

PET Recommendation Report 6

PET Imaging in Cervical Cancer

A Fyles and C Walker-Dilks

Report Date: January 19, 2009

PET Recommendation Report 6 is comprised of 2 sections and is available on the CCO Web site (https://www.cancercare.on.ca) PEBC PET Recommendation Reports page at: https://www.cancercare.on.ca/toolbox/qualityguidelines/other-reports/petrecs/

> Section 1: Recommendations Section 2: Evidentiary Base

For further information about this report, please contact:

Dr. Anthony Fyles, Princess Margaret Hospital, 610 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 2M9 Telephone (416) 946-6522; Fax (416) 946-2111; Email <u>anthony.fyles@rmp.uhn.on.ca</u>

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

Citation (Vancouver Style): Fyles A, Walker-Dilks C. PET Imaging in cervical cancer. Toronto (ON): Cancer Care Ontario; 2009 Jan 19. Program in Evidence-based Care PET Recommendation Report No.: 6.



Recommendation Report - PET #6: Section 1

PET Imaging in Cervical Cancer: Recommendations

A Fyles and C Walker-Dilks

Report Date: January 19, 2009

QUESTIONS

- What benefit to clinical management does positron emission tomography (PET) or positron emission tomography/computed tomography (PET/CT) contribute to the diagnosis or staging of cervical cancer?
- What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute to the assessment of treatment response for cervical cancer?
- What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute when recurrence of cervical cancer is suspected but not proven?
- What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute to restaging at the time of documented recurrence for cervical cancer?
- What is the role of PET when a solitary metastasis is identified at the time of recurrence and a metastectomy is being contemplated?

TARGET POPULATION

Patients with cervical cancer.

INTENDED PURPOSE

- This recommendation report is primarily intended to guide the Ontario PET Steering Committee in their decision making concerning indications for the use of PET imaging.
- This recommendation report may also be useful in informing clinical decision making regarding the appropriate role of PET imaging and in guiding priorities for future PET imaging research.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND KEY EVIDENCE

These recommendations are based on an evidentiary foundation consisting of one recent high-quality systematic review from the U.S. Agency for Health Research and Quality (AHRQ) (1) that included primary study literature for the period from 2003 to March 2008.

Diagnosis/Staging

PET is not recommended for diagnosis of cervical cancer.

PET is not recommended for staging early stage cervical cancer.

A recommendation cannot be made for or against the use of PET for staging advanced stage cervical cancer due to insufficient evidence. However, ongoing studies will clarify the role of PET in advanced disease.

Multiple prospective and retrospective clinical trials have evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of PET or PET/CT for determining involvement of pelvic and para-aortic nodes compared to surgical staging or CT/magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). A 2008 meta-analysis by Selman et al (2) on diagnostic tests for lymph node status in cervical cancer included seven studies on PET. Of the seven studies, two were included in the Alberta 2008 AHRQ review (1), and five were included in the Duke University AHRQ review (3). In pooled estimates of test prediction of lymph node status, PET was inferior to sentinel node biopsy, but superior to MRI and CT. Selman et al (2) also compared post-test probabilities of PET in early versus (vs.) advanced disease and showed PET to perform well in advanced disease compared with early disease.

For the staging workup of patients with cervical cancer who are potential candidates for curative therapy, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that PET benefits clinical management by improving the accuracy of staging for nodal and metastatic disease, particularly in women with early disease treated surgically. One trial (Bjurberg et al [4]) demonstrated a change in management (i.e., change in radiation fields or conversion from curative to palliative intent) in four of 17 (24%) women with locally advanced disease, due to the identification of new metastases on PET/CT. The impact on treatment outcome is not clear, and for women with advanced disease treated with chemoradiation, further (ideally randomized) trials evaluating clinical impact are needed.

Qualifying Statements

- Most cervix cancers take up fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) and are easily visualized on PET scan; however, as biopsy is needed for the diagnosis, there is little benefit to clinical management in using PET for assessment of the primary tumour.
- The impact of the detection of otherwise occult metastases of uncertain biology is unknown. In addition, although detection of metastases may render treatment palliative in intent, patients should not be deprived of aggressive chemoradiation to achieve pelvic control and optimal palliation.

Assessment of Treatment Response

PET is not recommended (following or early during therapy) for the purpose of predicting response to chemoradiation therapy.

Studies have demonstrated that chemo-radiation responders (defined at various times after treatment) have a better outcome than those with partial response or new development of metastases (Schwarz et al [5]). This is not surprising, and since salvage treatment of poor responders is unlikely to be effective, the clinical impact of using PET for response assessment remains to be determined.

Qualifying Statement

None.

Recurrence/Restaging

A recommendation cannot be made for or against the use of PET for evaluation of suspected recurrence, due to insufficient evidence.

Several trials have evaluated PET in women without clinical evidence of recurrence but with elevated serum SCC antigen. Chang et al (6) included 27 patients with elevated SCC-Ag levels but no evidence of recurrent disease. PET results were positive in 19 patients, only two of whom had local recurrence alone. Two patients had false-positive PET studies on further investigation and follow up.

For women with clinical or imaging suspicion of recurrence, PET will only be of use in those with salvageable disease in the pelvis or regional nodes, and the clinical impact of PET in this situation is unknown.

Qualifying Statement

None.

PET is recommended for women with recurrence who are candidates for pelvic exenteration or chemoradiation with curative intent.

Several studies have demonstrated significant changes in management in women with documented recurrent disease. In 12 patients with histologically confirmed relapsed disease (Bjurberg et al [4]), the treatment strategy was changed in three patients (25%).

Lai et al (7) included 40 patients with documented recurrent or persistent cervical carcinoma after definitive radiotherapy or surgery and potentially curable disease. Fifteen of 40 women (37.5%) were spared futile curative treatment, and in seven, curative treatment was continued but the treatment field or modality was changed following the demonstration of metastases on PET scan. Maximizing risk benefit ratios and avoiding the morbidity of major surgery is a meaningful endpoint in this admittedly small group of women.

Schwarz et al (5) (cited in the AHRQ report but not in data tables) showed that three-month posttherapy PET results provided an indication of response to treatment and were predictive of survival.

Qualifying Statement

None.

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. Anthony Fyles, Princess Margaret Hospital, 610 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario Canada M5G 2M9, telephone (416) 946-6522, fax (416) 946-2111, email <u>anthony.fyles@rmp.uhn.on.ca</u>

For information about the PEBC and the most current version of all reports, please visit the CCO Web site at http://www.cancercare.on.ca/ or contact the PEBC office at: Phone: 905-525-9140, ext. 22055 Fax: 905-522-7681

REFERENCES

- 1. McEwan AJ, Gulenchyn K, Ospina M, Horton J, Seida J, Vandermeer B, et al. Positron emission tomography for nine cancers (bladder, brain, cervical, kidney, ovarian, pancreatic, prostate, small cell lung, testicular). Rockville, Maryland: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; August 2008. Draft.
- 2. Selman TJ, Mann C, Zamora J, Appleyard TL, Khan K. Diagnostic accuracy of tests for lymph node status in primary cervical cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. CMAJ. 2008 Mar 25;178(7):855-62.
- Matchar DB, Kulasingam SL, Havrilesky L, Mann LO, Myers ER, McCrory DC, et al. Positron emission tomography for six cancers (brain, cervical, small cell lung, ovarian, pancreatic, and testicular). Rockville, Maryland: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2004 Feb [cited 2009 Jan 19]. Available from:

http://www.cms.hhs.gov/mcd/viewtechassess.asp?where=search&tid=21

- 4. Bjurberg M, Kjellén E, Ohlsson T, Ridderheim M, Brun E. FDG-PET in cervical cancer: staging, re-staging and follow-up. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2007;86(11):1385-91. Epub 2007 Sep 4.
- 5. Schwarz JK, Siegel BA, Dehdashti F, Grigsby PW. Association of posttherapy positron emission tomography with tumor response and survival in cervical carcinoma. JAMA. 2007 Nov 21;298(19):2289-95.
- 6. Chang TC, Law KS, Hong JH, Lai CH, Ng KK, Hsueh S, et al. Positron emission tomography for unexplained elevation of serum squamous cell carcinoma antigen levels during followup for patients with cervical malignancies: a phase II study. Cancer. 2004 Jul 1;101(1):164-71.
- 7. Lai CH, Huang KG, See LC, Yen TC, Tsai CS, Chang TC, et al. Restaging of recurrent cervical carcinoma with dual-phase [18F]fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography. Cancer. 2004 Feb 1;100(3):544-52.



Recommendation Report - PET #6: Section 2

PET Imaging in Cervical Cancer: Evidentiary Base and Consensus Process

A Fyles and C Walker-Dilks

Report Date: January 19, 2009

QUESTIONS

- What benefit to clinical management does positron emission tomography (PET) or positron emission tomography/computed tomography (PET/CT) contribute to the diagnosis or staging of cervical cancer?
- What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute to the assessment of treatment response for cervical cancer?
- What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute when recurrence of cervical cancer is suspected but not proven?
- What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute to restaging at the time of documented recurrence for cervical cancer?
- What is the role of PET when a solitary metastasis is identified at the time of recurrence and a metastectomy is being contemplated?

INTRODUCTION

The Ontario PET Steering Committee made a special request to the Clinical Council of Cancer Care Ontario to co-lead the development of guidance regarding the clinical uses of PET imaging. The Program in Evidence-based Care (PEBC), working together with PEBC Disease Site Groups (DSGs), synthesized the clinical research and drafted recommendations for 10 disease sites. Recommendations for the use of PET in colorectal cancer, esophageal cancer, head and neck cancer, and melanoma were reviewed at a consensus meeting on 19 September 2008, and recommendations for the use of PET in brain, ovarian, cervical, testicular, small-cell lung, and pancreatic cancer were reviewed at a consensus meeting on 25 November 2008.

METHODS

Overview

In order to develop the recommendations and achieve consensus, a three-step methodology was undertaken.

Step 1 - Systematic review. A systematic review of the published literature was undertaken (see details below). This was conducted by one clinical lead author,

nominated by the PEBC Gynecology (GYN) DSG and a PEBC methodologist. The systematic review served as the evidentiary foundation for a set of draft recommendations developed by this team.

Step 2 - Consensus by the PEBC GYN DSG. The draft recommendations were refined during a DSG teleconference. The GYN DSG is comprised of gynecologic, medical, and radiation oncologists and supported by a PEBC research methodologist.

Step 3 - Provincial PET imaging consensus meeting. The draft recommendations were vetted at a larger provincial PET imaging consensus meeting co-hosted by Cancer Care Ontario and the Provincial PET Steering Committee. The meeting was facilitated and supported by members of the PEBC team. Participants included representatives of the PEBC DSGs, other clinical experts in the areas of nuclear and diagnostic medicine, members of the Cancer Care Ontario clinical leadership team, and representatives from the Ontario PET Steering Committee and the Ontario Health Technology Assessment Committee.

The systematic review and companion recommendations are intended to promote evidence-based decisions in Ontario, Canada. The PEBC is 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.

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Literature Search

The PEBC was aware of a technology assessment being produced by the University of Alberta Evidence-based Practice Center for the U.S. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) evaluating the use of PET imaging in nine cancers (1) (referred to as the AHRQ review from this point forward). This review updated a previous AHRQ report produced by Duke University in 2004 (2). The Alberta update included individual primary studies dating from 2003 to March 2008 on six of the 10 cancer sites targeted by this project. Because the AHRQ review sufficiently covered the questions and methodologies of interest to this recommendation report, a draft of the AHRQ review was made available to the PEBC, and its results were used for the evidentiary base.

Study Selection Criteria

All primary studies in the AHRQ review that addressed the questions of interest in this recommendation report (diagnosis, staging, treatment response, recurrence, and restaging) were included.

The inclusion criteria for primary studies included in the AHRQ review were:

- prospective or retrospective clinical study evaluating the use of FDG PET or FDG PET/CT in primary cancer;
- study not duplicated or superseded by a later study with the same purpose from the same institution;
- study reported numeric data on at least one objective outcome of interest for the key
 questions of the technology assessment (diagnostic performance, treatment decisions
 and management strategy, changes in therapy, patient-centred outcomes, and
 economic outcomes);
- study included ≥ 12 patients with the cancer of interest;
- study used a suitable reference standard (pathological confirmation and clinical follow-up) when appropriate.

Synthesizing the Evidence

In some cases where sufficient evidence existed, meta-analyses were included with pooled likelihood ratios. The AHRQ review included evidence tables that summarized the characteristics and results of each study according to the outcomes the study addressed. For diagnostic performance, the evidence tables recorded details on the source of the publication and the evidence grade, study design, patient characteristics, PET technical characteristics, criteria for interpretation, and results. In addition to the diagnostic performance of PET, the AHRQ review also sought to evaluate PET in terms of its impact on physician decision making approaches to diagnosis and management (referred to as diagnostic thinking) and its impact as part of a management strategy to improve patient-centred outcomes (referred to as management strategy). Full text and data extractions of the studies were provided to the clinical lead author to aid in the formulation of the recommendations. Telephone conferences and email correspondence between the clinical lead and the PEBC methodologist took place to clarify details and answer questions.

CONSENSUS

DSG Consensus Process

The clinical lead author wrote summaries of the key evidence, draft recommendations, and qualifying statements for the questions pertaining to diagnosis/staging, assessment of treatment response, and recurrence/restaging. The ensuing documents were circulated to all members of the GYN DSG and discussed during a teleconference. The recommendations that were generated during this process are referred to below as the DRAFT DSG Recommendations. The intent of these recommendations was to guide discussion at the consensus meeting.

Provincial Consensus Process

The consensus meeting on 25 November 2008 was conducted as follows:

- Presentations by each of the clinical lead authors on the DRAFT DSG recommendations and supporting evidence were made to the meeting participants.
- The recommendations were refined by the large group, and in some cases a revised recommendation was proposed resulting in a FINAL recommendation.
- The participants voted on the FINAL recommendations to indicate their extent of agreement on a scale from 1 to 7 (1 indicating strong agreement, 5 indicating no agreement or disagreement, and 7 indicating strong disagreement).

RESULTS

Literature Search Results

The AHRQ review results for cervical cancer included 35 primary studies. Data from the evidence tables are summarized in Appendix 1. In addition to data for diagnostic performance, summaries of results for diagnostic thinking and management strategy are also presented where they apply. The key evidence is described below in an abbreviated fashion.

Key Evidence

Diagnosis/Staging

• Multiple prospective and retrospective clinical trials have evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of PET or PET/CT for determining involvement of pelvic and para-aortic nodes compared to surgical staging or CT/MR imaging. A 2008 meta-analysis by Selman et al (3) on diagnostic tests for lymph node status in cervical cancer included 7 studies on PET. Of the seven studies, twp were included in the Alberta 2008 AHRQ review (1), and five were included in the Duke University 2004 AHRQ review (2). In pooled estimates of test

prediction of lymph node status, PET was inferior to sentinel node biopsy, but superior to MRI and CT. Selman et al (3) also compared post-test probabilities of PET in early vs. advanced disease and showed PET to perform well in advanced disease compared with early disease.

• For the staging workup of patients with cervical cancer who are potential candidates for curative therapy, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that PET benefits clinical management by improving the accuracy of staging for nodal and metastatic disease, particularly in women with early disease treated surgically. One trial (Bjurberg et al [4]) demonstrated a change in management (i.e., change in radiation fields, or conversion from curative to palliative intent) in four of 17 (24%) women with locally advanced disease, due to identification of new metastases on PET/CT. The impact on treatment outcome is not clear, and for women with advanced disease treated with chemoradiation, further (ideally randomized) trials evaluating clinical impact are needed.

Assessment of Treatment Response

• Studies have demonstrated that chemoradiation responders (defined at various times after treatment) have a better outcome than those with partial response or new development of metastases (Schwarz et al [5]). This is not surprising, and since salvage treatment of poor responders is unlikely to be effective, the clinical impact of using PET for response assessment remains to be determined.

Recurrence/Restaging

- Several trials have evaluated PET in women without clinical evidence of recurrence but with elevated serum SCC antigen. Chang et al (6) included 27 patients with elevated SCC-Ag levels but no evidence of recurrent disease. PET results were positive in 19 patients, only two of whom had local recurrence alone. Two patients had false-positive PET studies on further investigation and follow-up.
- For women with clinical or imaging suspicion of recurrence, PET will only be of use in those with salvageable disease in the pelvis or regional nodes, and the clinical impact of PET in this situation is unknown.
- Several studies have demonstrated significant changes in management in women with documented recurrent disease. In 12 patients with histologically confirmed relapsed disease (Bjurberg et al [4]), the treatment strategy was changed in three patients (25%).
- Lai et al (7) included 40 patients with documented recurrent or persistent cervical carcinoma after definitive radiotherapy or surgery and potentially curable disease. Fifteen of 40 women (37.5%) were spared futile curative treatment, and in seven, curative treatment was continued but treatment field or modality was changed following the demonstration of metastases on PET scan. Maximizing risk benefit ratios and avoiding the morbidity of major surgery is a meaningful endpoint in this admittedly small group of women.
- Schwarz et al (5) (cited in the AHRQ report but not in data tables) showed that threemonth posttherapy PET results provided an indication of response to treatment and were predictive of survival.

RECOMMENDATIONS DIAGNOSIS/STAGING Clinical Question What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute to the diagnosis or staging of cervical cancer?

DRAFT DSG Recommendations

- a) PET is not recommended for the diagnosis of cervical cancer.
- b) PET is not recommended for staging early-stage cervical cancer.
- c) A recommendation cannot be made for or against the use of PET for staging advancedstage cervical cancer, due to insufficient evidence. However, ongoing studies will clarify the role of PET in advanced disease.

Provincial Consensus Meeting Deliberations

No major issues were raised during discussion of these recommendations. Whether brachytherapy would still be done was questioned, and the response was yes, for local control if the woman was healthy and otherwise fit.

FINAL Recommendation Put to Vote

a) PET is not recommended for the diagnosis of cervical cancer.

	1 - St Ag	rongly ree	4 - Neith	7 - Stro Disagı	N/A			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Total	17	4			1			
1/ 1	24							

Votes = 21

FINAL Recommendation Put to Vote

b) PET is not recommended for staging early-stage cervical cancer.

	1 - St Ag	rongly ree	4 - Neith	7 - Strongly Disagree		N/A		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Total	14	6	1					
Votes =	21							

FINAL Recommendation Put to Vote

c) A recommendation cannot be made for or against the use of PET for staging advancedstage cervical cancer due to insufficient evidence. However, ongoing studies will clarify the role of PET in advanced disease.

	1 - St Ag	rongly ree	4 - Neith	7 - Strongly Disagree		N/A		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Total	11	6	3	1				
Vataa	24							

Votes = 21

Qualifying Statements

• Most cervix cancers take up FDG and are easily visualized on PET scan; however, as biopsy is needed for the diagnosis, there is little benefit to clinical management in using PET for the assessment of the primary tumour.

• The impact of the detection of otherwise occult metastases of uncertain biology is unknown. In addition, although detection of metastases may render treatment palliative in intent, patients should not be deprived of aggressive chemoradiation to achieve pelvic control and optimal palliation.

ASSESSMENT OF TREATMENT RESPONSE

Clinical Question

What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute to the assessment of treatment response for cervical cancer?

DRAFT DSG Recommendation

PET is not recommended (following or early during therapy) for the purpose of predicting response to chemoradiation therapy.

Provincial Consensus Meeting Deliberations

No major issues were raised during the discussion about this recommendation.

FINAL Recommendation Put to Vote:

PET is not recommended (following or early during therapy) for the purpose of predicting response to chemoradiation therapy.

	1 - Stı Agı	rongly ree	4 - Neith	er Agree nor	7 - Stro Disagr	N/A		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Total	11	7	1	2				

Votes = 21

Qualifying Statement

None.

RECURRENCE/RESTAGING

Clinical Question

What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute when recurrence of cervical cancer is suspected but not proven? What benefit to clinical management does PET or PET/CT contribute to restaging at the time of documented recurrence for cervical cancer?

DRAFT DSG recommendation

A recommendation cannot be made for or against the use of PET for evaluation of suspected recurrence, due to insufficient evidence.

Provincial Consensus Meeting Deliberations

No major issues were raised during the discussion of this recommendation.

FINAL Recommendation Put to Vote

A recommendation cannot be made for or against the use of PET for evaluation of suspected recurrence due to insufficient evidence.

	1 - S A	itrongly gree	5	- Neither	- Agree n	or Disagre	e	9 - Stı Disa	rongly gree	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Total	8	10	2		1					
Votes = 2	21									

Qualifying Statement

None.

DRAFT DSG Recommendation

PET is recommended for women with pelvic recurrence who are candidates for pelvic exenteration or pelvic chemoradiation.

Provincial Consensus Meeting Deliberations

During group discussion, the issue was raised about the value of PET in patients who recur in the paraaortic region rather than in the pelvis. The Schwarz et al study (5) was cited as indicating that early detection of paraaortic recurrence leads to positive effects on clinical outcomes. Although the evidence is based on a single study, the group agreed that PET should not be limited to only pelvic recurrence.

FINAL Recommendation Put to Vote

PET is recommended for women with recurrence who are candidates for pelvic exenteration or chemoradiation with curative intent.

	1 - St Ag	rongly gree	5	- Neither	- Agree n	or Disagro	ee	9 - St Disa	rongly gree	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Total	13	7	1							

Votes = 21

Issues raised on voting questionnaire:

-This is uncommon, like with SCLC and pancreas "curative" recurrence.

Qualifying Statement

None.

Solitary Metastasis Identified at Time of Recurrence

Clinical Question

What is the role of PET when a solitary metastasis is identified at the time of recurrence and a metastectomy is being contemplated?

This question was not addressed in the cervical evidence review.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Areas for future research were not discussed in the process of drafting these recommendations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The GYN DSG would like to thank Dr. Anthony Fyles for taking the lead in drafting this systematic review.

For a complete list of the Gynecology DSG members, please visit the CCO Web site at http://www.cancercare.on.ca/

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. Anthony Fyles, Princess Margaret Hospital, 610 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario Canada M5G 2M9, telephone (416) 946-6522, fax (416) 946-2111, email <u>anthony.fyles@rmp.uhn.on.ca</u>

For information about the PEBC and the most current version of all reports, please visit the CCO Web site at http://www.cancercare.on.ca/ or contact the PEBC office at: Phone: 905-525-9140, ext. 22055 Fax: 905-522-7681

REFERENCES

- 1. McEwan AJ, Gulenchyn K, Ospina M, Horton J, Seida J, Vandermeer B, et al. Positron emission tomography for nine cancers (bladder, brain, cervical, kidney, ovarian, pancreatic, prostate, small cell lung, testicular). Rockville, Maryland: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; August 2008. Draft.
- Matchar DB, Kulasingam SL, Havrilesky L, Mann LO, Myers ER, McCrory DC, et al. Positron emission tomography for six cancers (brain, cervical, small cell lung, ovarian, pancreatic, and testicular). Rockville, Maryland: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2004 Feb [cited 2009 Jan 19]. Available from:

http://www.cms.hhs.gov/mcd/viewtechassess.asp?where=search&tid=21

- 3. Selman TJ, Mann C, Zamora J, Appleyard TL, Khan K. Diagnostic accuracy of tests for lymph node status in primary cervical cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. CMAJ. 2008 Mar 25;178(7):855-62.
- 4. Bjurberg M, Kjellén E, Ohlsson T, Ridderheim M, Brun E. FDG-PET in cervical cancer: staging, re-staging and follow-up. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2007;86(11):1385-91. Epub 2007 Sep 4.
- 5. Schwarz JK, Siegel BA, Dehdashti F, Grigsby PW. Association of posttherapy positron emission tomography with tumor response and survival in cervical carcinoma. JAMA. 2007 Nov 21;298(19):2289-95.
- 6. Chang TC, Law KS, Hong JH, Lai CH, Ng KK, Hsueh S, et al. Positron emission tomography for unexplained elevation of serum squamous cell carcinoma antigen levels during followup for patients with cervical malignancies: a phase II study. Cancer. 2004 Jul 1;101(1):164-71.
- 7. Lai CH, Huang KG, See LC, Yen TC, Tsai CS, Chang TC, et al. Restaging of recurrent cervical carcinoma with dual-phase [18F]fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography. Cancer. 2004 Feb 1;100(3):544-52.
- 8. Chang YC, Yen TC, Ng KK, See LC, Lai CH, Chang TC, et al. Does diabetes mellitus influence the efficacy of FDG-PET in the diagnosis of cervical cancer? Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2005;32(6):647-52.
- Amit A, Beck D, Lowenstein L, Lavie O, Bar Shalom R, Kedar Z, et al. The role of hybrid PET/CT in the evaluation of patients with cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2006;100(1):65-9.
- 10. Choi HJ, Roh JW, Seo SS, Lee S, Kim JY, Kim SK, et al. Comparison of the accuracy of magnetic resonance imaging and positron emission tomography/computed tomography in the presurgical detection of lymph node metastases in patients with uterine cervical carcinoma: a prospective study. Cancer 2006;106(4):914-22.
- 11. Chou HH, Chang TC, Yen TC, Ng KK, Hsueh S, Ma SY, et al. Low value of [18F]-fluoro-2deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography in primary staging of early-stage cervical cancer before radical hysterectomy. J Clin Oncol 2006;24(1):123-8.
- 12. Hope AJ, Saha P, Grigsby PW. FDG-PET in carcinoma of the uterine cervix with endometrial extension. Cancer 2006;106(1):196-200.
- 13. Lin WC, Hung YC, Yeh LS, Kao CH, Yen RF, Shen YY. Usefulness of (18)Ffluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography to detect para-aortic lymph nodal metastasis in advanced cervical cancer with negative computed tomography findings. Gynecol Oncol 2003;89(1):73-6.
- 14. Loft A, Berthelsen AK, Roed H, Ottosen C, Lundvall L, Knudsen J, et al. The diagnostic value of PET/CT scanning in patients with cervical cancer: a prospective study. Gynecol Oncol 2007;106(1):29-34

- 15. Ma SY, See LC, Lai CH, Chou HH, Tsai CS, Ng KK, et al. Delayed (18)F-FDG PET for detection of paraaortic lymph node metastases in cervical cancer patients. J Nucl Med 2003;44(11):1775-83
- 16. Park W, Park YJ, Huh SJ, Kim BG, Bae DS, Lee J, et al. The usefulness of MRI and PET imaging for the detection of parametrial involvement and lymph node metastasis in patients with cervical cancer. Jpn J Clin Oncol 2005;35(5):260-4.
- 17. Roh JW, Seo SS, Lee S, Kang KW, Kim SK, Sim JS, et al. Role of positron emission tomography in pretreatment lymph node staging of uterine cervical cancer: a prospective surgicopathologic correlation study. Eur J Cancer 2005;41(14):2086-92.
- 18. Sironi S, Buda A, Picchio M, Perego P, Moreni R, Pellegrino A, et al. Lymph node metastasis in patients with clinical early-stage cervical cancer: detection with integrated FDG PET/CT. Radiology 2006;238(1):272-9.
- 19. Tran BN, Grigsby PW, Dehdashti F, Herzog TJ, Siegel BA. Occult supraclavicular lymph node metastasis identified by FDG-PET in patients with carcinoma of the uterine cervix. Gynecol Oncol 2003;90(3):572-6.
- 20. Unger JB, Ivy JJ, Ramaswamy MR, Charrier A, Connor P. Whole-body [18F]fluoro-2deoxyglucose positron emission tomography scan staging prior to planned radical hysterectomy and pelvic lymphadenectomy. Int J Gynecological Cancer 2005;15(6):1060-4.
- 21. Wright JD, Dehdashti F, Herzog TJ, Mutch DG, Huettner PC, Rader JS, et al. Preoperative lymph node staging of early-stage cervical carcinoma by [18F]-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose-positron emission tomography. Cancer 2005;104(11):2484-91.
- 22. Yen TC, Ng KK, Ma SY, Chou HH, Tsai CS, Hsueh S, et al. Value of dual-phase 2-fluoro-2deoxy-d-glucose positron emission tomography in cervical cancer.[erratum appears in J Clin Oncol. 2004 Jan 1;22(1):209]. J Clin Oncol 2003;21(19):3651-8.
- 23. Yildirim Y, Sehirali S, Avci ME, Yilmaz C, Ertopcu K, Tinar S, et al. Integrated PET/CT for the evaluation of para-aortic nodal metastasis in locally advanced cervical cancer patients with negative conventional CT findings. Gynecol Oncol 2008;108(1):154-9.
- 24. Chang WC, Hung YC, Lin CC, Shen YY, Kao CH. Usefulness of FDG-PET to detect recurrent cervical cancer based on asymptomatically elevated tumor marker serum levels: a preliminary report. Cancer Invest 2004;22(2):180-4.
- 25. Chung HH, Jo H, Kang WJ, Kim JW, Park NH, Song YS, et al. Clinical impact of integrated PET/CT on the management of suspected cervical cancer recurrence. Gynecol Oncol 2007;104(3):529-34.
- 26. Chung HH, Kim SK, Kim TH, Lee S, Kang KW, Kim JY, et al. Clinical impact of FDG-PET imaging in post-therapy surveillance of uterine cervical cancer: from diagnosis to prognosis. Gynecol Oncol 2006;103(1):165-70.
- 27. Havrilesky LJ, Wong TZ, Secord AA, Berchuck A, Clarke-Pearson DL, Jones EL. The role of PET scanning in the detection of recurrent cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2003;90(1):186-90.
- 28. Lin CT, Yen TC, Chang TC, Ng KK, Tsai CS, Ho KC, et al. Role of [18F]fluoro-2-deoxy-Dglucose positron emission tomography in re-recurrent cervical cancer. Int J Gynecological Cancer 2006;16(6):1994-2003.
- 29. Ryu SY, Kim MH, Choi SC, Choi CW, Lee KH. Detection of early recurrence with 18F-FDG PET in patients with cervical cancer. J Nucl Med 2003;44(3):347-52.
- 30. Sakurai H, Suzuki Y, Nonaka T, Ishikawa H, Shioya M, Kiyohara H, et al. FDG-PET in the detection of recurrence of uterine cervical carcinoma following radiation therapy--tumor volume and FDG uptake value. Gynecol Oncol 2006;100(3):601-7.
- 31. Sironi S, Picchio M, Landoni C, Galimberti S, Signorelli M, Bettinardi V, et al. Post-therapy surveillance of patients with uterine cancers: value of integrated FDG PET/CT in the detection of recurrence. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2007;34(4):472-9.

- 32. Unger JB, Ivy JJ, Connor P, Charrier A, Ramaswamy MR, Ampil FL, et al. Detection of recurrent cervical cancer by whole-body FDG PET scan in asymptomatic and symptomatic women. Gynecol Oncol 2004;94(1):212-6.
- 33. Van Der Veldt AAM, Hooft L, Van Diest PJ, Berkhof J, Buist MR, Comans EF, et al. Microvessel density and p53 in detecting cervical cancer by FDG PET in cases of suspected recurrence. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2006;33(12):1408-16.
- 34. Yen TC, Lai CH, Ma SY, Huang KG, Huang HJ, Hong JH, et al. Comparative benefits and limitations of [18]F-FDG PET and CT-MRI in documented or suspected recurrent cervical cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2006;33(12):1399-407.
- 35. Yen TC, See LC, Chang TC, Huang KG, Ng KK, Tang SG, et al. Defining the priority of using 18F-FDG PET for recurrent cervical cancer. J Nucl Med 2004;45(10):1632-9.
- 36. Grisaru D, Almog B, Levine C, Metser U, Fishman A, Lerman H, et al. The diagnostic accuracy of 18F-Fluorodeoxyglucose PET/CT in patients with gynecological malignancies. Gynecol Oncol 2004;94(3):680-4.
- 37. Wong TZ, Jones EL, Coleman RE. Positron emission tomography with 2-deoxy-2-[(18)F]fluoro-D-glucose for evaluating local and distant disease in patients with cervical cancer. Mol Imaging Biol 2004;6(1):55-62.

Character Study design PET imaging Reference std Sens Spec Evid grade Primary diagnosis and recurrence Pospective PET Hist/bx or clin fup Met lesns 92% Met lesns 98% B Amit 2005 (8) Prospective PET/CT Hist/bx or clin fup Met lesns 91% All lesns 98% B Choi 2006 (9) Prospective PET/CT Hist/bx or clin fup 60% 94% B Choi 2006 (10) Prospective PET/CT Hist/bx 10% 94% B Lin 2003 (13) Prospective PET Hist/bx 69% 76% B Lin 2003 (15) Prospective PET Hist/bx to clin fup 82% 97% B Park 2005 (16) Retrospective PET Hist/bx to clin fup 82% 97% A Tran 2003 (15) Prospective PET Hist/bx 29% I00% C Stroni 2006 (18) Represpective PET Hist/bx 29% I00% C Tran 2003 (19) Retrospective PET Hist/bx 29% I00%			•	,			-
Draginskit periodinate Citation (ref.#)Study design inary diagnosis and recurrencePET imaging istReference istSensSpecEvid gradeChang 2005 (8)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupMet lesns 92% 1* turn/ loc rec 88% All lesns 91%Met lesns 98% 1* turn/ loc rec 100% All lesns 91%BStaging	CERVICAL Diagnostic porform						
Clubble (Fill (Fill)Study designPETReferenceSensSpec.CurrowCurrowChang 2005 (8)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupMet lesns 92%Met lesns 92%Met lesns 98%BStaging	Diagnostic perform	nance Study design		Deference	Come	Cree	Evid.
Primary diagnosis and recurrenceVertication of the second	Citation (ref #)	Study design	PEI	Reference	sens	spec	EVIO
Find y Diagnosis and recurrencePETHist/bx or clin fupMet lesns 92% 1° tum/ loc rec 100% 	Primary diagnosis	and recurrence	IIIIagilig	stu			grade
Chaing 2005 (6) Prospective PET Hist/bx 01 Met tests 92.6 Met tests 96.6 B Staging - <td< td=""><td>Chang 2005 (9)</td><td>and recurrence</td><td>DET</td><td>List /by or</td><td>Mot Jospa 02%</td><td>Mot Jospa 08%</td><td>D</td></td<>	Chang 2005 (9)	and recurrence	DET	List /by or	Mot Jospa 02%	Mot Jospa 08%	D
Left HupFe tum HupFe tum HupFe tum HupAmit 2006 (9)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup60%94%BAmit 2006 (10)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx57%92%BChou 2006 (11)ProspectivePETHist/bx10%94%BHope 2006 (12)ProspectivePETHist/bx60%76%BLin 2003 (13)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup100%88%ALoft 2007 (14)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup100%88%APark 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx at imag fup100%CCStront 2006 (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePET det PET /CTHist/bx29%100%CVen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET det PET det PET/CTPelvic LN met Pet/CTParaaort LN met 25%99%BYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET det PET/CTPelvic LN met PET/CT90%BCYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET det PET/CTS0%83%BBRecurrenceCHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%CChang 2004 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup	Chang 2005 (6)	Prospective	PEI	HISL/DX OF	Met teshs 92%	Met lesiis 90%	D
Tec 80.0 All tesns 91%StagingAll tesns 91%Amit 2006 (9)ProspectivePET/CTChoi 2006 (10)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx57%92%BChoi 2006 (11)ProspectivePETHist/bx57%92%Chou 2006 (12)ProspectivePETHist/bx69%76%BEtrist/bx69%Lin 2003 (13)ProspectivePETHist/bx88%ALoft 2007 (14)ProspectivePETHist/bx82%97%Ma 2003 (15)ProspectivePETHist/bx43%100%CRetrospectivePETHist/bx43%100%CRetrospectivePETHist/bx100%100%Colog (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx100%100%Colog (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%Vildirim 2008 (21)RetrospectivePET dYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx orLocal 88%Local 50%Vildirim 2008 (23)RetrospectivePET/CTYen 2003 (24)ProspectivePET/CTYen 2003 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx orLocal 88%Local 50%Qaraaort LNmet 25%ReturenceCChang 2004 (24)RetrospectiveChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>cun rup</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>				cun rup			
StagingAut teshs 71.6Aut teshs 70.6Aut teshs 70.6Amit 2006 (9)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup60%94%BChoi 2006 (10)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx10%94%BLin 2003 (13)ProspectivePETHist/bx10%94%BLoft 2007 (14)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup60%76%BLoft 2007 (14)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup100%88%AMa 2003 (15)ProspectivePETHist/bx dt imag fup82%97%BPark 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx43%100%CRoh 2005 (17)ProspectivePETHist/bx72%99%ASironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx72%99%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%90%AYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%C <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
Stegnig Amit 2006 (9)Prospective ProspectivePET/CT PET/CTHist/bx or clin fup60% 60%94% 94%BChol 2006 (11)Prospective ProspectivePETHist/bx57%92%BChou 2006 (11)Prospective ProspectivePETHist/bx69%76%BLin 2003 (13)Prospective ProspectivePETHist/bx69%94%BLoft 2007 (14)Prospective ProspectivePETHist/bx60%94%BLoft 2003 (15)Prospective ProspectivePETHist/bx43%100%CRah 2005 (16)Retrospective PETPETHist/bx72%99%ASironi 2006 (18)Prospective PETPET Hist/bx72%99%AJana 2005 (20)Retrospective PETPETHist/bx72%99%AVinght 2005 (21)Retrospective PET QPET Hist/bx72%90%Paraaort LN met 25%Paraaort LN met 25%Yen 2003 (22)Prospective ProspectivePET (CT PET/CTS0%83%BYen 2003 (22)Prospective ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or Clin fup00%BYildirim 2008 (23)Prospective PET/CTPET/CTLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChang 2004 (24) Chang 2004 (26)Retrospective PETPET/CTLocal 88% Local 88% Dist 100%Local 50% CCChang 2004 (26) Chang 2007 (25)Retrospect	Staging				All leshs 91%	All lesns 96%	
Almit 2006 (9) Prospective PET/CT Inst/Dx 0F 00% 94% B Choi 2006 (10) Prospective PET/CT Hist/bx 57% 92% B Choi 2006 (11) Prospective PET Hist/bx 10% 94% B Loft 2007 (14) Prospective PET Hist/bx or 66% 94% B Loft 2007 (14) Prospective PET/CT Hist/bx or 100% 88% A Ma 2003 (15) Prospective PET Hist/bx or 43% 100% C Sironi 2006 (18) Prospective PET Hist/bx 40% 97% B Sironi 2006 (19) Retrospective PET Hist/bx 100% C C Wright 2005 (21) Retrospective PET Hist/bx or 72% 99% A Carao 2003 (22) Retrospective PET A Hist/bx or 100% C Paraaort LN Yen 2003 (22) Prospective PET A Hist/bx or	Staging	Drospostivo		List /by or	40%	0.4%	D
Choi 2006 (10) Prospective PET/CT Hist/bx 57% 92% B Chou 2006 (11) Prospective PET Hist/bx 10% 94% B Hope 2006 (12) Prospective PET Hist/bx 69% 76% B Lin 2003 (13) Prospective PET Hist/bx or clin fup 100% 88% A Ma 2003 (15) Prospective PET Hist/bx dt 82% 97% B Choi 2005 (16) Retrospective PET Hist/bx 43% 100% C Roh 2005 (17) Prospective PET Hist/bx 72% 99% A Tran 2003 (19) Retrospective PET dt Hist/bx 72% 99% A Unger 2005 (20) Retrospective PET dt Hist/bx or 29% 100% C Wright 2005 (21) Retrospective PET dt Hist/bx or 29% 99% B (23) Prospective PET dt Hist/bx or 20% <td>AIIIIL 2006 (9)</td> <td>Prospective</td> <td>PEI/CI</td> <td></td> <td>00%</td> <td>94/0</td> <td>D</td>	AIIIIL 2006 (9)	Prospective	PEI/CI		00%	94/0	D
Choi 2006 (10) Prospective PET Hist/bx 10% 94% B Hope 2006 (12) Prospective PET Hist/bx 69% 76% B Lin 2003 (13) Prospective PET Hist/bx 69% 76% B Lin 2003 (13) Prospective PET Hist/bx 86% 94% B Loft 2007 (14) Prospective PET Hist/bx 88% A Ma 2003 (15) Prospective PET Hist/bx 4 82% 97% B Park 2005 (16) Retrospective PET Hist/bx 43% 100% C Roh 2005 (17) Prospective PET Hist/bx 100% 100% C Unger 2005 (20) Retrospective PET Hist/bx 100% 100% C Ven 2003 (22) Retrospective PET & Hist/bx or 29% 90% B Yen 2003 (22) Prospective PET /CT Hist/bx or 20% 99% B	Choi 2006 (10)	Drospostivo			57%	0.2%	D
Chou 2006 (11) Prospective PET Hist/bx 6% 76% B Lin 2003 (13) Prospective PET Hist/bx 6% 94% B Loft 2007 (14) Prospective PET Hist/bx 86% 94% B Ma 2003 (15) Prospective PET Hist/bx 82% 97% B Ma 2005 (16) Retrospective PET Hist/bx 43% 100% C Roh 2005 (17) Prospective PET Hist/bx 40% 97% B Sironi 2006 (18) Prospective PET Hist/bx 40% 97% A Tran 2003 (19) Retrospective PET Hist/bx 100% 100% C Wright 2005 (21) Retrospective PET & Hist/bx 29% 100% C Yen 2003 (22) Prospective PET (CT Hist/bx or clin fup Paraaort LN met 25% Yen 2003 (22) Prospective PET / CT Hist/bx or Local	Chou 2006 (10)	Prospective		Hist/bx	10%	92/0	D
Hope 2006 (12)ProspectivePETHist/bx85%94%BLoft 2007 (14)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup100%88%AMa 2003 (15)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup100%88%APark 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx 40%97%BSironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx40%97%BSironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx72%99%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePETHist/bxPelvic LN met 52%90%BYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or 		Prospective			10%	94 /0	D
Lin 2003 (13)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup80%94%BMa 2003 (15)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or imag fup100%88%APark 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx dt imag fup82%97%BPark 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx dt imag fup40%97%BSironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (21)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePETHist/bxPelvic LN met 52%Pelvic LN met 90%Paraaort LN met 25%Paraaort LN met 25%Paraaort LN met 97%BYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup20%83%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 50% Dist 100%BChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum Some 50% Liver/spleen 100%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum Some 20% Some 20%Periton	Hope 2006 (12)	Prospective	PEI	HIST/DX	69 %	76%	B
Lott 2007 (14)ProspectivePET/CTHist/DX or clin fup100%88%AMa 2003 (15)ProspectivePETHist/DX dright82%97%BPark 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/DX dright100%CRoh 2005 (17)ProspectivePETHist/DX dright97%BSironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePET/CTHist/DX dright97%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/DX dright100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/DX dright90%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePET drightHist/DX drightPelvic LN met PET/CT90%CYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET drightHist/DX drightParaaort LN met 25%Paraaort LN met 97%Paraaort LN met 97%Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET/CTHist/DX dright50%83%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/DX drightLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/Dx dright Clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/Dx dright Clin fupSuraclast N86%CClung 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/Dx dright Clin fupSuraclast N86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/Dx dright Clin fupSuraclast N86% <t< td=""><td>Lin 2003 (13)</td><td>Prospective</td><td></td><td>Hist/DX</td><td>86%</td><td>94%</td><td>В</td></t<>	Lin 2003 (13)	Prospective		Hist/DX	86%	94%	В
Ma 2003 (15)ProspectivePETHist/bx & imag fup82%97%BPark 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx & 40%43%100%CRoh 2005 (17)ProspectivePETHist/bx40%97%BSironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx72%99%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePET & PET & PET CTHist/bxPelvic LN met S2%90%Paraaort LN met 97%Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%83%BRecurrenceCClin fupDist 100%Bist 100%BChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88%Local 50%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88%Local 50%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7%B6%Low 96% Liver/spleen 100%Lin 200	Loft 2007 (14)	Prospective	PEI/CI	Hist/DX or	100%	88%	А
Ma 2003 (15)ProspectivePE1Hist/bx HB2%97%BPark 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx43%100%CRoh 2005 (17)ProspectivePETHist/bx40%97%BSironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx72%99%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePETHist/bxPelvic LN met90%Paraaort LNYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx50%83%BYildirim 2008ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or50%83%B(23)RecurrenceECLocal 88%Local 50%BChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx orLocal 88%Local 50%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx orLocal 88%Local 50%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx orSist 100%Dist 100%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orPeritoneum89%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orPeritoneum89%Local 50%Local 50%Lin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orC100%Local 50%Local 50%Local 50%Local 50%Lin 2006 (28) </td <td></td> <td>D</td> <td>DET</td> <td></td> <td>0201</td> <td>070</td> <td></td>		D	DET		0201	070	
Park 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx43%100%CRoh 2005 (17)ProspectivePETHist/bx40%97%BSironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx72%99%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePETHist/bxPelvic LN metSelvic LN metSelvic LN metYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup50%83%BRecurrenceProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24) Chung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2006 (26) (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%B <td>Ma 2003 (15)</td> <td>Prospective</td> <td>PEI</td> <td>Hist/bx &</td> <td>82%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>В</td>	Ma 2003 (15)	Prospective	PEI	Hist/bx &	82%	97%	В
Park 2005 (16)RetrospectivePETHist/bx43%100%CRoh 2005 (17)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx72%99%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePETHist/bxPelvic LN metPelvic LN met52%90%Paraaort LNParaaort LNmet 25%90%Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or22%99%BYildirim 2008ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or50%83%B(23)RecurrenceCClin fupDist 100%CDist 100%CChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx orLocal 88%Local 50%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx orCola 88%Local 50%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx orCNo%CChung 2006 (26)ProspectivePETHist/bx orCCLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orCNo%SurgerClau LNLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orCNo%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orCCLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orCNo%BLin 2006 (28)Prospe		Detus en estive	DET	Imag Tup	420/	100%	6
Kon 2005 (17)ProspectivePETHist/bx40%97%BSironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx72%99%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CVeright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePETHist/bxPelvic LN met90%RYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or92%90%BYildirim 2008ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or92%99%BYildirim 2008ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx orLocal 88%Local 50%BChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx orLocal 88%Local 50%CChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx orLocal 88%Local 50%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx orSit 100%Sit 100%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx orPeritoneumS7%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orCLocal 86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orRein senseCLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx orPeritoneumS9%Bone 50%Liver/spleen100%Long 100%Mediastinal LN	Park 2005 (16)	Retrospective	PEI	HIST/DX	43%	100%	
Sironi 2006 (18)ProspectivePETHist/bx72%99%ATran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePETHist/bx100%CWright 2005 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePET & PET/CTHist/bxPelvic LN met S2%90%Paraaort LN met 97%Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BRecurrencePetroceHist/bx or clin fup50%83%BChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% CCChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupDist 100%Sti 00%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup84%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7%BLung 7	Ron 2005 (17)	Prospective		Hist/DX	40%	97%	В
I ran 2003 (19)RetrospectivePE1Hist/bx100%100%CUnger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePET & PET & PET & PET CTHist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePET & PET CTHist/bx29%Pelvic LN met S2% Paraaort LN met 25%Pelvic LN met 90%Pelvic LN met 90%CYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BLing 75% Mediastinal LN 88%Supraclay LNSupraclay LNSupraclay LN	Stront 2006 (18)	Prospective	PET/CT	Hist/DX	12%	99%	A
Unger 2005 (20)RetrospectivePE1Hist/bx29%100%CWright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePET & PET/CTHist/bxPelvic LN met S2%Pelvic LN met 90%Pelvic LN met 90%Pelvic LN met 97%Pelvic LN met 97%Pelvic LN met 97%SYen 2003 (22)ProspectivePET Clin fupHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CT PET/CTHist/bx or clin fup50%83%BRecurrencePetrospective clin fupDist 100% Dist 100%BDist 100%BChang 2004 (24) Chang 2007 (25)Retrospective RetrospectivePET PET/CTLocal 88% clin fupLocal 50% Dist 100%CChung 2006 (26) Havrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePET PETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePET PETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BCLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BLing 75% Mediastinal LN 88%Sunraclay LNSunraclay LNSunraclay LN	Tran 2003 (19)	Retrospective	PEI	Hist/bx	100%	100%	C
Wright 2005 (21)RetrospectivePET & PET/CTHist/bxPelvic LN met S2% Paraaort LN met 97%Pelvic LN met 90% Paraaort LN met 97%Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup50%83%BRecurrenceCEELocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24) Chang 2007 (25)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2006 (26) Havrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7% Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%B	Unger 2005 (20)	Retrospective	PEI	Hist/bx	29%	100%	C
PET/CTSZ% Paraaort LN met 25%90% Paraaort LN met 97%Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup90%83%BRecurrenceEcurrenceEcurrenceEcurrenceEcurrenceEcurrenceChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupBCChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BBLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BLing 75% Mediastinal LN 100%Lung 75% Mediastinal LN 88%Lung 100% Mediastinal LN 88%No	Wright 2005 (21)	Retrospective	PEI	Hist/bx	Pelvic LN met	Pelvic LN met	C
Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupParaaort LN met 25%Paraaort LN met 97%Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx50%83%BRecurrenceVildirim 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup90%81%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%Local 20% Mediastinal LN 88%			PEI/CI		52%	90%	
Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BRecurrenceChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BBLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BBUng 75% Mediastinal LN 88%Lung 100% Mediastinal LN 88%Supraclay LNSupraclay LN					Paraaort LN	Paraaort LN	
Yen 2003 (22)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fup92%99%BYildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx50%83%BRecurrenceChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup90%81%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum S7% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%BLing 75% Mediastinal LN 80%Lung 100% Mediastinal LN 88%Supraclay LNSupraclay LN		D	DET		met 25%	met 97%	
Yildirim 2008 (23)ProspectivePET/CTHist/bx50%83%BRecurrenceChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupDist 100%Sti 100%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BBMediastinal LN 100%NowNeriastinal LN 88%Neriastinal LN 88%Neriastinal LN 88%Neriastinal LN 88%	ren 2003 (22)	Prospective	PEI	Hist/DX or	92%	99 %	В
Prospective (23)Prospective PetrictPETrict Hist/bxHist/bx Sumarclay LNSumarclay LNRecurrenceChang 2004 (6)Prospective ProspectivePET PET Clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)Retrospective PetrictPET PETrictHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)Retrospective PetrictPETrict PETrictHist/bx or clin fup90%81% CCChung 2006 (26)Retrospective PetrictPET PETHist/bx or clin fup96%84% S%CChung 2006 (28)Prospective PetrictPET PETHist/bx or clin fup96% S%86%C	Vil diving 2009	Draanaatiya		Clin Tup	E 00/	0.20/	D
(123)RecurrenceChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup90%81%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%B		Prospective	PEI/CI	HIST/DX	50%	83%	В
RecurrenceChang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%BChang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup90%81%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx85%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BMediastinal LN 100%Neediastinal LN 88%Supraclay LNNeediastinal LN 88%Neediastinal LN 88%	(23)						
Chang 2004 (6)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 80% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%Chang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup90%81%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%BBLing 75% Mediastinal LN 100%Lung 75% Mediastinal LN 88%Lung 100% Supraclay LNSupraclay LNSupraclay LN	Recurrence	Dreenestive	DET	List / by ar			Б
Chang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fupLocal 88% Dist 100%Local 50% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup90%81%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%Liver/spleen Lung 75%Bone 96% Lung 75%Local 20% Mediastinal LN 88%	Chang 2004 (6)	Prospective	PEI	HIST/DX OF	LOCal 88%	Local 50%	D
Chang 2004 (24)RetrospectivePETHist/bx of clin fupLocat 88% Dist 100%Locat 30% Dist 100%CChung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fup90%81%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Peritoneum 89%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%BIong 75% Mediastinal LN 100%Lung 75% 88%Lung 100% 88%Supraclay LNSupraclay LN	Chang 2004 (24)	Detrospectivo	DET	List /by or			C
Chung 2007 (25)RetrospectivePET/CTHist/bx or clin fupDist 100%Dist 100%Chung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup90%81%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx85%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Peritoneum 89%Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%Liver/spleen 88%Nediastinal LN 88%	Chang 2004 (24)	Retrospective	PEI	HISL/DX OF	LUCal 00%	LOCAL 50%	L
Chung 2007 (23)RetrospectivePETHist/bx of clin fup90%81%CChung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx85%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Peritoneum Bone 50%Peritoneum Liver/spleen 100%Bone 96%Lin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Bone 96%Liver/spleen 100%100%Lung 75%Lung 100%Mediastinal LN 100%100%Supraclay LNSupraclay LN	Chung 2007 (25)	Potrospostivo		List /by or		010/	C
Chung 2006 (26)RetrospectivePETHist/bx or clin fup96%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx85%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Peritoneum 89%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%B		Recrospective	PEI/CI	clip fup	90%	01/0	C
Chung 2000 (20)RetrospectivePETHist/bx of clin fup90%84%CHavrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx85%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Peritoneum 89%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%BLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%B	Chung 2006 (26)	Potrospostivo	DET	Hist/by.or	06%	81%	C
Havrilesky 2003 (27)RetrospectivePETHist/bx85%86%CLin 2006 (28)ProspectivePETHist/bx or clin fupPeritoneum 57%Peritoneum 89%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100%Liver/spleen 100%Liver/spleen Liver/spleen 100%Bone 96% Liver/spleen Liver/s	Chung 2000 (20)	Recrospective	FLI	clin fun	90%	04/0	C
Inavitesky 2003 Retrospective PET Hist/bx 85% 80% Lin 2006 (28) Prospective PET Hist/bx or clin fup Peritoneum Peritoneum 57% 89% Bone 50% Bone 96% Liver/spleen 100% 100% Lung 75% Lung 75% Lung 100% Mediastinal LN 88% Supraclay LN Supraclay LN	Havrilosky 2003	Potrospoctivo	DET	Hist /by	85%	86%	C
Lin 2006 (28) Prospective PET Hist/bx or clin fup Peritoneum Peritoneum B Lin 2006 (28) Prospective PET Hist/bx or clin fup Peritoneum Bone 50% Bone 96% Liver/spleen Liver/spleen 100% Lung 70% Lung 100% Mediastinal LN No% Supraclay LN Supraclay LN Supraclay LN Supraclay LN	(27)	Recrospective	FLI	TIISC/ DX	00%	00/0	C
clin fup 57% Bone 50% Liver/spleen 100% Lung 75% Lung 100% Mediastinal LN 100% Supraclay LN Supraclay LN	(27)	Prospective	DET	Hist/by.or	Peritoneum	Poritonoum	R
Bone 50% Bone 96% Liver/spleen Liver/spleen 100% 100% Lung 75% Lung 100% Mediastinal LN Mediastinal LN 100% 88%		Trospective		clin fun	57%	80%	D .
Liver/spleen 100% Lung 75% Mediastinal LN 100% Supraclay LN Supraclay LN				currup	Bone 50%	Bone 96%	
100% 100% Lung 75% Lung 100% Mediastinal LN Mediastinal LN 100% 88% Supraclay LN Supraclay LN					l iver/spleen	l iver/spleen	
Lung 75% Lung 100% Mediastinal LN Mediastinal LN 100% 88%					100%	100%	
Mediastinal LN 100% Supraclay LN Supraclay LN					1 ung 75%	Lung 100%	
100% 88% Supraclay I.N. Supraclay I.N.					Mediastinal IN	Mediastinal I N	
Supraclay I N					100%	88%	
					Supraclav LN	Supraclay LN	

Appendix 1. PET for cervical cancer: summary of the evidence from 2003 to Marc	ch 2008.
ERVICAL	

				75%	95%	
				Paraaort LN	Paraaort LN	
				90%	94 %	
				Pelvic LN 50%	Pelvic LN	
D 0000 (00)		NFT		0.00%	100%	
Ryu 2003 (29)	Retrospective	PEI	Hist/bx or clin fup	90%	/6%	C
Sakurai 2006 (30)	Prospective	PET	Hist/bx	91%	57%	D
Sironi 2007 (31)	Prospective	PET/CT	Hist/bx or clin fup	83%	100%	В
Unger 2004 (32)	Retrospective	PET	Hist/bx or clin fup	Asympt women 80% Sympt women	Asympt women 100% Sympt women	C
				100%	100%	
Van der Veldt 2006 (33)	Retrospective	PET	Hist/bx or clin fup	96%	100%	C
Yen 2006 (34)	Prospective	PET	Hist/bx or clin fup	Peritoneum 65%	Peritoneum 98%	В
				Bone 100%	Bone 97%	
				Liver/spleen 67%	Liver/spleen 99%	
				Lung 92%	Lung 97%	
				Mediastinal LN 100%	Mediastinal LN 96%	
				Supraclav LN 81%	Supraclav LN 98%	
				Paraaort LN 88%	Paraaort LN 99%	
				Pelvic LN 83%	Pelvic LN 98%	
Yen 2004 (35)	Prospective	PET	Hist/bx or	Peritoneum	Peritoneum	В
			clin fup	88%	96%	
				Bone Not calc	Bone 98%	
				Liver/spieen	Liver/spieen	
				100%	Lung 100%	
				Mediastinal LN	Mediastinal LN	
				100%	98 %	
				Supraclav LN 85%	Supraclav LN 98%	
				Paraaort LN	Paraaort LN	
				Pelvic I N 91%	Pelvic I N 98%	
Restaging		1				
Lai 2004 (7)	Prospective	PET	Hist/bx or clin fup	91%	98%	С
Staging and recur	rence	1	1 ·	1		
Grisaru 2004	Prospective	PET	Hist/bx	Stag 100%	Stag 100%	В
(36)				Recur 100%	Recur 100%	
Staging and restage	ging		Hist/by or	Early die Not	Early dia	P
	Prospective		clin fun		Larty 015	D
				Loc adv 94%	Loc adv Not	
				Relapse 92%.	calc	
					Relapse 100%	

Wong 2004 (37)	Retrospective	PTE	Hist/bx or clin fup	Stag dist 100% Restag loc 84% Restag dist 100%	Stag dist 100% Restag loc 96%	С
				Dist 100%	89% Loc 96% Dist 90%	

Abbreviations: Asympt, asymptomatic; bx, biopsy; calc, calculated; clin, clinical; CT, computed tomography; dis, disease; Dist, distant; fup, follow up; Hist, histology; imag, imaging; lesns, lesions; LN, lymph node; loc adv, locally advanced; loc rec, local recurrence; Met, metastasis; PET, positron emission tomography; Sens, sensitivity; Spec, specificity; std, standard; Supraclav, supraclavicular; Sympt, symptomatic; tum, tumour.

Meta-analysis: Studies evaluating diagnostic performance with purpose of detecting recurrence. Imaging: PET Design: Prospective Reference standard: Histology/biopsy or clinical follow-up 3 studies: Lin et al (28), Yen et al (34), Yen et al (35)

Pooled +LR Peritoneum = 15.75 Bone = 26.56 Liver/spleen = 45.89 Lung = 33.32Mediastinal lymph node = 15.24 Supraclavicular lymph node = 29.06 Paraaortic lymph node = 40.24 Pelvic lymph node = 41.42 Inguinal lymph node = 27.92 Pooled -LR Peritoneum = 0.37 Bone = 0.22 Liver/spleen = 0.25 Lung = 0.22Mediastinal lymph node = 0.09 Supraclavicular lymph node = 0.19 Paraaortic lymph node = 0.12Pelvic lymph node = 0.23Inguinal lymph node = 0.17

Imaging: PET Design: Retrospective Reference standard: Histology/biopsy or clinical follow-up 3 studies: Chung et al (26), Ryu et al (29), Unger et al (32) Pooled +LR = 5.33 Pooled -LR = 0.11

Meta-analysis: Studies evaluating diagnostic performance with purpose of staging Imaging: PET Design: Prospective Reference standard: Any reference standard 5 studies: Chou et al (11), Hope et al (12), Lin et al (13), Ma et al (15), Roh et al (17) Pooled +LR = 8.22 Pooled -LR = 0.38

Imaging: PET Design: Retrospective Reference standard: Histology/biopsy or clinical follow-up 3 studies: Park et al (16), Tran et al (19), Unger et al (20) Pooled +LR = 32.90 Pooled -LR = 0.41

Imaging: PET/CT Design: Prospective Reference standard: Any reference standard 3 studies: Amit et al (9), Loft et al (14), Yildirim et al (23) Pooled +LR = 6.89 Pooled -LR = 0.28

CERVICAL Diagnostic thin	king				
Citation (ref #)	Study design	PET imaging	Purpose of PET	Management decision	Evidence grade
Bjurberg2007 (4)	Prospective	PET/CT	Staging & restaging	Pts with loc adv dis: -Rx strategy changed for 4/17 pts (24%) due to id of new mets. Pts with relapsing dis: -PET did not confirm clin suspicion of recurrence. -PET deemed true -ve in fup of 3/15 pts. -Rx strategy changed for 3/12 +ve recurrence pts (25%). -Add'l dx testing in 6/12 +ve recurrence pts.	B
Chang2004 (6)	Prospective	PET	Recurrence	Rx strategy changed for 17/27 pts (63%): Curative Rx (7 pts), palliative chemo (4 pts), supportive care (6 pts). 7/13 pts (39%) with recurrence rec'd curative Rx based on PET vs 16/30 (53%) in historic control.	В
Chung2007 (25)	Retrospecti ve	PET/CT	Recurrence	Rx strategy changed for 12/52 pts (3%): -Initiated previously unplanned Rx (4 pts). -Changed previously planned Rx approach (5 pts). -Eliminated previously planned dx procedure (3 pts). PET guided add'l invasive dx procedures.	C
Lai2004 (7)	Prospective	PET	Restaging	Rx strategy changed for 22/40 pts (55%): -From curative to palliatve Rx (15 pts). -Curative Rx cont'd, Rx field or modality changed (7 pts). Dx testing impact due to PET findings in 14 pts: -Add'l guided bx (11 pts. -Exploratory surgery (3 pts).	C
Lin2006 (28)	Prospective	PET	Recurrence	Rx strategy changed for 12/26 pts (46%): -From curative to palliative Rx (9 pts). -Isolated in field failure successfully resected (3 pts). -PET led to unnecessary & invasive procedures (4 pts).	В

				-PET stated to have overall -ve imact on mgmt (2 pts).	
Yen2004 (35)	Prospective	PET	Recurrence	Rx strategy changed for 36/55 pts (65%): -Field or modality of rad'n changed (9 pts). -From curative to palliative Rx (27 pts).	В

Abbreviations: -ve, negative; +ve, positive; clin, clinical; dis, disease; dx, diagnostic; fup, follow up; id, identification; loc adv, locally advanced; mets, metastases; PET, positron emission tomography; pts, patients; Rx, treatment.

CERVICAL Management strategy					
Citation (ref #)	Study design	PET imaging	Purpose of PET	Patient centred outcomes and prognosis	Evidence grade
Chang2004 (6)	Prospective	PET	Recurrence	Comparison groups: PET (27 pts), historical control (30 pts). Mean overall survival: PET 22 mo vs. Historical cntrl 12.7 mo (P=0.0202)	B
Lai2004 (7)	Prospective	PET	Restaging	Comparison groups: Restaged with PET (40 pts), historical cntrols restaged w/o PET (125 pts). -All pts treated with a Rx field altered post-PET remained alive (7 pts). -Pts treated with primary RT or CCRT did not differ between groups (HR 0.99, CI 0.53 to 1.85; P=0.996). -In pts treated with surgery, PET group had higher survival than historical cntrls at 2 yr (HR 0.21, CI 0.05 to 0.83; P=0.020).	C

Abbreviations: CCRT, concurrent chemotherapy and radiotherapy; CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; mo, months; PET, positron emission tomography; pts, patients; RT, radiotherapy; yr, year.