

CORRECTION

Open Access



Correction to: Combined quality and dose-volume histograms for assessing the predictive value of ^{99m}Tc -MAA SPECT/CT simulation for personalizing radioembolization treatment in liver metastatic colorectal cancer

Hugo Levillain^{1,2*}, Manuela Burghilea¹, Ivan Duran Derijckere², Thomas Guiot¹, Akos Gulyban¹, Bruno Vanderlinden¹, Michael Vouche³, Patrick Flamen² and Nick Reynaert¹

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40658-020-00345-4>.

* Correspondence: hugo.levillain@bordet.be

¹Medical Physics Department, Jules Bordet Institute, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1 Rue Héger-Bordet, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium

²Nuclear Medicine Department, Jules Bordet Institute, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1 Rue Héger-Bordet, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Correction to: *EJNMMI Phys* 7, 75 (2020)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40658-020-00345-4>

Following publication of the original article [1], it was noted that, due to a typesetting error, Table 4 was missing several columns.

The corrected Table 4 has been reproduced in this Correction article and the original article has been updated.

Author details

¹Medical Physics Department, Jules Bordet Institute, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1 Rue Héger-Bordet, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium. ²Nuclear Medicine Department, Jules Bordet Institute, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1 Rue Héger-Bordet, 1000 Brussels, Belgium. ³Department of Radiology, Jules Bordet Institute, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1 Rue Héger-Bordet, 1000 Brussels, Belgium.

Published online: 27 January 2021

Reference

1. Levillain H, Burghilea M, Derijckere ID, et al. Combined quality and dose-volume histograms for assessing the predictive value of ^{99m}Tc -MAA SPECT/CT simulation for personalizing radioembolization treatment in liver metastatic colorectal cancer. *EJNMMI Phys*. 2020;7:75 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40658-020-00345-4>.

Table 4 Univariate analysis of predictive factors of poor agreement between $D^{\text{Post-treatment-R}}$ and $D^{\text{Predictive-D}}$ for Lesion, TL and NTL

Variables	Dichotomisation	QF Lesion		QF TL		QF NTL	
		median (IQR)	<i>p</i>	median (IQR)	<i>p</i>	median (IQR)	<i>p</i>
Sex	Male vs. Female	0.23 (0.14-0.34) vs 0.22 (0.13-0.33)	0.50	0.29 (0.20-0.37) vs 0.25 (0.17-0.29)	0.22	0.27 (0.19-0.36) vs 0.27 (0.22-0.40)	0.79
Age (y)	> 73 vs ≤73	0.21 (0.14-0.33) vs 0.23 (0.14-0.34)	0.54	0.25 (0.16-0.33) vs 0.26 (0.20-0.34)	0.61	0.24 (0.19-0.43) vs 0.28 (0.24-0.32)	0.47
Previous Liver surgery	Yes vs No	0.26 (0.15-0.34) vs 0.22 (0.14-0.32)	0.74	0.28 (0.18-0.39) vs 0.26 (0.17-0.30)	0.53	0.24 (0.20-0.33) vs 0.28 (0.19-0.39)	0.70
Previous Bevacizumab	Yes vs No	0.19 (0.13-0.34) vs 0.26 (0.17-0.33)	0.07	0.24 (0.17-0.33) vs 0.27 (0.19-0.33)	0.98	0.27 (0.18-0.33) vs 0.28 (0.23-0.43)	0.19
Delay predictive / post-treatment dosimetry (d)	> 9 vs ≤9	0.26 (0.17-0.38) vs 0.19 (0.12-0.30)	0.003	0.28 (0.22-0.37) vs 0.22 (0.15-0.27)	0.03	0.33 (0.28-0.41) vs 0.22 (0.18-0.28)	0.004
Net administered activity (MBq)	> 1262 vs ≤1262	0.20 (0.13-0.34) vs 0.24 (0.16-0.33)	0.49	0.25 (0.20-0.35) vs 0.26 (0.17-0.33)	0.64	0.26 (0.19-0.35) vs 0.28 (0.21-0.41)	0.50
Lesion Volume (ml)	> 5.8 vs ≤5.8	0.23 (0.15-0.32) vs 0.21 (0.13-0.34)	0.51				
TL Volume (ml)	> 73.34 vs ≤73.34			0.28 (0.16-0.37) vs 0.26 (0.20-0.30)	0.40		
NTL Volume (ml)	> 1354 vs ≤1354					0.29 (0.21-0.41) vs 0.27 (0.20-0.31)	0.37
Type of targeting	Whole liver single injection	0.17 (0.12-0.28)	0.02	0.20 (0.15-0.28)	0.65	0.23 (0.17-0.33)	0.42
	Whole Liver injection left and right lobes separately	0.24 (0.14-0.35)		0.27 (0.17-0.37)		0.31 (0.19-0.41)	
	Uni-lobar	0.26 (0.18-0.33)		0.27 (0.22-0.33)		0.28 (0.24-0.38)	