![Cancer Care Ontario / Action Cancer Ontario logo with Ontario wordmark]

Evidence-Based Series 7-18

A Quality Initiative of the
Program in Evidence-Based Care (PEBC), Cancer Care Ontario (CCO)

**Positron Emission Tomography in
Radiation Treatment Planning for Lung Cancer**

Y.C. Ung, A. Bezjak, N. Coakley, W.K. Evans, and the Lung Cancer Disease Site Group

Report Date: November 17, 2010

An assessment conducted in November 2014 deferred the review of
Evidence-based Series (EBS) 7-18, which means that the document remains
current until it is assessed again next year. The PEBC has a formal and
standardize process to ensure the currency of each document (PEBC
Assessment & Review Protocol)

The full Evidence-based Series 7-18 is comprised of 3 sections
and is available on the CCO website on the PEBC Lung Cancer DSG page.

   Section 1:   Guideline Recommendations
   Section 2:   Evidentiary Base
   Section 3:   EBS Development Methods and External Review Process

---

For information about the PEBC and the most current version of all reports,
please visit the CCO website at http://www.cancercare.on.ca/
or contact the PEBC office at:
Phone: 905-527-4322 ext. 42822   Fax: 905-526-6775   E-mail: ccopgi@mcmaster.ca

Evidence-Based Series 7-18

Positron Emission Tomography in Radiation Treatment Planning for Lung Cancer: Guideline Recommendations

Y.C. Ung, A. Bezjak, N. Coakley, W.K. Evans, and the Lung Cancer Disease Site Group

A Quality Initiative of the
Program in Evidence-Based Care (PEBC), Cancer Care Ontario (CCO)

Report Date: November 17, 2010

QUESTION
What role should positron emission tomography (PET) play in radiation treatment planning for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)? Specifically, does the combination of PET and computed axial tomography (CT) imaging provide data that is superior to CT imaging data alone for the purposes of radiation treatment (RT) planning?

TARGET POPULATION
Patients with lung cancer for whom thoracic RT is indicated.

INTENDED USERS
Radiation oncologists involved in RT planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND KEY EVIDENCE
Combination PET-CT imaging data may be used as part of research protocols in RT planning. Current evidence does not support the routine use of PET-CT imaging data in RT planning at this time outside of a research setting.
- The PET START trial, released in abstract form at the 2009 ASCO Annual Meeting (1), reported on the use of PET-CT compared to CT in treatment planning for patients with stage III non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). The primary outcome was the proportion of patients who did not receive combined modality therapy because their tumour was upstaged to stage 4 or their intrathoracic tumour was too extensive for radical RT. The primary outcome was achieved in 15% of the patients randomized to PET, as opposed to 2.7% in the CT arm (p=0.0002). Data on other outcomes, including overall survival, have not yet been reported.

- Twenty-eight non-randomized prospective and retrospective studies provided evidence on the impact of PET imaging data on RT planning (2-29).
- No studies provided data on the effect of PET-based changes in RT planning on patient outcomes such as overall survival, recurrence, or quality of life. Therefore, data on technical measures form the evidence base of this recommendation. These measures include changes in gross treatment volume (GTV) and changes in planning treatment volume (PTV)
- Eighteen studies including a total of 587 patients reported changes in GTV as a result of the inclusion of PET data in RT planning (2-12,20-22,27,29). See Table 3 and its accompanying text in Section 2 of this Evidence-based Series for details of these data.
- Eleven studies including a total of 283 patients reported changes in PTV as a result of the inclusion of PET data in RT planning. (5-7,9,12-17,21). See Table 4 and its accompanying text in Section 2 of this Evidence-based Series for details of these data.
- The limited data available suggest that the addition of PET to RT planning is more likely to decrease the dose to the esophagus rather than increase it. Two of five studies (3,7,8,18,22) providing data on esophageal exposures (V_{50-55}eso), reported statistically significant decreases (-10.4%, p<0.005, and -8.7%, p=0.004, respectively) (8,18), and one study reported a result with no significance test (22). Changes in total radiation dosages to the esophagus were more variable across the studies, although one study did report a statistically significant (p=0.004) decrease of 6.1 Gy (8).
- The available data regarding the effect of PET in RT planning on dose to lung tissue is mixed. While substantial numbers of patients experience a change in V_{20}lung (between 42% and 100% of patients across four studies (3,7,9,22), these changes involve both increases and decreases. However, three studies (8,12,18), did report statistically significant reductions in V_{20} lung. The data do suggest that PET does reduce lung dose, with four studies (8,9,12,18) reporting decreases (range of changes -5.1 to +1.5 Gy), and one of these reported a statistically significant decrease (8).
- Two studies evaluated the impact of PET on the total RT dose administered and treatment control probability: the total RT dose administered to patients increased by approximately 15 Gy because of PET, and the tumour control probability increased by 17.7% and 8.6% (p=0.026), respectively (8,18).
- In twelve studies (6,7,9-11,13,14,17,19,21,23,24) with a total of 656 patients, PET detected distant metastases in 8% to 25% of patients and resulted in a change from curative to palliative RT intent in 8% to 41% of patients.

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS
- There is only one randomized trial, the PET-START trial, to inform recommendations on this topic, and this trial has only been reported in abstract form. Should the results of this trial be similar when reported in a peer-reviewed publication with longer follow-up, the recommendation above may warrant review.
- There are no data available that demonstrate an impact of PET-based RT planning on either survival or local recurrence rates.
- The available evidence, besides the PET-START trial, consists of data from small, non-randomized studies that report on changes in treatment volume, changes in treatment intent, and changes in dose delivered to critical organs. These data, taken as a whole, suggest that the addition of PET increases accuracy in RT planning.
- The available data on change in treatment volume and other changes in response to the incorporation of PET into RT planning have not yet been confirmed to be beneficial, for example, through clinicopathological correlation and/or failure analysis patterns.

- Higher quality research, such as randomized trials, should be conducted to better evaluate the utility of PET in RT planning and to determine if the technology provides added value over existing imaging technologies for this purpose. Investigators publishing data related to the use of PET should evaluate and report on a wider range of outcome measures.
- PET may be useful in RT planning under very specific circumstances in the differentiation of malignant from non-malignant tissue, such as lung opacification that may be due to tumour and/or major atelectasis or pneumonitis secondary to airway obstruction. Clinicians should cautiously interpret results in situations where PET is known to produce false-positive results (e.g., presence of inflamed lymph nodes due to pneumonitis).
- When performing RT planning, clinicians should take into consideration the technical specifications of the PET scanner being used, as these may modify the utility of the device for RT planning purposes.

Funding
The PEBC is a provincial initiative of Cancer Care Ontario supported by the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care through Cancer Care Ontario. All work produced by the PEBC is editorially independent from its funding source.

Copyright
This report is copyrighted by Cancer Care Ontario; the report and the illustrations herein may not be reproduced without the express written permission of Cancer Care Ontario. Cancer Care Ontario reserves the right at any time, and at its sole discretion, to change or revoke this authorization.

Disclaimer
Care has been taken in the preparation of the information contained in this report. Nonetheless, any person seeking to apply or consult the report is expected to use independent medical judgment in the context of individual clinical circumstances or seek out the supervision of a qualified clinician. Cancer Care Ontario makes no representation or guarantees of any kind whatsoever regarding the report content or use or application and disclaims any responsibility for its application or use in any way.

Contact Information
For further information about this report, please contact:
Dr. William K. Evans, Co-Chair, Lung Cancer Disease Site Group
McMaster University and Juravinski Cancer Centre, 699 Concession Street, Hamilton ON L8V 5C2
Phone: 905-387-9711, ext. 63001   Fax 905-575-6323
or
Dr. Yee C. Ung, Co-Chair, Lung Cancer Disease Site Group
Sunnybrook Odette Cancer Centre, 2075 Bayview Ave, Toronto, ON M4N 3M5
Phone: 416) 480-4951   Fax: 416-480-6002

For information about the PEBC and the most current version of all reports,
please visit the CCO website at http://www.cancercare.on.ca/
or contact the PEBC office at:
Phone: 905-527-4322 ext. 42822   Fax: 905-526-6775   E-mail: ccopgi@mcmaster.ca

REFERENCES

1. Ung Y, Sun A, MacRae R, Gu C, Wright J, Yu E, et al. Impact of positron emission tomography (PET) in stage III non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): a prospective randomized trial (PET START) [abstract]. J Clin Oncol. 2009;27;A7548.
2. Gondi V, Bradley K, Mehta M, Howard A, Khuntia D, Ritter M, et al. Impact of hybrid fluorodeoxyglucose positron-emission tomography/computed tomography on radiotherapy planning in esophageal and non-small-cell lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2007;67(1):187-95.
3. Grills IS, Yan D, Black QC, Wong CY, Martinez AA, Kestin LL. Clinical implications of defining the gross tumor volume with combination of CT and 18FDG-positron emission tomography in non-small-cell lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2007;67(3):709-19.
4. Lewandowska A, Windorbska W, Morgas T. Radiation treatment planning using positron emission tomography for patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Nowotwory. 2006;56(3):259-314.
5. Ashamalla H, Rafla S, Parikh K, Mokhtar B, Goswami G, Kambam S, et al. The contribution of integrated PET/CT to the evolving definition of treatment volumes in radiation treatment planning in lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2005;63(4):1016-23.
6. Brianzoni E, Rossi G, Ancidei S, Berbellini A, Capoccetti F, Cidda C, et al. Radiotherapy planning: PET/CT scanner performances in the definition of gross tumour volume and clinical target volume. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2005;32(12):1392-9.
7. Deniaud-Alexandre E, Touboul E, Lerouge D, Grahek D, Foulquier JN, Petegnief Y, et al. Impact of computed tomography and 18F-deoxyglucose coincidence detection emission tomography image fusion for optimization of conformal radiotherapy in non-small-cell lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2005;63(5):1432-41.
8. Van Der Wel A, Nijsten S, Hochstenbag M, Lamers R, Boersma L, Wanders R, et al. Increased therapeutic ratio by 18FDG-PET CT planning in patients with clinical CT stage N2-N3M0 non-small-cell lung cancer: a modeling study. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2005;61(3):649-55.
9. Bradley J, Thorstad WL, Mutic S, Miller TR, Dehdashti F, Siegel BA, et al. Impact of FDG-PET on radiation therapy volume delineation in non-small-cell lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2004;59(1):78-86.
10. Kalff V, Hicks RJ, MacManus MP, Binns DS, McKenzie AF, Ware RE, et al. Clinical impact of (18)F fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer: a prospective study. J Clin Oncol. 2001;19(1):111-8.
11. MacManus MP, Hicks RJ, Ball DL, Kalff V, Matthews JP, Salminen E, et al. F-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography staging in radical radiotherapy candidates with nonsmall cell lung carcinoma: powerful correlation with survival and high impact on treatment. Cancer. 2001;92(4):886-95.
12. Vanuytsel LJ, Vansteenkiste JF, Stroobants SG, De Leyn PR, De Wever W, Verbeken EK, et al. The impact of (18)F-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) lymph node staging on the radiation treatment volumes in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Radiother Oncol. 2000;55(3):317-24.
13. Messa C, Ceresoli GL, Rizzo G, Artioli D, Cattaneo M, Castellone P, et al. Feasibility of [18F]FDG-PET and coregistered CT on clinical target volume definition of advanced non-small cell lung cancer. Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2005;49(3):259-66.
14. Roberts KB, Manus MP, Hicks RJ, Rischin D, Wirth A, Wright GM, et al. PET imaging for suspected residual tumour or thoracic recurrence of non-small cell lung cancer after pneumonectomy. Lung Cancer. 2005;47(1):49-57.

15. Schmucking M, Baum RP, Griesinger F, Presselt N, Bonnet R, Przetak C, et al. Molecular whole-body cancer staging using positron emission tomography: consequences for therapeutic management and metabolic radiation treatment planning. Recent Res Cancer. 2003;162:195-202.

16. Erdi YE, Rosenzweig K, Erdi AK, Macapinlac HA, Hu YC, Braban LE, et al. Radiotherapy treatment planning for patients with non-small cell lung cancer using positron emission tomography (PET). Radiother Oncol. 2002;62(1):51-60.

17. Mah K, Caldwell CB, Ung YC, Danjoux CE, Balogh JM, Ganguli SN, et al. The impact of (18)FDG-PET on target and critical organs in CT-based treatment planning of patients with poorly defined non-small-cell lung carcinoma: a prospective study. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2002;52(2):339-50.

18. De Ruysscher D, Wanders S, Minken A, Lumens A, Schiffelers J, Stultiens C, et al. Effects of radiotherapy planning with a dedicated combined PET-CT-simulator of patients with non-small cell lung cancer on dose limiting normal tissues and radiation dose-escalation: a planning study. Radiother Oncol. 2005;77(1):5-10.

19. Ceresoli GL, Cattaneo GM, Castellone P, Rizzo G, Landoni C, Gregorc V, et al. Role of computed tomography and [18]fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography image fusion in conformal radiotherapy of non-small cell lung cancer: a comparison with standard techniques with and without elective nodal irradiation. Tumori. 2007;93(1):88-96.

20. Hong R, Halama J, Bova D, Sethi A, Emami B. Correlation of PET standard uptake value and CT window-level thresholds for target delineation in CT-based radiation treatment planning. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2007;67(3):720-6.

21. MacManus M, D'Costa I, Everitt S, Andrews J, Ackerly T, Binns D, et al. Comparison of CT and positron emission tomography/CT coregistered images in planning radical radiotherapy in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer. Australas Radiol. 2007;51:386-93.

22. Giraud P, Grahek D, Montravers F, Carette MF, Deniaud-Alexandre E, Julia F, et al. CT and (18)F-deoxyglucose (FDG) image fusion for optimization of conformal radiotherapy of lung cancers. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2001;49(5):1249-57.

23. Hicks RJ, Kalff V, MacManus MP, Ware RE, Hogg A, McKenzie AF, et al. (18)F-FDG PET provides high-impact and powerful prognostic stratification in staging newly diagnosed non-small cell lung cancer. J Nucl Med. 2001 Nov;42(11):1596-1604.

24. Roman MR, Rossleigh MA, Angelides S, Walker BM, Dixon J. Staging and managing lung tumors using F-18 FDG coincidence detection. Clin Nucl Med. 2001 May;26(5):383-8.

25. Hanna GG, McAleese J, Carson KJ, Stewart DP, Cosgrove VP, Eakin RL, et al. ^{18}F-FDG PET-CT simulation for non-small-cell lung cancer: effect in patients already staged by PET-CT. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2010;70(1):24-30.

26. Kruser TJ, Bradeley KA, Bentzen SM, Anderson BM, Gondi V, Khuntia D, et al. The impact of hybrid PET-CT scan on overall oncologic management, with a focus on radiotherapy planning: a prospective, blinded study. Technol Cancer Res Treat. 2009 Apr;8(2):149-58.

27. Spratt DE, Diaz R, McElmurray J, Csiki I, Duggan D, Lu B, et al. Impact of FDG PET/CT on delineation of the gross tumor volume for radiation planning in non-small-cell lung cancer. Clin Nucl Med. 2010 Apr;35(4):237-243.

28. Vinod SK, Kumar S, Holloway LC, Shafiq J. Dosimetric implications of the addition of 18 flurordeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography in CT-based radiotherapy planning for non-small cell lung cancer. J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol. 2010;54:152-160.

29. Feng M, Kong FM, Gross M, Fernando S, Hayman JA, Ten Haken RK, et al. Using fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography to assess tumor volume during

radiotherapy for non-small-cell lung cancer and its potential impact on adaptive dose escalation and normal tissue sparing. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2009;73(4):1228-1234.