoregionally advanced nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Ann Oncology 23(5): 1287–1292.