FDG-PET/CT Imaging-Based Target Volume Delineation for Preoperative Conformal Radiotherapy of Rectal Carcinoma
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ABSTRACT

Positron emission tomography (PET) has the potential to improve staging and radiation treatment-planning (RTP) for tumors in various sites. We compared computed tomography (CT) with co-registered 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG)-PET-CT) as the basis for delineating gross tumor volume (GTV) in patients with rectal carcinoma undergoing preoperative three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3D-CRT). Twenty-three patients diagnosed with localized rectal carcinoma who were candidates for preoperative chemoradiation were evaluated using both CT and PET imaging. For each patient, two 3D-CRT plans were created using the CT and PET-CT fusion data sets. GTV was contoured on both CT (GTVCT) and co-registered PET-CT (GTVPET-CT) images. The resulting GTVCT and GTVPET-CT images were analyzed comparatively.

The median GTVPET-CT (40 cm^3) was significantly greater than the median GTVCT (25.7 cm^3) (p= 0.0001). The median difference between GTV PET-CT and GTVCT was 65%. The intersected tumor volume determined by the two methods was median 19.7 cm^3, and tumor volumes remaining outside CT was median 15.2 cm^3. The median volume identified by PET but not by CT (PEToutCT) was 35% of GTV PET-CT, indicating the possibility of a geographic miss in GTV. Co-registration of PET and CT information in localized rectal cancer may improve the delineation of GTV and theoretically reduce the likelihood of geographic misses, thus potentially having a positive impact on treatment planning.
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ÖZET

Rektum Kanserinin Preoperatif Radyoterapisinde BT ile PET-BT Bazlı 3-Boyutlu Konformal Radyoterapi Planlamalarının Karşılaştırılması

Positron emisyon tomografisi (PET) bir çok tümörün evrelenmesi ve radyoterapi planlamasında potansiyel bir kazanç sağlamıştır. Rektum kanserinin preoperatif konformal radyoterapisi öncesi bilgisayarlı tomografi (BT) ile 18F-fluorodeoksiglikoz positron emisyon tomografisi/bilgisayarlı tomografi (FDG-PET/CT) bazlı 3-boyutlu tedavi planlamaları çaprazdan metin. Kınığinize rektum kanseri tanısı ile preoperatif kemoradyoterapi planlanan 23 hasta çalışmaya alınmıştır. Tüm hastaların tedavi öncesiinde, tedavi pozisyonunda olacaktır şekilde PET ve BT görüntüleri elde edilmiştir.
INTRODUCTION

High-dose preoperative chemoradiotherapy has significantly improved the rates of sphincter preservation, local control and survival in localized rectal carcinoma.1-4 One way to improve on current results is to increase the radiation dose applied to the tumor tissue; however, further dose escalation is limited by toxicity to adjacent normal tissue. In this context, three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy (3D-CRT), intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) and helical tomotherapy have shown great promise.5-8 The current standard imaging technique used in radiation therapy treatment planning (RTP) is conventional computed tomography (CT), a technique that has inherent disadvantages in determining primary tumor and lymphatic extension due to limited sensitivity and specificity.9 Thus, the images generated by conventional CT tend to either underestimate or overestimate tumor boundaries, potentially leading to unnecessarily large radiation therapy (RT) portals or geographic misses.

Clearly, a more accurate definition of RT target volumes would reduce geographic misses in rectal carcinoma RTP. Tumor delineation and noninvasive tissue characterization is important for effective treatment selection, planning and monitoring in radiation oncology.10-12 Although CT has a relatively higher spatial resolution than other imaging methods, its value in rectal cancer RTP is significantly diminished by its lower specificity. Functional 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) has been shown to have higher sensitivity and specificity than anatomic CT in the detection of primary tumors, lymphatic extensions and distant metastases.13-17 In recent years, the co-registration of CT images with FDG-PET images has attracted increasing attention for staging and RTP of several tumor sites, including the rectum. The fusion of PET signals with CT has proved highly accurate for localizing pelvic disease.18 The specific activity of the FDG-PET signal improves target-volume definition and may result in more uniform assessment of target volume by different radiation oncologists.19,20 More recently, investigations of the reliability of PET-determined GTVs for macroscopic lesions that are amenable to appropriate surgery or RT have shown that PET information can change treatment decisions.21,22 Applied to external-beam RT, PET technology may allow the establishment of a standardized and highly reproducible approach to defining tumor volume. PET-CT-based RTP has been shown to significantly alter RT fields in patients with various tumors, including cancers of the head and neck, lung, pancreas, esophagus and cervix.23-28 Only a few published studies have addressed the potential benefit of FDG-PET for tumor staging, predicting the response to preoperative treatment, and defining the target volume in rectal cancer.29-35

The purpose of this current study was to compare the CT method with co-registered PET-CT as the basis for GTV delineation in patients with rectal carcinoma undergoing preoperative 3D-CRT.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Twenty-three patients with pathologically confirmed rectal adenocarcinoma and candidates for radiotherapy in a preoperative setting with concomitant chemotherapy were prospectively enrolled. Other eligibility criteria were as follows: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status of 0 to 2; age between 18 and 75 years; determination of disease extent by proctoscopy, colonoscopy and radiographic imaging; no prior chemotherapy or abdominal irradiation; no contraindication for PET-CT imaging. The clinical stage was defined accor-
According to the 2002 American Joint Committee on Cancer – International Union Against Cancer (AJCC-UICC) classification. All patients provided written informed consent, and the institutional ethics committee, in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration on human projects, approved the study design.

CT and PET Imaging

Prior to CT and PET imaging, patients were immobilized in the supine position with arms crossed on the thorax with a “knee-fix” cushion under the knees. Before imaging, simulator lasers (Acuity, Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto, CA, USA) were used to align and mark patients to define the coordinate system that would be used for treatment planning. For PET-based planning, eligible patients were evaluated using the combined PET-CT system (Discovery-STE 8, General Electric Medical System, Milwaukee, WI, USA). The patients were administered an intravenous dose of FDG (370-555 MBq, 10-15 mCi) after fasting for at least 6 hours. Preinjection blood glucose was measured to ensure that levels were below 150 mg/dl. During the distribution phase, patients lay supine in a quiet room. Patients were scanned on a flat-panel carbon-fiber composite table insert, with combined image acquisition beginning 60 minutes after FDG injection. An unenhanced CT scan (5 mm slice thickness) from the base of the skull to the inferior border of the pelvis was acquired first using a standardized protocol with 140 kV, 80 mA. The subsequent PET scan was acquired in 3D mode from the base of the skull to the inferior border of the pelvis (6-7 bed positions, 3 min/position) without repositioning the patient on the table. Both CT and PET images were acquired with the patient breathing shallowly. Attenuation was corrected using the CT images. Areas of FDG uptake were categorized as malignant based on location, intensity, shape and size, and visual correlated with CT images to differentiate physiologic from pathologic uptake. The processed images were displayed in coronal, transverse and sagittal planes. CT- and PET-CT based treatment planning for each patient was performed using an Eclipse 7.5 RTP system (Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto, CA, USA), which includes all standard RTP features as well as a DICOM image reader and automated image registration software.

Target Volume Delineation

The target volumes were defined by a radiation oncologist (MNY) with specific experience in rectal cancer treatment, according to the guidelines of International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements Report 62. For each patient, gross tumor volume were first delineated on CT images to obtain GTVCT, and then on PET/CT fused images to obtain GTV PET-CT. PET images were interpreted by setting window and level using a method previously shown by Erdi et al. and Bassi et al. to achieve accurate target definitions. In this protocol, we first set the upper window level the value of the highest-intensity pixel in the lesion, and then set the lower window level to 40% of this maximum level.

Statistical Analysis

On the basis of the available literature on rectal carcinoma tumor volume delineation, we hypothesized that integration of PET into RTP would change the target volumes in approximately 30% of the patients. To detect such a change with a 95% confidence interval of 5%-55%, we needed to enroll at least 13 patients. The GTV PET-CT was compared with GTVCT using a Wilcoxon signed-rank test for paired data. Results were expressed as median (min-max). Differences were considered significant when the two-tailed p-value was less than 0.05. Also included in the statistical analysis was the volume identified by PET but not by CT (PEToutCT), and the volume common to CT and PET (CT&PET).

RESULTS

The patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1. A comparison of the tumor volumes estimated by the two methods showed that the median GTV PET-CT (40 cm³) was significantly greater than the GTVCT (25.7 cm³) (p= 0.0001; Wilcoxon rank test). The median difference between GTV measured by the two methods was 65% (Table 2). Comparisons of additional volume parameters measured by PET/CT and CT alone are shown in Table 2 and Figure 1. The common volume measured by the two methods (intersected tumor volume) was 19.7 cm³, and tumor volumes remaining outside CT was
15.2 cm³. The median volume identified by PET but not by CT (PEToutCT) was 35% of GTV_{PET-CT}, indicating the possibility of a geographic miss in GTV.

**DISCUSSION**

We compared CT- and PET-CT-based target volume delineation techniques for localized rectal carcinoma, determining their respective effects on 3D-CRT planning. Our results revealed that PET-CT-based target volume delineation significantly increased the GTV compared to CT-based delineation, an outcome that could alter the RT portals in unresectable or medically inoperable patients where a boost in RT doses was potentially a great concern.

Preoperative chemoradiotherapy is the current standard treatment option for localized rectal cancer because it provides a chance for sphincter preservation and achieves better local control in a significant percentage of patients, translating into improved quality of life and overall survival rates compared to postoperative RT protocols. In the absence of local control, cure of rectal carcinoma is not possible; therefore, optimal dose delivery is necessary to ensure successful local tumor control. This can best be achieved by avoiding geographic misses. Compared to postoperative RTP, one important advantage of preoperative RTP is its reliance on readily identifiable, intact tumor tissue, which helps to better define target volumes. Currently, CT-based definition of target and organ at-risk volumes remains the reference standard for curative 3D-CRT. However, the accurate definition and contouring of the boundaries of the primary tumor and its locoregional extensions are difficult using conventional CT-based GTV delineation methods. Tumoral extensions into the rectal wall or perirectal tissue structures usually are not visible, and significant interobserver variation has been demonstrated when CT data is utilized as the sole RTP tool. When used in conjunction with anatomic CT as a functional imaging method, FDG-PET may provide additional data that may lead to better definition of target volumes and aid in overcoming variability in interpretations between radiation oncologists.

Additional data provided by PET has led to impressive changes in physicians’ perception of tumor extension, and has prompted adaptation of this method for defining treatment volumes in a broad variety of cancers, including lung, esophagus, head-and-neck, anal canal, pancreas, malignant lymphoma, Hodgkin’s disease and rectal carcinoma. FDG-PET, with its higher sensitivity, specificity and accuracy, is suitable for detecting treatment volumes identified after fusion of PET and CT.

**Table 1. Characteristics of study population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18 - 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 N0 MO</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 N1 MO</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 N0 M1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4 N0 MO</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations**: AJCC: American Joint Committee on Cancer; T: tumor extension; N: lymph-nodal disease; M: distant metastasis.

**Table 2. Volumes (cc) identified after fusion of PET and CT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min-Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT - GTV</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3.17-135.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET/CT - GTV</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.6-177.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEToutCT</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.9-133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT&amp;PET</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.7-123.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations**: PET/CT-GTV: the composite volume between PET and CT; PEToutCT: the volume identified by PET but not by CT; CT&PET: the common volume of the two image modalities (CT and PET).
ting rectal-cancer tissue and determining its boundaries for the purpose of staging/restaging of disease in the pelvis or for staging of metastatic diseases.\textsuperscript{22} The additional data provided by FDG-PET may influence RT portals. Furthermore, the intent of treatment may change from curative to palliative, potentially sparing a significant percentage of patients from unnecessary debilitating RT and hastening the initiation of full-dose chemotherapy protocols.\textsuperscript{30,32}

Incorporation of composite PET-CT images has had a significant impact on GTV delineation in rectal carcinoma RTP in studies by Ciernik et al, Lammering et al and, more recently, by Bassi et al.\textsuperscript{20,29,30} Compared to CT-based delineation, PET-CT based delineation was shown to produce an increase in GTV in 3 of 6 cases (50\%) of preoperative rectal cancers in the study of Ciernik et al.\textsuperscript{20}, an increase in GTV that led to a 20\% increase in planning target volume (PTV). Lammering et al.\textsuperscript{29} studied a group of 40 patients with rectal carcinoma in a preoperative setting and demonstrated that the inclusion of PET information significant increased GTV (GTV\textsubscript{CT}= 95.9 ± 57.1 cm\textsuperscript{3} versus GTV\textsubscript{PET}= 128.3 ± 80.4 cm\textsuperscript{3}; p < 0.0001), a difference that corresponded to a 33.8\% increase. Bassi et al.\textsuperscript{29} compared the PET-CT\textsubscript{GTV} and CT\textsubscript{GTV} in a preoperative setting among 25 consecutive patients diagnosed with rectal carcinoma who were candidates for RT with/without concurrent chemotherapy, a cohort similar to our own. The use of PET information in conjunction with CT revealed a significant change in GTV, with a mean difference of 19.6 ± 29.0 cm\textsuperscript{3} (p < 0.00013), amounting to a 25.4\% enlargement in GTV. The 65\% enlargement of GTV with inclusion of PET information demonstrated in the current study is consistent with these previous reports.

In the present cohort, CT- and PET-estimated volumes differed significantly. Neither CT nor PET is 100\% sensitive for detecting tumor extension; thus, for clinical purposes, we used the co-registered PET-CT volumes, reasoning that the delineated composite volume would maximize target volume coverage. Supporting our choice, Ciernik et al.\textsuperscript{22}, using an automated PET-based algorithm for RTP of preoperative rectal carcinoma, previously showed that the true anatomic-pathologic tumor extension might exceed the radiologic volume identified on CT images. Considering this fact, it is reasonable to assume that composite PET-CT information could be useful in preventing the risk of a geographic miss. An important drawback of such an approach is that it contradicts the logic of conformal RT, in which a high therapeutic index is achieved by delivering high radiation doses to a precisely defined volume while sparing neighboring healthy tissues. The availability of more specific radiotracers and/or additional studies designed to correlate FDG-PET and pathological findings will be needed to resolve this issue.

Although concurrent chemoradiotherapy is the standard treatment option for medically unfit rectal cancer patients, outcomes are highly variable, ranging from complete response to no response. Pathological complete remission was reported to range from 8\% to 29\%, depending on the stage at presentation, regimen of chemotherapy and dose of radiation administered.\textsuperscript{59,63} In the remaining 71\% to 92\% of patients, intact viable tumor tissue remained, justifying escalated RT doses for better local

\textbf{Figure 1.} Representative image of patient with different GTV delineations; CT (A), PET (B) and coregistered PET-CT (C)
control. In this context, the additional information provided by PET could be helpful in accurately defining the boost volume for conformal RT techniques. Furthermore, the additional volume and intratumoral functional variations uniquely identified by PET may have an even more critical importance in the near future when so-called dose-painting IMRT becomes widely used in clinical practice, opening the possibility of controlled and reproducible internal-dose escalation to functionally interesting areas of the tumor. With the use of more specific functional PET tracers, this high-precision RT technique could help enormously in resolving the reciprocal problems of over- and underestimation of GTV and mitigate their negative consequences for the radiation management of tumors at many sites, including the rectum.

There are two major drawbacks of PET-based target volume delineation studies that are also relevant here. First, available reports of GTV delineation based on PET images have employed varied approaches, but have typically used standardized uptake value. To facilitate comparison with the available literature, we utilized a signal threshold of 40%, similar to that of Bassi et al., in our current cohort. Second, the absence of reliable data correlating PET- or co-registered PET-CT-based GTVs with true tumor volumes in pathologic specimens limits our ability to draw more precise conclusions. Although such correlational studies would be worthwhile, the logic of preoperative rectal cancer chemoradiation studies unfortunately has apparently precluded formally addressing this question. However, this issue deserves to be studied in patients planning to first undergo a curative resection. Such evidence, we believe, can safely be extrapolated to rectal cancer patients who are candidates for preoperative chemoradiation.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of our current study demonstrate the usefulness of PET-CT-based target volume delineation in localized rectal cancer patients destined for preoperative chemoradiotherapy. In cases where an additional radiation boost dose to the primary tumor site is needed, the observed increase in GTV (median, 65%) could be relevant, reducing the risk of geographic misses associated with CT-based RTP. This benefit could potentially translate into better rates of local control and survival. However, further clinical studies are needed to reach more precise conclusions.
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