Medical Policy

BlueCross BlueShield of Kansas

An independent licensee of the
Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

Title: **Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Scanning:
In Oncology to Detect Early Response During Treatment**

See also:
- *PET Scanning: Cardiac Applications*
- *PET Scanning: Miscellaneous (Non-cardiac, Non-oncologic) Applications of Fluorine 18 Fluorodeoxyglucose*
- *PET Scanning: Oncologic Applications*

Professional
Original Effective Date: October 1, 1997
Revision Date(s): October 16, 2013;
October 22, 2015; November 26, 2018
Current Effective Date: November 26, 2018

Institutional
Original Effective Date: October 1, 1997
Revision Date(s): October 16, 2013;
October 22, 2015; November 26, 2018
Current Effective Date: November 26, 2018

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With breast cancer	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: • With esophageal cancer	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With gastrointestinal stromal tumors receiving palliative or adjuvant therapy	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With gastrointestinal stromal tumors treated with tyrosine kinase inhibitors for <6 months	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With head and neck cancer	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With lymphoma	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With non-small-cell lung cancer	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With ovarian cancer	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: • With other malignant solid tumors[a] (eg, bladder, colorectal, prostate, thyroid) during treatment	Interventions of interest are: • Interim positron emission tomography as an adjunct to interim computed tomography	Comparators of interest are: • Interim computed tomography	Relevant outcomes include: • Overall survival • Disease-specific survival • Change in disease status • Quality of life • Morbid events • Treatment-related morbidity

DESCRIPTION

Positron emission tomography (PET) scanning has many established roles in oncology. One potential use of PET scanning is to assess treatment response early in the course of therapy with the intent of potentially altering the regimen based on PET scan results. While several types of PET scanning are used for interim detection of cancer, we refer to fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) unless otherwise noted.

Objective

The objective of this evidence review is to evaluate the technical reliability, clinical validity, and clinical utility of positron emission tomography in assessing early response to treatment in individuals with various types of cancer.

Background

POSITRON EMISSION TOMOGRAPHY

Positron emission tomography (PET) scans are based on the use of positron emitting radionuclide tracers coupled to other molecules, such as glucose, ammonia, or water. The radionuclide tracers simultaneously emit 2 high-energy photons in opposite directions that can be simultaneously detected (referred to as *coincidence detection*) by a PET scanner, which comprises multiple stationary detectors that encircle the region of interest.

A variety of tracers are used for PET scanning, including oxygen 15, nitrogen 13, carbon 11, and fluorine 18. The radiotracer most commonly used in oncology imaging has been fluorine 18, coupled with deoxyglucose to form fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG), which has a metabolism related to glucose metabolism. FDG has been considered potentially useful in cancer imaging, since tumor cells show increased metabolism of glucose.

This evidence review focuses on the use of PET to determine early treatment response for cancer, i.e., assessment of therapy response during cancer treatment. The purpose of the PET scan at this particular interval is to determine whether the treatment should be maintained or changed. Such a treatment strategy has been called "risk-adapted" or "response-adapted" treatment. This evidence review addresses detecting early response during short-term therapy, (eg, during cycle(s) of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of radiotherapy) and not response during use of long-term agents, (eg, tamoxifen).

The technique of using PET for early treatment response assessment involves comparing PET images before treatment and at some interval after the initial course of treatment. Many intervals have been used in various studies, and there appears to be no standard interval. Comparison of the pre- and mid-treatment PET images can either be performed qualitatively or quantitatively. If a quantitative technique is used, the most common quantity measure is the standardized uptake value calculated for a specific region of the

image. Various methods are used to compare standardized uptake values between 2 images, and a specific cutoff value is selected to determine whether the patient is responding to therapy. A change in standardized uptake value between 40% and 60% often has been used in studies of early treatment response. Other metabolic parameters measured are total lesion glycolysis and metabolic tumor volume.

In 2009, Hillner et al published results of a survey of physicians who had registered patients in the National Oncologic PET Registry, assessing the impact of PET on clinical management decisions for their patients with cancer.[1] PET scans were most frequently ordered for patients with ovarian cancer (14%), followed by pancreatic cancer (8%), non-small-cell lung cancer (7%), and small-cell lung cancer (7%). Physicians considered the patients' prognoses as better (42%), unchanged (31%), or worse (26%) compared with the prognosis assessment before receiving information from PET. Physicians reported changing the management plan (switching therapy, adjusting the dose or duration of therapy, or switching to observation or supportive care) in 41% of their patients whose prognosis assessment was better based on PET results, in 35% of patients whose prognosis did not change based on PET results, and in 79% of patients whose prognosis was worse based on PET results.

Use of interim PET to guide therapy decisions is to be distinguished from uses of PET in the initial diagnosis and staging of cancer and other uses after treatment, such as routine surveillance, detection of progression, or recurrence. This use also differs from what has been called "response assessment" or "treatment response" in some reports, which refers to imaging done after completion of therapy for prognosis and future treatment planning. Some differentiate between PET during and after treatment by referring to PET during cancer treatment as "interim treatment response" or "interim staging" and PET at the conclusion of treatment as "restaging."

Regulatory Status
A number of PET scan platforms have been cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process since the Penn-PET scanner was approved in 1989. These systems are intended to aid in detecting, localizing, diagnosing, staging, and restaging of lesions, tumors, disease, and organ function for the evaluation of diseases and disorders such as, but not limited to, cardiovascular disease, neurologic disorders, and cancer. The images produced by the system can aid in radiotherapy treatment planning and interventional radiology procedures.

PET radiopharmaceuticals have been evaluated and approved as drugs by FDA for use as diagnostic imaging agents. These radiopharmaceuticals are approved for specific conditions. In December 2009, FDA issued guidance for Current Good Manufacturing Practice for PET drug manufacturers[2] and, in August 2011, issued similar Current Good Manufacturing Practice guidance for small businesses compounding radiopharmaceuticals.[3] An additional final guidance document issued in December 2012 required all PET drug manufacturers and compounders to operate under an approved

new drug application or abbreviated new drug application, or investigational new drug application, by December 12, 2015.[4]

Table 1 lists some of the radiopharmaceuticals granted FDA approval for use with PET for oncologic-related indications.

Table 1. Radiopharmaceuticals Approved for Use With PET for Carcinoma-Related Indications

Agent	Brand Name	Manufact-urer	Date Approved	NDA No.	Carcinoma-Related Indication With PET
Carbon 11 choline	NA	Various	2012	203155	Suspected prostate cancer recurrence based on elevated blood PSA after therapy and noninformative bone scintigraphy, CT, or MRI
Fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose	NA	Various	2000	20306	Suspected or existing diagnosis of cancer, all types
Fluorine 18 fluciclovine	Axumin™	Blue Earth Diagnostics	2016	208054	Suspected prostate cancer recurrence based on elevated blood PSA levels after treatment
Gallium 68 dotatate	NETSPOT™	Advanced Accelerator Applications	2016	208547	Localization of somatostatin receptor positive NETs in adult and pediatric patients

CT: computed tomography; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; NA: not applicable; NDA: new drug application; NETs: neuroendocrine tumors; PET: positron emission tomography; PSA: prostate-specific antigen.

POLICY

A.   The use of interim florine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography scans to determine response to tyrosine kinase inhibitor treatment in patients with gastrointestinal stromal tumors is considered **medically necessary**.

B.   The use of positron emission tomography scans to determine early response to treatment (positron emission tomography scans done during a planned course of chemotherapy and/or radiation) in patients with gastrointestinal stromal tumors on palliative or adjuvant therapy, as well as all other cancers, is considered **experimental / investigational**.

RATIONALE

This evidence review has been updated with searches of the MEDLINE database. The most recent literature update was performed through July 26, 2018.

Evidence reviews assess the clinical evidence to determine whether the use of a technology improves the net health outcome. Broadly defined, health outcomes are length of life, quality of life, and ability to function—including benefits and harms. Every clinical condition has specific

outcomes that are important to patients and to managing the course of that condition. Validated outcome measures are necessary to ascertain whether a condition improves or worsens; and whether the magnitude of that change is clinically significant. The net health outcome is a balance of benefits and harms.

To assess whether the evidence is sufficient to draw conclusions about the net health outcome of a technology, 2 domains are examined: the relevance and the quality and credibility. To be relevant, studies must represent one or more intended clinical use of the technology in the intended population and compare an effective and appropriate alternative at a comparable intensity. For some conditions, the alternative will be supportive care or surveillance. The quality and credibility of the evidence depend on study design and conduct, minimizing bias and confounding that can generate incorrect findings. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) is preferred to assess efficacy; however, in some circumstances, nonrandomized studies may be adequate. RCTs are rarely large enough or long enough to capture less common adverse events and long-term effects. Other types of studies can be used for these purposes and to assess generalizability to broader clinical populations and settings of clinical practice.

This evidence review discusses only studies that explicitly stated positron emission tomography (PET) was used to guide therapeutic decisions in cancer patients. Most studies that evaluate PET during treatment have analyzed the association between PET findings and various intermediate end points, such as pathologic or clinical response at the end of treatment, PET findings at the end of treatment, or long-term results. Although associations between PET and all these end points have consistently been found for a number of cancers, whether such associations lead directly to improved patient outcomes depends on the specific context of the treatment decisions being made in response to PET findings and available alternatives.

BREAST CANCER
Clinical Context and Test Purpose
The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim computed tomography (CT) in patients with breast cancer is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with breast cancer?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The population of interest is patients with breast cancer.

Interventions
The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators
The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing breast cancer who have initiated treatment to determine therapeutic response and guide decision making: interim CT.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are quality of life (QOL), overall survival (OS), and progression-free survival (PFS).

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing
The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of radiotherapy (RT).

Setting
Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Systematic Reviews
The purpose of the systematic review and meta-analysis by Li et al (2018) relates to the current lack of consensus on the best tool to evaluate pathologic response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) in breast cancer patients.[5] Selection criteria included patients who had undergone both magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and PET/CT after preoperative NAC. The postoperative pathologic result (pathologic complete response [pCR] vs non-pCR) served as the criterion standard for inclusion, and each study required a minimum of 10 patients and associated raw data. The evaluation parameter for MRI was tumor size or maximum diameter, while the parameter for PET/CT was the maximum standardized uptake value (SUVmax) or peak SUV served. The literature search included the Cochrane, PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, and CBM databases from inception to February 2017. Thirteen studies involving 575 patients who underwent MRI and 618 who underwent PET/CT were analyzed. The pooled sensitivity and specificity of MRI were 88% (95% confidence interval [CI] 78% to 94%) and 69% (95% CI, 51% to 83%) and the corresponding PET/CT values were 77% (95% CI, 78% to 94%) and 69% (95% CI, 63% to 885), respectively. The area under the summary receiver operating characteristic curve for MRI and PET/CT were 0.88 and 0.84, respectively. Reviewers concluded that MRI had a higher sensitivity and PET/CT has a higher specificity, but based on the area under the summary receiver operating characteristic curve and anatomic discriminative resolution, MRI was deemed more suitable for predicting breast cancer pathologic response after NAC. Subgroup analysis to address the different definitions of pCR and histology subtypes and various receptor statuses was not conducted due to the limited number of patients, possibly suggesting heterogeneity. Other study limitations included inconsistencies in definitions and criteria, and exclusion of non-English studies.

Lindenberg et al (2017) published a systematic review on the use of imaging (fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose PET [FDG-PET] and dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI) to monitor response to neoadjuvant therapy in patients with breast cancer.[6] The literature search, conducted through March 2015, identified 15 observational studies for inclusion. Studies were assessed for quality using the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS) tool, and all included studies had scores of 8 or higher. Reviewers provided descriptions of the imaging methods (type of imaging, monitoring interval) and results (sensitivity, specificity, negative and positive predictive values) by breast cancer subtype: estrogen receptor (ER)–positive and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2)–negative, triple-negative, HER2-positive, ER-positive and HER2-positive, and ER-negative and HER2-positive. Sensitivity estimates ranged from 18%

to 89%, specificity estimates ranged from 52% to 100%, positive predictive value estimates ranged from 0% to 100%, and negative predictive values ranged from 10% to 84%. Meta-analyses were not performed due to heterogeneity across studies. Studies differed by neoadjuvant chemotherapy regimen and definition of pCR. While reviewers intended to determine the best performing imaging technique by breast cancer subtype, selected articles showed that there is a lack of evidence with adequate statistical power to draw conclusions by each subtype.

To compare the utility of PET/CT with MRI of the breast in the assessment of pCR to NAC, Chen et al (2017) conducted meta-analysis using head-to-head comparative studies.[7] Analysis of 11 studies with a total of 527 patients calculated a pooled sensitivity of 87% (95% CI, 71% to 95%) and a specificity of 85% (95% CI, 70% to 93%) for PET/CT. The pooled sensitivity was 79% (95% CI, 68% to 87%) and the specificity was 82% (95% CI, 72% to 89%) for MRI. Reviewers concluded that diagnostic performance of MRI was similar to that for PET/CT when assessing breast cancer response to NAC, however, they found PET/CT more sensitive than conventional contrast-enhanced MRI (88% [95% CI, 71% to 95%] vs 74% [95% CI, 60% to 85%]; p=0.018) and more specific when scanned within 3 cycles of NAC (94% [95% CI, 78% to 98%] vs 83% [95% CI, 81% to 87%]; p=0.015). Limitations of the studies assessed included small sample sizes, potential publication bias, and the decision to exclude factors such as the definition of pCR and breast cancer phenotypes, which are known to affect estimate accuracy.

Randomized Controlled Trials
Early results of the AVATAXHER (Addition of beVAcizumab to neoadjuvant doceTAXel and trastuzumab [HER]) trial were reported by Coudert et al (2014).[8] This randomized, open-label, multicenter phase 2 trial enrolled women (≥18 years) with early-stage *HER2*-positive breast cancer from 26 oncology centers in France. A total of 142 patients were enrolled between 2010 and 2012. Patients initially received 2 cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (standard regimen). Before the first and second cycles, the change in SUV measured by FDG-PET was used to predict pathologic complete PET responders continued to receive standard therapy. FDG-PET nonresponders were randomized (2:1) to 4 cycles of 1 chemotherapy regimen or to continue on the standard regimen. Investigators and patients were unblinded, but the pathologist in charge of central surgical sample and lymph node reviews was blinded. The primary endpoint was centrally assessed pathologic complete response according to the Chevallier classification.

Of the 142 patients, 69 were PET responders after 2 cycles and 73 were nonresponders. Pathologic complete responses were noted in 37 (54%) of the FDG-PET responders. In the randomized participants (PET nonresponders), 27 (37%) of 73 achieved pCR, as did 21 (43.8%; 95% CI, 29.5% to 58.8%) of those in PET-directed therapy group, and 6 (24.0%; 95% CI, 9.4% to 45.1%) of those in standard therapy group. Incidences of grade 3 or 4 adverse events were similar in both groups, with the most common grade being neutropenia and febrile neutropenia. Fifteen serious adverse events were reported in 11 (15%) of 73 patients. No deaths occurred during the trial. OS or PFS results were not available at reporting.

Nonrandomized Studies
Several clinical studies of breast cancer in the neoadjuvant setting have demonstrated associations between early or interim PET and recurrence, response, or survival outcomes.[9-19]

Kitajima et al (2018) compared the response classifications Positron Emission Tomography Response Criteria in Solid Tumors (PERCIST), version 1.0, with Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST), version 1.1, to evaluate the pathologic therapeutic response to NAC in 32 breast cancer patients who underwent both MRI and FDG-PET.[20] Based on RECIST 1.1 using MRI measurements, treatment efficacy was graded as complete response in 5 (15.6%) patients, partial response in 25 (78.1%), stable disease in 2 (6.3%), and progressive disease in 0. Based on PERCIST 1.0 with FDG-PET/CT findings, treatment efficacy was graded as complete metabolic response in 28 (87.5%) patients, partial metabolic response in 2 (6.3%), stable metabolic disease in 1 (3.1%), and progressive metabolic disease in 1 (3.1%). Concordance between RECIST 1.1 and PERCIST 1.0 classifications was found in 7 (21.9%) cases, while discordance was found in 25 (78.1%)(κ=0.103, p<0.001). This study found the 2 classifications to be complementary in predicting pathologic response to NAC. Study limitations include the retrospective design, small sample size collected at a single-center, and inability to analyze OS due to a small number of deaths in the cohort (n=3).

In a multicenter study of 59 breast cancer patients, Kitajima et al (2018) found that, based on PERCIST response, FDG-PET/CT underestimated the residual tumor volume following NAC and had both a relatively low specificity for pCR and positive predictive value, and that a combination of other imaging modalities would still be needed to predict pCR of primary tumors.[21] Other limitations included retrospective design, small sample size, heterogeneous chemotherapy regimen across centers, and an inability to assess OS.

Retrospectively, Yoon et al (2018) investigated the prognostic value of tumor heterogeneity using analysis of texture parameters with FDG-PET and diffusion-weighted imaging in 83 patients who had locally advanced breast cancer and had completed NAC.[22] Among the 83 patients, 46 were pathologic responders and 37 nonresponders. Authors concluded the results suggested that texture-based analysis of tumor heterogeneity on FDG-PET/CT and diffusion-weighted imaging could be used to predict NAC response and disease recurrence in this population, and in particular, higher metabolic heterogeneity on PET was a significant predictor of unfavorable response to chemotherapy and a worse disease prognosis (p=0.009).

Quantitative indexes of PET findings used to identify response vs nonresponse on PET or PET plus CT may depend on the type of chemotherapy and tumor phenotype.[23,24] For example, van Ramshorst et al (2017) found that for patients with triple-negative tumors (n=45) receiving neoadjuvant systemic therapy, FDG-PET/CT of the breast can predict pCR, while patients with *HER2*-positive tumors (n=60) may need both FDG-PET/CT of the breast and axilla for a more accurate pCR.[25]

In a larger study, Schmitz et al (2017) assessed 188 women with stages II or III breast cancer who underwent MRI and FDG-PET/CT before and after neoadjuvant chemotherapy.[26] Analyses were stratified by tumor type: *HER2*-positive, ER-positive and *HER2*-negative, and triple-negative. The primary outcome was pCR defined as no or only small numbers of scattered invasive tumor cells. Results showed that for *HER2*-positive tumors, MRI was a significantly better predictor of pCR than FDG-PET/CT. For ER-positive and *HER2*-negative tumors, combining MRI and FDG-PET/CT might provide the best monitoring of treatment, though results were not statistically significant. For triple-negative tumors, the 2 imaging techniques performed equally in predicting pCR.

Riedl et al (2017) compared the efficacy of FDG-PET/CT with contrast-enhanced CT for the primary outcomes of PFS and disease-free survival in 65 patients undergoing systemic therapy for stage IV breast cancer.[27] Treatment response was evaluated using RECIST for contrast-enhanced CT and using PERCIST for PET. Results suggested that PET/CT was superior to contrast-enhanced CT in predicting PFS and disease-free survival. For example, responses using RECIST and PERCIST both correlated with PFS, but PERCIST showed significantly higher predictive accuracy (concordance index for PFS: 0.70 vs 0.60), and at 1 year, responders vs nonresponder rates using RECIST were 59% vs 27%,compared with 63% vs 0% using PERCIST, respectively. At 4 years, disease-free survival for responders and nonresponder rates using RECIST were 50% and 38%, respectively (p=0.2, concordance index: 0.55) compared with 58% and 18% using PERCIST (p<0.001, concordance index: 0.65). Use of multiple therapy protocols, inclusion of various breast cancer subtypes, small sample size, and a retrospective design limit conclusions drawn from this study.

Very little data are available on the use of FDG-PET or FDG-PET/CT to guide management decisions.[28] [29]

Section Summary: Breast Cancer

Evidence for the clinical validity of interim FDG-PET for monitoring disease in patients with breast cancer includes several systematic reviews, numerous observational studies, and a randomized control trial Results from the systematic reviews showed wide ranges in sensitivities, specificities, positive predictive values, and negative predictive values. The wide ranges may be due to small sample sizes, use of different definitions of the primary outcome (pCR), and differences in breast cancer subtypes in the sample populations. Data from observational studies have suggested a need for considering breast cancer subtype and the type of treatment in creating criteria for assessing early prediction of response with PET. Evidence for the clinical utility of interim FDG-PET or PET/CT to evaluate early response in breast cancer is limited and consists of early results of an RCT that included patients identified as nonresponders by interim PET randomized to more intensive chemotherapy or standard care. The results showed higher response rates in the more intensive group, but clinical outcomes such as PFS or OS were not available. As yet, the evidence does not permit conclusions on whether PET improves health outcomes because data are not available showing that response-adaptive therapy leads to improved outcomes.

ESOPHAGEAL CANCER

The current treatment strategy for patients with esophageal cancer depends on the cancer stage. Patients who do not have lymph node involvement and have no evidence of metastases usually undergo surgery alone. Patients with locally advanced disease are often offered neoadjuvant treatment (chemotherapy and/or chemoradiotherapy) followed by esophagectomy.

Clinical Context and Test Purpose

The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT in patients with esophageal cancer is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies. Specifically, the goal of using interim FDG-PET is to determine whether the tumors would respond to the neoadjuvant therapy, which in turn would inform a decision to offer neoadjuvant therapy or proceed directly to surgery.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with esophageal cancer?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The population of interest is patients with esophageal cancer.

Interventions
The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators
The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing those with esophageal cancer: interim CT.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are QOL, OS, and PFS.

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing
The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of RT.

Setting
Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Systematic Reviews
Cong et al (2016) published a meta-analysis on the predictive value of FDG-PET for the pathologic response during and after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (NCRT) in patients with esophageal cancer.[30] The literature review, conducted through January 2016, identified 15 publications. Four studies (n=192 patients) conducted PET during NCRT, and 11 studies (n=490 patients) conducted PET after NCRT. Study quality was assessed using QUADAS scores, which ranged from 9 to 12 (total points, 14) in the included studies. Only 5 studies described blinding of the pathology reviewers to FDG-PET data and other test results. The pooled sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic odds ratio for the studies conducting PET during NCRT were: 85% (95% CI, 76% to 91%), 59% (95% CI, 48% to 69%), and 6.8 (95% CI, 2.3 to 20.7), respectively. The pooled sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic odds ratio for the studies conducting PET after NCRT were: 67% (95% CI, 60% to 73%), 69% (95% CI, 63% to 74%), and 6.3 (95% CI, 2.1 to 19.3), respectively. Subgroup analyses of studies that conducted PET after NCRT and included only patients with squamous cell carcinoma (4 studies, 129 patients), showed higher pooled a sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic odds ratio: 90% (95% CI, 80% to 96%), 69% (95% CI, 56% to 80%), and 17.3 (95% CI, 3.1 to 95.4), respectively. Reviewers concluded that FDG-PET should not be used routinely to guide treatment strategies in patients with esophageal cancer based on the low pooled estimates; however, PET may be considered for the subset of patients with squamous cell carcinoma.

Nonrandomized Studies

Van Rossum et al (2017) published a study evaluating the use of FDG-PET before and after induction chemotherapy to predict response to subsequent chemoradiotherapy in patients with adenocarcinoma.[32] Patients who were to receive a 3-step treatment strategy of induction chemotherapy, followed by chemoradiotherapy and then surgery (N=70), underwent FDG-PET before and after the induction chemotherapy phase of the treatment. PET identified 27 patients with poor pathologic responses to the induction chemotherapy (defined as <26% reduction in total lesion glycolysis after chemotherapy). After a median follow-up of 48 months (range, 15-99 months), PFS was significantly lower among patients identified by PET as poor responders compared with patients identified by PET as good responders.

Hagen et al (2017) published a study evaluating the predictive value of FDG-PET before and 2 weeks after chemoradiotherapy in 106 patients with esophageal cancer who then underwent potentially curative surgery.[33] The outcome of metabolic response, stable disease, or progression was assessed using PERCIST. Patients were followed until disease recurrence or death. Minimum follow-up of surviving patients was 60 months. Five-year disease-free survival rates for patients determined by FDG-PET as having a metabolic response, stable disease, or progression were 66%, 53%, and 67%, respectively. These rates did not differ statistically. The authors concluded that FDG-PET should not be used as a prognostic tool for these patients.

Retrospective Studies

A retrospective study by Odawara et al (2018) compared classification using RECIST and PERCIST in the assessment of response to NAC for 62 patients who had esophageal cancer.[34] Patients underwent FDG-PET/CT, contrast-enhanced CT scanning, esophageal fiberscopy, endoscopic ultrasonography, or esophagography before and after NAC. Patients were divided into responders and nonresponders by pathologic response, and concordance between RECIST and PERCIST for response classification was seen in 28 (45.2%) patients. The authors concluded that PERSIST might be better suited to evaluate neoadjuvant therapeutic response to esophageal cancer. Study limitations included the retrospective design, small sample size, and single institution sample, as well as the lack of correlation between PERCIST criteria and prognosis.

Manoharan et al (2017) published a study evaluating the use of FDG-PET before and after neoadjuvant therapy in patients with resectable distal esophageal cancer (n=21) and gastric adenocarcinoma (n=14).[35] Maximum and percent change of both SUV and metabolic tumor volume (MTV) were measured and correlated with tumor regression and survival to assess predictive value. The best PET-based biomarker for predicting pathologic response and survival was percent change in maximum SUV (SUVmax). Patients with 70% or more change in SUVmax had lower risks of death and recurrence than patients with less than 70% SUVmax.

Section Summary: Esophageal Cancer

Evidence for the clinical validity of FDG-PET as an adjunct to CT to determine early treatment response for patients with esophageal cancer consists of a meta-analysis, 3 nonrandomized studies, and 2 retrospective studies. Results were inconsistent across studies. Results from the meta-analyses showed low pooled sensitivities and specificities, indicating FDG-PET may be a poor guide to inform treatment strategies in patients with esophageal cancer. One of the nonrandomized trials published after the meta-analysis supported this conclusion. However, a subgroup analysis in the meta-analysis that included only studies of patients with squamous cell carcinoma, and 2 studies published after the meta-analysis, reported that FDG-PET could

adequately predict responders to neoadjuvant therapy. No evidence was identified examining the clinical validity of FDG-PET for patients with esophageal cancer.

GASTROINTESTINAL STROMAL TUMORS

Palliative or Adjuvant Therapy

Clinical Context and Test Purpose

The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT in patients with gastrointestinal stromal tumors (GIST) who are receiving palliative or adjuvant therapy is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with GIST who are receiving palliative or adjuvant therapy?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients

The population of interest is patients with GIST who are receiving palliative or adjuvant therapy.

Interventions

The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators

The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing those with GIST: interim CT.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are QOL, OS, and PFS.

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing

The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of RT.

Setting

Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Systematic Reviews

A systematic review by Treglia et al (2012) assessed studies of FDG-PET for evaluating treatment response to imatinib and other drugs to treat GIST.[36] Reviewers identified 2 studies (n=44 patients) relative to this patient population that did not show an association between PET and long-term (>6 months) response to tyrosine kinase inhibitors. None of the reviewed studies assessed the impact of PET-directed treatment changes on net health outcome.

Section Summary: Palliative or Adjuvant Therapy
There were no studies identified to provide support for long-term PET-guided palliative or adjuvant treatment of patients with GIST.

With Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitors
Clinical Context and Test Purpose
The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT in patients with GIST treated with tyrosine kinase inhibitors for less than 6 months is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with GIST treated with tyrosine kinase inhibitors?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The population of interest includes patients with GIST treated with tyrosine kinase inhibitors less than 6 months.

Interventions
The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators
The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing those with GIST: interim CT.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are QOL, OS, and PFS.

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing
The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of RT.

Setting
Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Systematic Reviews
The systematic review by Treglia et al (2012) assessed studies of FDG-PET for evaluating treatment response to imatinib and other drugs in GIST.[36] Reviewers concluded that "FDG PET allows an early assessment of treatment response and is a strong predictor of clinical outcome." This conclusion was based on 19 studies (n=192 patients) that showed associations between PET as early as 1 week after initiation of tyrosine kinase inhibitor (imatinib, sunitinib, masitinib) therapy and survival outcomes. None of the reviewed studies assessed the impact of PET-directed treatment changes on net health outcome. A chain of evidence was identified; in

patients with borderline resectable GIST involvement, rapid assessment of treatment response can guide clinical decision making regarding the surgical approach or addition of second-line treatment.[37,38]

Retrospective Studies

A 2009 National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) task force report (included in the Treglia review) identified a small retrospective study of 20 patients with GIST who were treated with the tyrosine kinase inhibitor imatinib and underwent PET, CT, and PET/CT imaging.[37] PET/CT was more accurate than either PET or CT alone for detecting tumor response at 1, 3, and 6 months after initiation of imatinib. Based on this study, the task force recommended PET for response assessment to targeted GIST therapy.

Section Summary: With Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitors

Evidence for the clinical validity of the use of interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to CT to evaluate treatment response in patients with GIST consists of a systematic review of 19 studies. Seventeen of the studies found that interim FDG-PET adequately measured tumor response to tyrosine kinase inhibitors (imatinib, sunitinib, masitinib), and could be a strong predictor of clinical outcome as early as 1 month after initiating treatment. While CT detects anatomic changes in the tumor, FDG-PET detects changes in metabolic activity of the tumor. Because metabolic changes precede anatomic changes by several weeks or even months, FDG-PET can detect treatment response earlier, compared with CT's size-based criteria. PET is therefore preferred if a rapid read-out of response to targeted therapy is needed to guide treatment decisions.

HEAD AND NECK CANCER

Clinical Context and Test Purpose

The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT in patients with head and neck cancer is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with head and neck cancer?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients

The population of interest is patients with head and neck cancer.

Interventions

The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators

The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing those with head and neck cancer: interim CT.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are QOL, OS, and PFS.

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing
The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of RT.

Setting
Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Systematic Reviews
The diagnostic value of FGD-PET/CT used to evaluate treatment response in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma was analyzed in a systematic review and meta-analysis by Helsen et al (2018).[39] A search of the MEDLINE and Web of Knowledge databases, identified 20 studies (total N=1293 patients). The pooled sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic odds ratio were 85% (95% CI, 76% to 91%), 93% (95% CI, 89% to 96%), and 76 (95% CI, 35 to 165), respectively. Positive and negative predictive values were 58% and 98% at a prevalence of 10%, and significant heterogeneity was shown between trials (p<0.001). FDG-PET/CT within 6 months of chemoradiotherapy was a reliable detector of residual/recurrent nodal disease in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma patients. This analysis suggested that the timing of FDG-PET/CT after therapy completion is important particularly after 11 weeks.

Min et al (2017) published a systematic review of the predictive value of functional imaging (MRI, CT, PET) in patients with mucosal primary head and neck cancer treated with RT.[40] The literature search, conducted through March 2015, identified 99 studies for inclusion, 7 of which used interim PET/CT and 9 which used different radiotracers with PET (fluorine 18 misonidazole, fluorine 18 thymidine, fluoroazomycin arabinoside, and methionine carbon 11). Study quality assessment was not mentioned in the review. Five of the 7 studies using PET/CT confirmed the predictive value of PET for disease-free survival and OS. The non-FDG-PET studies had small sample sizes and inconsistent results. One study showed that fluorine 18 thymidine may have better predictive value than FDG.

Castelli et al (2016) published a systematic review of the predictive value of FDG-PET/CT for patients with head and neck cancer who were treated with chemoradiotherapy.[41] The literature search, conducted through March 2016, identified 45 studies for inclusion. Most studies evaluated the predictive value of FDG-PET for diagnosing head and neck cancer. Seven of the studies (n=374 patients) investigated interim FDG-PET in patients receiving RT with or without chemotherapy. Five of the 7 studies overlapped with those identified in the 2017 Min review. Study quality assessment was not mentioned in the review. Six of the 7 studies reported a correlation between PET measurements (SUVmax, total lesion glycolysis, MTV) and clinical outcomes (disease-free survival, OS). The optimal time to perform FDG-PET during treatment is unclear, though most studies used PET after 3 weeks of treatment. Meta-analyses were not conducted.

Dos Anjos et al (2016) published a systematic review of the effectiveness of FDG-PET/CT for patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma receiving induction chemotherapy.[42] The literature search, conducted through May 2016, identified 7 articles for inclusion (n=207 patients). Based on an Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality checklist for assessing the

quality of observational studies, the articles were considered to have a moderate risk of bias. Methodologic limitations included incomplete explanations of confounding variables and absence of follow-up. Six of the 7 articles reported that FDG-PET/CT provided an adequate early response prediction of survival. Meta-analysis could not be conducted due to the heterogeneity in response criteria, SUVmax thresholds, and outcomes.

Section Summary: Head and Neck Cancer
Evidence for the clinical validity of interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to CT in predicting disease-free survival and OS in patients with head and neck cancer consists of several systematic reviews. Most showed that FDG-PET used during RT, with or without chemotherapy, can adequately predict disease-free survival and OS. Meta-analyses could not be performed in any of the systematic reviews due to the heterogeneity in the methods used across the studies to determine response. Most studies used SUVmax, however, thresholds varied across the studies. No studies were identified that could provide evidence for the clinical utility of interim FDG-PET for patients with head and neck cancer.

LYMPHOMA
Clinical Context and Test Purpose
The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT in patients with lymphoma is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with lymphoma?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The population of interest is patients with lymphoma.

Interventions
The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators
The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing those with lymphoma: interim CT.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are QOL, OS, and PFS.

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing
The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of RT.

Setting
Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Systematic Reviews

Adams and Kwee (2016) published a systematic review and meta-analysis calculating false-positive rates of FDG-PET during and at the end of treatment, using biopsy as the reference standard in patients with lymphoma and FDG-avid lesions.[43] Overall methodologic study quality was moderate, as assessed by the QUADAS-2 tool. Table 2 summarizes the pooled false-positive rates.

Table 2. Pooled False-Positive Rates

Treatment	Condition	No. of Studies	False-Positive Rate	95% CI, %
Interim FDG-PET	Hodgkin lymphoma	0		
Interim FDG-PET	Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	4	83	72 to 90
End-of-treatment FDG-PET	Hodgkin lymphoma	3	23	5 to 65
End-of-treatment FDG-PET	Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	2	31	4 to 84

CI: confidence interval; FDG-PET: fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography.

Reviewers questioned the use of FDG-PET for assessing lymphoma treatment due to these high false- positive rates. FDG-PET exposes patients to potentially harmful levels of radiation and may provide misinformation leading to incorrect treatment changes and/or unnecessary biopsies.

A Cochrane systematic review by Sickinger et al (2015) evaluating interim FDG-PET-adapted therapy following first-line treatment in Hodgkin lymphoma.[44] The search strategy included RCTs comparing PET-adapted therapy to nonadapted therapy in patients with previously untreated Hodgkin lymphoma of all stages and ages published in Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, MEDLINE, or presented at conference proceedings from 1990 to 2014. Reviewers found 2 publications and 1 abstract for a total of 3 eligible trials (total N=1480 participants).[45-47] The quality of the evidence for the primary outcome of PFS was considered moderate. In all 3 trials, PET-adapted therapy included no RT after PET-negative results following initial chemotherapy. The pooled estimate of PFS was shorter in participants with PET-adapted therapy (without RT) than in those receiving standard treatment with RT (hazard ratio [HR], 2.38; 95% CI, 1.62 to 3.50; p<0.001). The authors were unable to draw conclusions about OS due to the small number of deaths reported in the 3 trials. The studies included little to no data on response rates, treatment-related mortality, QOL, or short- and long-term adverse events.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Interim PET-Negative

Patients with PET-negative results following induction chemotherapy tend to have a good prognosis. The goal of PET-directed therapy is to achieve similar efficacy concerning PFS while avoiding unnecessary exposure to radiation, which can have toxic side effects, including late secondary cancers[48,49] and cardiovascular disease[50,51] or to reduce the side effects of additional chemotherapy by decreasing the number of cycles or chemotherapeutic agents.

Five RCTs have compared PET-directed therapy with standard therapy in patients who had lymphoma and had negative interim PET findings after an initial course of chemotherapy. Three

studies were evaluated in the Cochrane review (2015; previously described). Characteristics of the studies are summarized in Table 3 and briefly below.

A phase 2 RCT by Casasnovas et al (2017) evaluated the use of interim FDG-PET in the treatment of 200 patients with diffuse large B-cell lymphoma.[52] FDG-PET was conducted after cycles 2 (PET2) and cycles 4 (PET4) of induction therapy. Patients who were PET4-positive (n=100) were advised to proceed with a salvage regimen followed by autologous cell transplantation; the final treatment decision was made by the patients and their clinicians. Patients who were PET4-negative (n=100) were given different therapies depending on whether the PET2 was negative or positive. PET2- and PET4-patients (n=52) were treated with 8 cycles of various chemotherapy regimens. PET2-positive and PET4-negative patients (n=48) were treated with 3 cycles of different chemotherapy regimens, followed by autologous cell transplantation.

Wong-Sefidan et al (2017) published a study evaluating the predictive value of FDG-PET/CT on survival in patients with follicular lymphoma.[53] Among 1289 patients in the National LymphoCare Study, 447 underwent FDG-PET/CT following rituximab induction therapy. After a median follow-up of 7.6 years, the 5-year OS rate for PET-negative patients (n=292) was 88%, and the PFS rate was 65%.

The trial reported by Johnson et al (2016) randomized 937 newly diagnosed advanced classic Hodgkin lymphoma patients (median age, 33 years; 55% men) who had a negative interim PET coupled with CT scan after an initial 2 cycles of standard chemotherapy to continued standard chemothearpy for 4 cycles or to a different combination of chemotherapy agents (PET-directed therapy).[54] A Deauville score of 1, 2, or 3 was regarded as indicating negative PET findings, and a score of 4 or 5 as indicating positive PET findings. The trial evaluated the noninferiority of the chemotherapy regimen in the PET-directed therapy for 3-year PFS with a 5% point margin for the risk difference.

The RAPID study, reported by Radford et al (2015) recruited 602 patients (53.3% male; median age, 34 years) with newly diagnosed stage IA or stage IIA Hodgkin lymphoma, of whom 571 patients received 3 cycles of chemotherapy and then PET scanning performed on full-ring PET or PET with CT cameras.[45] A Deauville score of 1 or 2 indicated negative findings and a score of 3, 4, or 5 indicated positive findings. A total of 420 patients with negative PET findings were randomized to involved-field RT (standard therapy) or no further treatment (PET-directed therapy). This trial assessed the noninferiority of no further treatment, designed to exclude a difference in the 3-year PFS rate of 7 or more percentage points from the assumed 95% PFS rate in the RT group.

Raemaekers et al (2014) published a preplanned interim futility analysis of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer/Lymphoma Study Association/Fondazione Italiana Linfomi (EORTC/LYSA/FIL) Intergroup H10 trial.[47] The trial randomized patients who had previously untreated stage I or II Hodgkin lymphoma to PET-directed therapy or standard therapy. Standard therapy was chemotherapy plus 30-gray radiation. PET images were scored according to the International Harmonization Project criteria, with a negative PET corresponding to scores 1 (no uptake) and 2 (uptake ≤ mediastinum) on the 5-point Deauville scale. Patients in the PET-directed therapy arm who had a negative early PET scan (after 2 chemotherapy cycles) did not receive RT but received additional chemotherapy cycles. Patients with favorable or

unfavorable prognostic factors were analyzed separately. The trial design was noninferiority, with margins for the HRs of 3.2 and 2.1 for favorable and unfavorable, respectively.

Picardi et al (2007) reported on a trial of PET-directed therapy vs standard therapy in 160 patients (median age, 31 years; 55% men) with newly diagnosed bulky Hodgkin lymphoma.[46] PET scans were performed using a dedicated tomography scanner (Advanced NXi, General Electrics). Negative PET was defined as no evidence of uptake, and positive PET was defined as increased uptake in a focus within an abnormal area. Patients having negative PET scans following induction chemotherapy with 6 cycles of chemotherapy were randomized to observation (PET-directed therapy) or 32-gray RT (standard therapy). The study was powered to detect a 10% risk difference in event-free survival, defined as relapse, secondary malignancies, or death from any cause; the specific hypothesis (superiority vs noninferiority) was not reported.

Table 3. Summary of Key RCT Characteristics of PET-Guided Therapy in PET-Negative Patients

Study; Trial	Countries	Sites	Dates	Participants	Interventions	
					PET-Directed	Standard
Casasnovas et al (2017)[52]	France		2007-2010	High-risk DLBCL	48 PET2+/ PET4-	52 PET2-/PET4-
Johnson et al (2016)[54]	5 European countries plus Australia, NZ	138	2008-2012	Untreated stage IIA (with adverse features) or IIB-IV HL	465	470
Radford et al (2015)[45]; RAPID	U.K.	94	2003-2010	Untreated stage IA/IIA HL	211	209
Raemaekers et al (2014)[47]; EORTC/ LYSA/FIL H10	8 European countries	158	2006-2011	Untreated stage I/II HL	• 221 favorable prognoses[a] • 347 unfavorable prognoses[a]	• 233 favorable prognoses[a] • 346 unfavorable prognoses[a]
Picardi et al (2007)[46]	NR	NR	2000-2006	Untreated bulky HL	80	80

DLBCL: diffuse large B-cell lymphoma; ESR: erythrocyte sedimentation rate; HL: Hodgkin lymphoma; NR: not reported; PET2/4: 2 or 4 cycles of positron emission tomography; RCT: randomized controlled trial; NZ: New Zealand.
[a] Favorable prognosis: age <50 y with ≤3 involved nodal areas, absence of mediastinal bulk (mediastinum-to-thorax ratio <0.35), and ESR <50 mm without B symptoms or ESR <30 mm with B symptoms; Unfavorable prognosis: age ≥50 y, >4 involved nodal areas, presence of mediastinal bulk (mediastinum-to-thorax ratio ≥0.35), or ESR ≥50 mm without B symptoms or ESR ≥30 mm with B symptoms.

The results of these 5 RCTs for PET-directed therapy in PET-negative lymphoma patients are summarized in Table 4 and below.

In the Casasnovas trial, median follow-up was 45 months (range, 1-63 months).[52] Of the 100 patients who were PET4-negative, 55 progressed or relapsed and 39 died. There was no significant difference in 4-year PFS or OS between the 2 treatment groups. The trialists proposed that the flawed criteria were used to determine PET-positive and -negative classifications. The International Harmonization Project criteria were used because these criteria were accepted at the time of the trial launch. The International Harmonization Project criteria are now known to

generate high false-positive results. The authors suggested that SUVmax may guide treatment decisions more effectively.

In the Johnson trial, median follow-up was 41 months.[54] There were 68 vs 74 events of disease progression, relapse, or death in the standard chemotherapy group vs the PET-directed therapy group, respectively (HR with PET-directed therapy, 1.13; 95% CI, 0.81 to 1.57; p=0.48). Three-year PFS rate was 85.7% (95% CI, 82.1% to 88.6%) in the standard chemotherapy group and 84.4% (95% CI, 80.7% to 87.5%) in the PET-directed therapy group (risk difference [RD], 1.6 percentage points; 95% CI, -3.2 to 5.3); CIs included the noninferiority margin. Three-year OS rates were similar in both 2 groups: 97.2% (95% CI, 95.1% to 98.4%) with standard chemotherapy and 97.6% (95% CI, 95.6% to 98.7%) with PET-directed therapy. Grade 3 and 4 respiratory adverse events were more severe in the standard chemotherapy group than in the PET-directed therapy group, and the difference in change in the diffusing capacity of the lung for carbon monoxide from baseline to the completion of therapy was -7.4% (95% CI, -5.1% to -9.7%; p<0.001).

In the RAPID trial, with a median of 60 months of follow-up, 8 instances of disease progression occurred in the RT group (standard therapy), and 8 patients had died (3 with disease progression, one of whom died from Hodgkin lymphoma); 20 instances of disease progression occurred in the group with no further therapy (PET-directed therapy), and 4 patients had died (2 with disease progression and none from Hodgkin lymphoma).[45] The 3-year PFS rate was 95% (95% CI, 91.5% to 97.7%) in the RT group and 90.8% (95% CI, 86.9% to 94.8%) in the group that received no further therapy; the absolute RD was -3.8 percentage points (95% CI, -8.8 to 1.3) and the CIs included the noninferiority margin.

The EORTC/LYSA/FIL H10 trial (2014) performed a prespecified interim analysis including 1124 randomized patients (favorable group, n=441; unfavorable group, n=683) with a median follow-up of 1.1 years.[47] Progression or death was more common among patients in PET-guided therapy arms than in standard therapy arms of both groups (5% vs 0.5%, respectively, in the favorable group; 6% vs 3%, respectively, in the unfavorable group). Estimated HRs for progression or death were 9.4 (80% CI, 2.5 to 35.7) in the favorable group and 2.4 (80% CI, 1.4 to 4.4) in the unfavorable group. Based on these findings, futility was declared, and accrual to the early PET-negative experimental arm was discontinued.

In the Picardi trial, all 80 patients were included in the analysis with a median of 40 months of follow-up.[46] Events were more common in the PET-directed arm. Eleven (14%) events vs 3 (4%) events were reported, corresponding to an event-free survival rate of 86% in the PET-directed arm vs 96% in the standard arm (HR for standard therapy, 3.32; 95% CI, 1.13 to 9.76; p=0.03). Twenty percent of patients in PET-directed vs 22% in standard therapy experienced a hematologic toxicity of at least World Health Organization grade 2. The nonhematologic toxicity (including pneumonitis, cardiovascular abnormality, and peripheral neuropathy) of at least World Health Organization grade 2 was 5% in both groups. No deaths were reported.

Table 4. Summary of Key RCT Trial Results of PET-Guided Therapy in PET-Negative Patients

Study or Trial	Primary Outcome	Results (95% CI)
Casasnovas et al (2017)[52]	PFS and OS (n=48 vs n=52)	4-y PFS: • PET2+: 85% (71.1% to 92.6%) • PET2-: 75% (60.9% to 84.5%) 4-y OS: • PET2+: 90.4% (81% to 95.1%) • PET2-: 89.6% (85% to 92.2%)
Johnson et al (2016)[54]	PFS (n=470 vs n=465)	• 3-y PFS: 84.4% (80.7% to 87.5%) vs 85.7% (82.1% to 88.6%) • HR for ST, 1.13 (0.81 to 1.57) • RD for ST, 1.6 (-3.2 to 5.3)
Radford et al (2015)[45]; RAPID	PFS (n=211 vs n=209)	• 3-y PFS: 90.8% (86.9% to 94.8%) vs 94.6% (91.5% to 97.7%) • HR for PET-directed, 0.51 (0.15 to 1.68) • RD for PET-directed, -3.8 (-8.8 to 1.3)
Raemaekers et al (2014)[47]; EORTC/LYSA/FIL H10	PFS (favorable: n=188 vs n=193[a]; unfavorable: n=251 vs n=268[a])	Favorable: • PFS at 1 y: 94.9% vs 100% • 9 vs 1 events[a,b] • HR for ST, 9.36 (2.45 to 35.73) Unfavorable: • PFS at 1 y: 94.7% vs 97.3% • 16 vs 7 events[a,b] • HR for ST, 2.42 (1.35 to 4.36)
Picardi et al (2007)[46]	EFS	• EFS: 69 (86%) vs 77 (96%) • HR for ST, 3.32 (1.13 to 9.76)

CI: confidence interval; EFS: event-free survival; HR: hazard ratio; OS: overall survival; PET: positron emission tomography; PET2: 2 cycles of positron emission tomography; PFS: progression-free survival; RCT: randomized controlled trial: RD: risk difference; ST: standard therapy.
[a] Results from interim analysis.
[b] Events of progression, relapse, or death.

Interim PET-Positive

The goal of PET-directed therapy for PET-positive patients is to intensify therapy for those at highest risk of treatment failure to improve PFS or OS. The trial by Casasnovas et al (2017) described in the PET-negative section above also included patients who were PET-positive after induction chemotherapy.[52] For patients who were PET-positive after induction therapy, guidance was given to proceed with a salvage regimen followed by autologous cell transplantation, though the final treatment decision was left to the patient's clinician. The 4-year PFS rate was lower in patients who were PET-positive (72.9%; 95% CI, 63.1% to 80.6%) than in patients who were PET-negative following induction therapy (79.8%; 95% CI, 79.4% to 86.4%). The 4-year OS rate was also lower in PET-positive patients (80%; 95% CI, 69.0% to 87.5%) than in PET-negative patients (88.9%; 95% CI, 82.1% to 94.4%).

Wong-Sefidan et al (2017) evaluated the predictive value of FDG-PET/CT on survival in patients with follicular lymphoma.[53] Among 1289 patients in the National LymphoCare Study, 447 underwent FDG-PET/CT following rituximab induction therapy. After a median follow-up of 7.6 years, the 5-year OS rate for PET-positive patients (n=155) was 78% and the PFS rate was 51%.

Both the RAPID trial (2015)[45] and the Johnson trial (2016)[54] included observation of patients with a positive interim PET after initial induction chemotherapy, although neither trial had a randomized comparison in the PET-positive group. In the RAPID trial, 145 patients with positive PET findings received a fourth cycle of chemotherapy and involved-field RT. After a median of 62 months of follow-up, there were 18 events of progression, relapse, or death for a PFS rate in the PET-positive patients of 87.6% (precision not given). In the Johnson trial, 182 patients with a positive PET received accelerated or escalated chemotherapy regimens. There were 55 events of disease progression, relapse, or death in the PET-positive group. The 3-year PFS rate was 67.5% (95% CI, 59.7% to 74.2%) and the OS rate was 87.8% (95% CI, 81.5% to 92.1%).

As previously described, the EORTC/LYSA/FIL H10 trial (2014) randomized 1925 patients who had previously untreated stage I or II Hodgkin lymphoma to PET-directed therapy or standard therapy; patients in the PET-directed therapy arm who had a positive early PET scan (after 2 chemotherapy cycles) received intensified chemotherapy.[47] Available results were presented at the 13th International Conference on Malignant Lymphoma in June 2015.[55] These preliminary results indicated improvement in 5-year PFS rates in the PET-directed arm (91%) vs standard arm (77%; HR=0.42; 95% CI, 0.23 to 0.74; p=0.002) and were confirmed in the final results from the trial, published by André et al (2017).[56]

Other Clinical Studies
Some single-arm early-phase trials, observational studies, and secondary analyses of RCT data that have assessed outcomes of patients with Hodgkin lymphoma and diffuse large B-cell lymphoma who received treatment changes based on interim PET/CT scans suggest that some chemotherapeutic regimens can be intensified or switched to less-toxic regimens without harm.[57-66]

Conclusions of single-arm and retrospective studies may be limited by selection and lead-time bias and lack concurrent comparators. Given the potential for biases, comparative trials would be necessary to determine the efficacy of such a strategy.

Section Summary: Lymphoma
Evidence for the validity of using interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to CT consists of a systematic review, which has shown high false-positive rates for patients with Hodgkin or non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Evidence for the utility of interim FDG-PET for guided treatment in patients with lymphoma consists of a Cochrane review and several RCTs. The Cochrane review reported lower PFS in patients receiving PET-guided therapy compared with patients receiving standard care. Two retrospective studies published after the review evaluated interim FDG-PET in patients with follicular lymphoma and T-lymphoblastic leukemia/lymphoma; the studies showed that PET may have potential in predicting survival in these specific lymphomas. In the RCTs comparing PET-guided therapy with standard therapy, results did not show noninferiority.

NON-CELL SMALL-CELL LUNG CANCER
Clinical Context and Test Purpose
The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with NSCLC?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The population of interest is patients with NSCLC.

Interventions
The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators
The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing those with NSCLC: interim CT.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are QOL, OS, and PFS.

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing
The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of RT.

Setting
Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Nonrandomized Studies
Twelve studies identified have evaluated a potential association between interim FDG-PET analyses during various treatments and OS or PFS in patients with NSCLC.[67-78] The studies included patients with various stages of NSCLC, receiving various lung cancer treatments: chemotherapy, chemoradiotherapy, chemotherapy with or without nitrogen patches, and low-dose fractionated radiotherapy with concurrent other studies had populations between 50 and 100. Most studies found correlations between early metabolic response detected by FDG-PET and survival, thereby suggesting that FDG-PET might be used to personalize treatment for patients with NSCLC. Generalizability of these results is limited due to the heterogeneity across studies, which included patients at various stages of the disease, undergoing various treatment regimens, and receiving FDG-PET during different cycles of treatment.

Section Summary: Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer
Evidence for the clinical validity of interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to CT, following various treatments for NSCLC, consists of many small observational studies. The studies were heterogeneous, with different patient populations, different therapies, and different timings of PET assessments. Most studies concluded that FDG-PET might adequately detect responders and nonresponders, which may predict OS and PFS. However, early prediction of survival does not translate into patient benefit unless decisions based on those predictions result in improved patient outcomes by either extending OS or improving quality of life.

OVARIAN CANCER

Clinical Context and Test Purpose

The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT in patients with ovarian cancer is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with ovarian cancer?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients

The population of interest is patients with ovarian cancer.

Interventions

The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators

The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing those with ovarian cancer: interim CT.

Outcomes

The general outcomes of interest are QOL, OS, and PFS.

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing

The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of RT.

Setting

Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Systematic Reviews

Suppiah et al (2017) published a systematic review of the accuracy of PET/CT and PET/MRI in managing patients with ovarian cancer.[79] The literature search, conducted through December 2016, identified 9 articles that addressed the use of PET/CT for treatment response and provided HRs for the prediction of recurrence. Outcomes of the studies were metabolic parameters (SUVmax, MTV, and/or total lesion glycolysis). Six of the 7 studies that measured SUVmax (n=750 patients) reported that it was not a significant indicator of survival. Two of the 3 studies that measured MTV (n=129 patients) reported that it was not a significant indicator of survival. All 4 studies that measured total lesion glycolysis (n=304 patients) reported that it was a significant predictive factor for prognosis. Meta-analyses were not performed.

Section Summary: Ovarian Cancer

Evidence for the use of PET as an adjunct to CT for assessing treatment response in patients with ovarian cancer consists of a systematic review of nonrandomized studies. Although total lesion glycolysis as measured by interim PET appeared to be associated with response and may be

better than other methods of prognosis, these studies did not demonstrate whether such improved prediction leads to improved patient outcomes. No case series or comparative trials of risk-adapted treatment for ovarian cancer were identified.

<div align="center">

OTHER MALIGNANT SOLID TUMORS
</div>

Clinical Context and Test Purpose
The purpose of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT in patients with other malignant solid tumors (eg, bladder, colorectal, prostate, thyroid) during treatment is to provide a treatment option that is an alternative to or an improvement on existing therapies.

The question addressed in this evidence review is: Does the use of interim PET as an adjunct to interim CT improve the net health outcome in individuals with other malignant solid tumors?

The following PICOTS were used to select literature to inform this review.

Patients
The population of interest is patients with other malignant solid tumors (eg, bladder, colorectal, prostate, thyroid) during treatment.

Interventions
The intervention of interest is interim PET scan, performed to guide therapy.

Comparators
The following test is currently being used to make decisions about managing those with other malignant solid tumors: interim CT.

Outcomes
The general outcomes of interest are QOL OS, and PFS.

Both false-positive test results and false-negative results can lead to incorrect treatment recommendations, such as continuing treatment that is ineffective, stopping treatment that is effective, and/or delaying initiation of more appropriate therapy.

Timing
The timing is during cycles of chemotherapeutic agents and/or a course of RT.

Setting
Interim PET is administered in an outpatient imaging setting equipped with a PET scanner.

Systematic Reviews
Beckers et al (2018) conducted a PRISMA-based systematic review to assess the value of FDG-PET, FDG-PET/CT, CT, and MRI in predicting response to chemotherapy in colorectal liver metastases.[80] PubMed and EMBASE databases were searched up to October 2016 to select studies assessing the accuracy of PET, PET-CT, CT and MRI in predicting RECIST or metabolic response to chemotherapy and/or survival in patients with colorectal liver metastases; 16 studies met inclusion criteria. Results included 6 studies on FDG-PET(/CT), 6 studies on CT, and 9 studies on MRI. FDG-PET (/CT) findings were ambiguous. Meta-analysis could not be conducted due to the heterogeneity of populations, scan protocols, types of chemotherapy, and the use of targeted

therapy. The quality of this review was reduced by the lack of histopathology reference standards.

The 2007 and 2009 NCCN task force reports assessed the use of interim PET for other malignant solid tumors. The 2007 report cited a small study of patients with colorectal cancer that showed an association between PET and tumor response to 5-fluorouracil after 1 month of therapy.[37,72] The British National Health Service review (2007) also assessed other cancers for PET during treatment.[81] For colorectal cancer, 1 study showed that PET after 1 month of chemotherapy predicted the outcome, but predictive accuracy was low. For head and neck cancer, esophageal cancer, and melanoma, only studies that evaluated PET after treatment were identified. In total, the British National Health Service review found 22 studies of PET during treatment. Reviewers concluded that many studies were small and evaluated different treatments using a diversity of response targets and monitoring methods. There was little evidence of change in patient management, even anecdotally, and no published evidence of successful applications to drug development.

The 2009 NCCN report[37] reviewed cancers not discussed in the 2007 report. For most cancers (eg, bladder, prostate, thyroid), evidence for interim PET was not cited. Although the task force included a recommendation for PET to assess response to liver-directed therapies in patients with localized hepatocellular carcinoma, the recommendation was based on studies of PET after transcatheter chemo-embolization and/or radiofrequency ablation (ie, not interim PET).

Since the NCCN and the National Health Service reports, other studies have been reported in patients with colon cancer demonstrating associations between early or interim PET and recurrence or survival outcomes.[82,83] Evidence in rectal or colorectal cancer was mixed,[84-93] and studies of early (during or after 1 or 2 neoadjuvant chemotherapy cycles) PET to predict axillary lymph node response reported conflicting results.[94,95] Studies have also reported on associations between early or interim PET during treatment and recurrence or survival outcomes in bladder cancer,[96] malignant pleural mesothelioma,[97,98] squamous cell carcinomas of the head and neck,[99-102] pancreatic cancer,[103] and bone or soft tissue sarcoma.[104,105]

Conversely, evidence for advanced renal cell carcinoma was mixed.[106-109] Method of measurement of quantitative parameters and cutpoint thresholds for PET-positivity varied across studies within the same cancer. No study demonstrated the impact of PET-directed treatment on net health outcome.

Section Summary: Other Malignant Solid Tumors
Evidence for the use of interim PET during treatment of other cancers, such as bladder, colorectal, prostate, and thyroid consists of a systematic review, NCCN reports, and mostly single-arm observational studies. Results have been inconsistent with the use of interim PET for patients with colorectal cancer and renal cell carcinoma. While some studies have reported on associations between interim PET and recurrence or survival, the lack of comparative trials of risk-adapted treatment was identified.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE
Breast Cancer
For individuals with breast cancer who receive interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to interim CT, the evidence consists of several systematic reviews, an RCT, and many observational studies.

Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. Results from the systematic review have shown wide ranges in sensitivities, specificities, positive predictive values, and negative predictive values. The wide ranges might be due to small sample sizes, the use of various definitions of the outcome measure (pathologic complete response), and differences in breast cancer subtype populations. One RCT was identified in which therapy decisions were guided by FDG-PET results. Nonresponders, determined by PET measures, were given more intensive chemotherapy. Clinical outcomes such as progression-free survival and overall survival are not yet available for this RCT. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Esophageal Cancer
For individuals with esophageal cancer who receive interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to interim CT, the evidence includes a meta-analysis, 3 nonrandomized studies, and 2 retrospective studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. Results on clinical validity were inconsistent across the studies. The meta-analysis reported low pooled sensitivities and specificities, while a subgroup analysis including only patients with squamous cell carcinoma and 2 studies published after the meta-analysis reported an adequate potential in predicting responders to neoadjuvant therapy. No evidence was identified that examined the clinical utility of PET for patients with esophageal cancer. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors
For individuals with gastrointestinal stromal tumors receiving palliative or adjuvant therapy who receive interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to interim CT, the evidence includes a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. The systematic review included 19 studies, 2 of which reviewed FDG-PET scans more than 6 months after the start of treatment. CT is currently recommended for standard long-term follow-up and surveillance of gastrointestinal stromal tumors. FDG-PET is equivalent to CT in the detection of treatment response when follow-up is long term. No studies were identified that tested outcomes following PET-guided treatment. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals with gastrointestinal stromal tumors treated with tyrosine kinase inhibitors for 6 months or less who receive interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to interim CT, the evidence includes a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. The systematic review included 19 studies, 17 of which showed that FDG-PET detected an early response to tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy, which was a strong predictor of clinical outcomes. FDG-PET detected treatment response as early as 1 week after initiation of treatment. While CT detects anatomic changes in the tumor, PET detects changes in metabolic activity of the tumor. Because metabolic changes precede anatomic changes by several weeks or sometimes months, PET can detect treatment response earlier than CT. PET is therefore preferred if a rapid read-out of response to targeted therapy is needed to guide treatment decisions (eg, change in targeted therapy or surgery). While no studies were identified that tested outcomes following PET-guided treatment, it is possible to construct a chain of evidence demonstrating improved patient outcomes. The evidence is sufficient to determine that the technology results in a meaningful improvement in the net health outcome.

Head and Neck Cancer

For individuals with head and neck cancer who receive interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to CT, the evidence includes several systematic reviews and a retrospective study. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. There was an overlap of studies among the systematic reviews. Most studies included in the reviews showed that FDG-PET used during radiotherapy, with or without chemotherapy, can adequately predict disease-free and overall survival. Meta-analyses to determine response could not be performed in any of the systematic reviews due to the heterogeneity in the methods across the studies. Most studies used maximum standardized uptake volume, however, threshold values to determine response varied across studies. No studies were identified that provided evidence for the clinical utility of PET. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Lymphoma

For individuals with lymphoma who receive interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to interim CT, the evidence includes systematic reviews with meta-analyses and RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. The systematic review evaluating the validity of interim FDG-PET showed high false-positive rates for both Hodgkin and non-Hodgkin lymphomas. After the systematic review, 2 studies were published; one focused on patients with follicular lymphoma and the other on patients with T-lymphoblastic leukemia/lymphoma. These studies showed a potential for FDG-PET to predict survival rates for these specific lymphomas. Evidence for the clinical utility of interim PET for guiding treatment in patients with lymphoma consists of a Cochrane review and several RCTs. The review reported lower progression-free survival rates in patients who received PET-guided therapy. The RCTs that compared PET-guided therapy with standard therapy did not demonstrate noninferiority. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer

For individuals with NSCLC who receive interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to interim CT, the evidence includes numerous small observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. While most studies showed correlations between FDG-PET measurements and progression-free and overall survival, the generalizability of the results is limited. The studies were small, with most population sizes fewer than 50 patients. The studies were also heterogeneous, including patients at different stages of the disease, undergoing different treatment regimens, and receiving PET at different times during treatment cycles. No studies were identified that evaluated outcomes after PET-guided therapy. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Ovarian Cancer

For individuals with ovarian cancer who receive interim FDG-PET as an adjunct to interim CT, the evidence includes a systematic review. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. The systematic review identified 9 studies that calculated hazard ratios for various FDG-PET parameters (eg, maximum standardized uptake value, metabolic tumor volume, tumor lesion glycolysis). The only parameter consistently showing prognostic value was tumor lesion

glycolysis. Additionally, no studies were identified that evaluated outcomes after PET-guided therapy. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Other Cancers

For individuals with other malignant solid tumors (eg, bladder, colorectal, prostate, thyroid) who receive FDG-PET as an adjunct to interim CT, the evidence includes a systematic review, National Comprehensive Cancer Network task force report, and single-arm observational studies published after the task force report. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, change in disease status, quality of life, morbid events, and treatment-related morbidity. Results have been inconsistent on the use of interim FDG-PET among the various cancers. While some have reported associations between interim FDG-PET and recurrence or survival, there is a lack of comparative trials evaluating outcomes in patients whose treatments were altered based on PET measurements. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

CLINICAL INPUT FROM PHYSICIAN SPECIALTY SOCIETIES AND ACADEMIC MEDICAL CENTERS

While the various physician specialty societies and academic medical centers may collaborate with and make recommendations during this process, through the provision of appropriate reviewers, input received does not represent an endorsement or position statement by the physician specialty societies or academic medical centers, unless otherwise noted.

In response to requests, input was received from 1 physician specialty society and 5 academic medical centers while this policy was under review in 2011. In general, there was agreement with the conclusions of this policy from those providing input. Most disagreement related to use of positron emission tomography scans during a planned course of treatment for patients with Hodgkin lymphoma. Some reviewers felt current data were sufficient to show benefit; others commented that additional studies needed to evaluate this issue.

PRACTICE GUIDELINES AND POSITION STATEMENTS

American College of Radiology and Society for Pediatric Radiology

The American College of Radiology and the Society for Pediatric Radiology (2016) updated their joint practice guidelines for performing fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) coupled with computed tomography (CT) in oncology.[110] The guidelines stated that FDG-PET/CT imaging in oncology patients "should only be performed when there is reasonable expectation that the results will have an impact on patient care." Examples of indications for imaging included "Monitoring response to therapy to include determining whether residual abnormalities identified with another imaging modality represent persistent viable tumor or post-treatment changes (inflammation, fibrosis, or necrosis)" and "Guiding specific clinical strategies, such as radiation therapy planning or directed biopsy." Further clarification was not provided.

National Comprehensive Cancer Network

Current National Comprehensive Cancer Network recommendations for interim PET scanning during treatment to assess early response in a variety of cancers are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Recommendations for Interim PET Scanning

Guideline	Version	Recommendation
Bladder cancer[111]	5.2018	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.
Breast cancer[112]	1.2018	"Studies of functional imaging [for monitoring metastatic disease], such as radionuclide bone scans and PET imaging, are particularly challenging when used to assess response... PET imaging is challenging because of the absence of a reproducible, validated, and widely accepted set of standards for disease activity assessment."
CNS cancers[113]	1.2018	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.
Cervical cancer[114]	1.2019	"For patients with International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) stage IB2 or patients who required postoperative adjuvant radiation or chemoradiation due to high-risk factors, a whole body PET/CT may be performed at 3–6 months after completion of treatment." "Patients with stage II-IV, whole body PET/CT is preferred or chest/abdomen/pelvic CT with contrast within 3–6 months of completion of therapy."
Colon cancer[115]	3.2018	"PET/CT should not be used to monitor progress of therapy. PET/CT scans should not be used to assess response to chemotherapy because a PET/CT scan can become transiently negative after chemotherapy. False positive PET/CT scan results can occur in the presence of tissue inflammation after surgery or infection."
Esophageal and EGJ cancers[116]	2.2018	In the clinical setting of patients with squamous cell carcinoma or adenocarcinomas following preoperative chemoradiation or definitive chemoradiation the response to treatment assessment using PET/CT or PET is preferred.
Soft tissue carcinoma[38]	2.2018	"PET/CT may be useful in determining response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy for lesions that are larger than 3 cm, firm, deep (not superficial)" "PET may give an indication of imatinib activity after 2-4 weeks of [primary or preoperative] therapy when rapid readout of activity is necessary."[a]
Head and neck cancers[117]	2.2018	After either radiation therapy or chemoradiation, post-treatment evaluation with imaging (ie, CT and/or MRI with contrast, FDG-PET/CT) guides the use of neck dissection. If PET/CT is used for follow-up, the first scan should be performed at a minimum of 12 weeks after treatment to reduce the false-positive rate.
Hepatobiliary cancers[118]	2.2018	"In PET/CT it is not recommended for detection of HCC because of limited sensitivity. When an HCC is detected by CT or MRI and has increased metabolic activity on PET/CT, higher intralesional standardized uptake value is a marker of biologic aggressiveness and might predict less optimal response to locoregional therapies."
Hodgkin lymphoma[119]	3.2018	"PET scans are increasingly being used to assess treatment response during therapy. Interim PET scans may be useful to identify a subgroup of patients with early-stage disease that can be treated with chemotherapy alone. The NCCN Guidelines emphasize that the value of interim PET scans remains unclear for many clinical scenarios and all measures of response should be considered in the context of management decisions. It is important that the Deauville score be incorporated into the nuclear medicine PET scan report, since subsequent management is often dependent upon that score. Suggested treatment regimens for stage I-II unfavorable or stage III-IV disease: "A (B) VD (2cycles) followed by AVD (4 cycles), if PET scan is

Guideline	Version	Recommendation
		negative after 2 cycles of ABVD. Patients with positive PET scan after 2 cycles of ABVD need individualized treatment."
Melanoma[120]	3.2018	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.
MPM[121]	2.2018	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.
Multiple myeloma[122]	1.2019	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma: B-cell[123]	4.2018	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma: T-cell[124]	5.2018	"The guidelines recommend interim restaging with PET/CT or CT scan for all patients."
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma: PCBCL[125]	2.2018	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.
NSCLC[126]	6.2018	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.
Ovarian cancer[127]	2.2018	Primary chemotherapy regimens include monitoring with chest/abdominal/pelvic CT or MRI with contrast, PET/CT (skull base to mid-thigh), or PET as indicated[b]
Pancreatic adenocarcinoma[128]	2.2018	"PET/CT scan may be considered after formal pancreatic CT protocol of high-risk patients to detect extra pancreatic metastases. It is not a substitute for high-quality, contrast-enhanced CT. See Principles of Diagnosis, Imaging, and Staging (PANC-A)."
Prostate cancer[129]	4.2018	"In certain clinical settings, the use of FDG-PET/CT may provide useful information, but FDG-PET/CT should not be used routinely since data on the utility of FDG-PET/CT in patients with prostate cancer is limited."
Rectal cancer[130]	3.2018	"PET-CT should not be used to monitor progress of therapy. CT with contrast or MRI is recommended."
SCLC[131]	2.2018	PET has a low sensitivity for nodules with less than 8 mm of solid component and for small nodules near the diaphragm. PET/CT is only one consideration of multiple criteria for determining whether a nodule has a high risk of being lung cancer. In areas endemic for fungal disease, the false-positive rate for PET/CT is higher.
Thyroid carcinoma[132]	1.2018	Post-treatment 131 I imaging may indicate the location of metastases when the serum Tg level is increased, but a tumor [or metastases] cannot be found by physical examination or other localizing techniques such as diagnostic 131 I imaging, neck ultrasonography, CT, MRI, or PET.
Uterine neoplasms[133]	2.2018	Interim PET for assessing response to ongoing treatment is not addressed.

ABVD: doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, dacarbazine; AVD: doxorubicin, vinblastine, dacarbazine; CNS: central nervous system; CT: computed tomography; DLBCL: diffuse large B-cell lymphoma; EGJ: esophagogastric junction; FDG: fluorine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose; HCC: hepatocellular carcinoma; MPM: malignant pleural mesothelioma; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; NCCN: National Comprehensive Cancer Network; NSCLC: non-small-cell lung cancer; PCBCL: primary cutaneous B-cell lymphoma; PET: positron emission tomography; PTCL: peripheral T-cell lymphoma; SCLC: small-cell lung cancer.

[a] This statement is a footnote to gastrointestinal stromal tumor treatment recommendations and is uncited.

[b] This statement is a footnote to epithelial ovarian cancer/fallopian tube cancer/primary peritoneal cancer treatment recommendations and is uncited.

U.S. PREVENTIVE SERVICES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS
Not applicable.

ONGOING AND UNPUBLISHED CLINICAL TRIALS
Currently, unpublished trials that might influence this review are listed in Table 6.

Table 6. Summary of Key Trials

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Ongoing			
Hodgkin lymphoma			
NCT01132807	Phase II Trial of Response-Adapted Chemotherapy Based on Positron Emission Tomography for Non-Bulky Stage I and II Hodgkin Lymphoma	164	Jan 2018 (ongoing)
NCT01356680	HD17 for Intermediate Stages - Treatment Optimization Trial in the First-Line Treatment of Intermediate Stage Hodgkin Lymphoma	1100	Dec 2019
NCT00822120	A Phase II Trial of Response-Adapted Therapy of Stage III-IV Hodgkin Lymphoma Using Early Interim FDG-PET Imaging	371	Apr 2020
NCT00736320	HD16 for Early Stages - Treatment Optimization Trial in the First-line Treatment of Early Stage Hodgkin Lymphoma; Treatment Stratification by Means of FDG-PET	1150	May 2020
NCT01118026	Phase II Trial of Response-Adapted Therapy Based on Positron Emission Tomography (PET) for Bulky Stage I and Stage II Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma (HL)	101	Aug 2020
NCT00515554	HD18 for Advanced Stages in Hodgkins Lymphoma	1500	Dec 2020
NCT00943423	A Randomised Phase III Trial to Determine the Role of FDG-PET Imaging in Clinical Stages IA/IIA Hodgkin's Disease	602	Dec 2030
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma			
NCT01478542	Improvement of Outcome and Reduction of Toxicity in Elderly Patients With CD20+ Aggressive B-Cell Lymphoma by an Optimised Schedule of the Monoclonal Antibody Rituximab, Substitution of Conventional by Liposomal Vincristine, and FDG-PET Based Reduction of Therapy	1152	Oct 2019
NCT01285765	Randomized Phase III Study Evaluating the Non-inferiority of a Treatment Adapted to the Early Response Evaluated With 18F-FDG PET Compared to a Standard Treatment, for Patients Aged From 18 to 80 Years With Low Risk (aa IPI = 0) Diffuse Large B-cells Non Hodgkin's Lymphoma CD 20+	650	Dec 2020
NCT02063685	A Multicenter, Phase III, Randomized Study to Evaluate the Efficacy of Response-adapted Strategy to Define Maintenance After Standard Chemoimmunotherapy in Patients With Advanced-stage Follicular Lymphoma	810	Dec 2021

NCT No.	Trial Name	Planned Enrollment	Completion Date
Lung cancer			
NCT02507518	Role of 18FDG PET in the Evaluation of Early Response to Maintenance Treatment With Bevacizumab or Pemetrexed in Advanced Non-small-cell Lung Cancer	80	Mar 2019
Stomach or gastroesophageal junction cancer			
NCT02485834	Impact of Early FDG-PET Directed Intervention on Preoperative Therapy for Locally Advanced Gastric Cancer: A Random Assignment Phase II Study	5	Jun 2019
Colorectal cancer			
NCT01718873	Randomized Phase 3 Study on the Optimization of Bevacizumab With mFOLFOX/mOXXEL in the Treatment of Patients With Metastatic Colorectal Cancer	230	Jun 2018
Esophageal cancer			
NCT02125448	PReoperative Identification Of Response to Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy for Esophageal Cancer (PRIOR)	50	Nov 2016 (unknown)
Breast cancer			
NCT01142778	A Study of Avastin (Bevacizumab) Added to Herceptin (Trastuzumab) Plus Docetaxel in the Neoadjuvant Setting in Patients With Early Stage HER2-Positive Breast Cancer	152	Dec 2017 (completed)
Head and neck cancer			
NCT02469922	Prospective Study Assessing Predictive Value of [18]FDG Positron Emission Tomography During Radiochemotherapy for Locally Advanced Epidermoid Carcinoma of the Head and Neck	123	Jan 2019

NCT: national clinical trial.

CODING

The following codes for treatment and procedures applicable to this policy are included below for informational purposes. Inclusion or exclusion of a procedure, diagnosis or device code(s) does not constitute or imply member coverage or provider reimbursement. Please refer to the member's contract benefits in effect at the time of service to determine coverage or non-coverage of these services as it applies to an individual member.

CPT/HCPCS
 78811   Positron emission tomography (PET) imaging; limited are (eg, chest, head/neck)
 78812   Positron emission tomography (PET) imaging; skull base to mid-thigh
 78813   Positron emission tomography (PET) imaging; whole body
 78814   Positron emission tomography (PET) with concurrently acquired computed tomography (CT) for attenuation correction and anatomical localization imaging; limited area (eg., chest, head/neck)
 78815   Positron emission tomography (PET) with concurrently acquired computed tomography (CT) for attenuation correction and anatomical localization imaging; skull base to mid-thigh
 78816   Positron emission tomography (PET) with concurrently acquired computed tomography (CT) for attenuation correction and anatomical localization imaging; whole body
 G0235   PET imaging, any site, not otherwise specified

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.

- There is no specific coding for positron emission tomography (PET) scans to determine early response to treatment.
  - CPT codes for PET or PET/computed tomography (CT) imaging (78811-78816) would be used.
- There is a HCPCS modifier:
  Modifier PS: PET or PET/ CT to inform the subsequent treatment strategy of cancerous tumors when the beneficiary's treating physician determines that the PET study is needed to inform subsequent antitumor strategy.

DIAGNOSES
C49.A1   Gastrointestinal stromal tumor of esophagus
C49.A2   Gastrointestinal stromal tumor of stomach
C49.A3   Gastrointestinal stromal tumor of small intestine
C49.A4   Gastrointestinal stromal tumor of large intestine
C49.A5   Gastrointestinal stromal tumor of rectum
C49.A9   Gastrointestinal stromal tumor of other sites

REVISIONS

10-16-2013	PET Scanning in Oncology to Detect Early Response during Treatment was originally part of the Positron Emission Tomography (PET) medical policy. This portion was pulled out and placed into a separate medical policy, Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Scanning: In Oncology to Detect Early Response during Treatment.
10-22-2015	Description section updated
	Rationale section updated
	In Coding section: - Added HCPCS Code: G0235 - Coding notations updated
	References updated
11-26-2018	Policy published October 26, 2018. Policy effective November 26, 2018.
	In Description section updated
	In Policy section: - Added medically necessary indication of "The use of interim florine 18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography scans to determine response to tyrosine kinase inhibitor treatment in patients with gastrointestinal stromal tumors is considered medically necessary." - Added to Item B "gastrointestinal stromal tumors on palliative or adjuvant therapy, as well as all other" to read "The use of positron emission tomography scans to determine early response to treatment (positron emission tomography scans done during a planned course of chemotherapy and/or radiation) in patients with gastrointestinal stromal tumors on palliative or adjuvant therapy, as well as all other cancers is considered experimental / investigational."
	Rationale section updated
	In Coding section: - Added ICD-10 Codes: C49.A1, C49.A2, C49.A3, C49.A4, C49.A5, C49.A9 - Removed "Experimental / Investigational on all diagnoses related to this medical policy." statement. - Updated Coding notations.
	References updated

Current Procedural Terminology © American Medical Association. All Rights Reserved.

REFERENCES

1. Hillner BE, Siegel BA, Shields AF, et al. The impact of positron emission tomography (PET) on expected management during cancer treatment: findings of the National Oncologic PET Registry. *Cancer.* Jan 15 2009;115(2):410-418. PMID 19016303
2. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). PET Drugs - Current Good Manufacturing Practice (CGMP). 2009; https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM070306.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.
3. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). PET Drugs - Current Good Manufacturing Practice (CGMP) Small Entity Compliance Guide. 2011; https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM266640.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.
4. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Guidance: Investigational New Drug Applications for Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Drugs. 2012; https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM291573.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.
5. Li H, Yao L, Jin P, et al. MRI and PET/CT for evaluation of the pathological response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Breast.* Aug 2018;40:106-115. PMID 29758503
6. Lindenberg MA, Miquel-Cases A, Retel VP, et al. Imaging performance in guiding response to neoadjuvant therapy according to breast cancer subtypes: A systematic literature review. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol.* Apr 2017;112:198-207. PMID 28325260
7. Chen L, Yang Q, Bao J, et al. Direct comparison of PET/CT and MRI to predict the pathological response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer: a meta-analysis. *Sci Rep.* Aug 16 2017;7(1):8479. PMID 28814795
8. Coudert B, Pierga JY, Mouret-Reynier MA, et al. Use of [(18)F]-FDG PET to predict response to neoadjuvant trastuzumab and docetaxel in patients with HER2-positive breast cancer, and addition of bevacizumab to neoadjuvant trastuzumab and docetaxel in [(18)F]-FDG PET-predicted non-responders (AVATAXHER): an open-label, randomised phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* Dec 2014;15(13):1493-1502. PMID 25456368
9. Boers-Sonderen MJ, de Geus-Oei LF, Desar IM, et al. Temsirolimus and pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (PLD) combination therapy in breast, endometrial, and ovarian cancer: phase Ib results and prediction of clinical outcome with FDG-PET/CT. *Target Oncol.* Dec 2014;9(4):339-347. PMID 24577626
10. Groheux D, Hindie E, Giacchetti S, et al. Early assessment with (18)F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computed tomography can help predict the outcome of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in triple negative breast cancer. *Eur J Cancer.* Jul 2014;50(11):1864-1871. PMID 24841218
11. Humbert O, Cochet A, Riedinger JM, et al. HER2-positive breast cancer: (18)F-FDG PET for early prediction of response to trastuzumab plus taxane-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Aug 2014;41(8):1525-1533. PMID 24647576
12. Andrade WP, Lima EN, Osorio CA, et al. Can FDG-PET/CT predict early response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer? *Eur J Surg Oncol.* Dec 2013;39(12):1358-1363. PMID 24120422
13. Mghanga FP, Lan X, Bakari KH, et al. Fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography-computed tomography in monitoring the response of breast cancer to neoadjuvant chemotherapy: a meta-analysis. *Clin Breast Cancer.* Aug 2013;13(4):271-279. PMID 23714689
14. Humbert O, Riedinger JM, Charon-Barra C, et al. Identification of biomarkers including 18FDG-PET/CT for early prediction of response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in triple-negative breast cancer. *Clin Cancer Res.* Dec 15 2015;21(24):5460-5468. PMID 26130460
15. Humbert O, Riedinger JM, Vrigneaud JM, et al. 18F-FDG PET-derived tumor blood flow changes after 1 cycle of neoadjuvant chemotherapy predicts outcome in triple-negative breast cancer. *J Nucl Med.* Nov 2016;57(11):1707-1712. PMID 27103025

16. Lee HW, Lee HM, Choi SE, et al. The prognostic impact of early change in 18F-FDG PET SUV after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with locally advanced breast cancer. *J Nucl Med.* Aug 2016;57(8):1183-1188. PMID 27033896

17. Luo J, Zhou Z, Yang Z, et al. The value of 18F-FDG PET/CT imaging combined with pretherapeutic Ki67 for early prediction of pathologic response after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in locally advanced breast cancer. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Feb 2016;95(8):e2914. PMID 26937935

18. Pahk K, Kim S, Choe JG. Early prediction of pathological complete response in luminal B type neoadjuvant chemotherapy-treated breast cancer patients: comparison between interim 18F-FDG PET/CT and MRI. *Nucl Med Commun.* Sep 2015;36(9):887-891. PMID 25932536

19. Lin NU, Guo H, Yap JT, et al. Phase II study of lapatinib in combination with trastuzumab in patients with human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-positive metastatic breast cancer: clinical outcomes and predictive value of early [18F]fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography imaging (TBCRC 003). *J Clin Oncol.* Aug 20 2015;33(24):2623-2631. PMID 26169615

20. Kitajima K, Miyoshi Y, Yamano T, et al. Assessment of tumor response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with breast cancer using MRI and FDG-PET/CT-RECIST 1.1 vs. PERCIST 1.0. *Nagoya J Med Sci.* May 2018;80(2):183-197. PMID 29915436

21. Kitajima K, Nakatani K, Yamaguchi K, et al. Response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy for breast cancer judged by PERCIST - multicenter study in Japan. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* May 12 2018. PMID 29754160

22. Yoon HJ, Kim Y, Chung J, et al. Predicting neo-adjuvant chemotherapy response and progression-free survival of locally advanced breast cancer using textural features of intratumoral heterogeneity on F-18 FDG PET/CT and diffusion-weighted MR imaging. *Breast J.* Mar 30 2018. PMID 29602210

23. Groheux D, Biard L, Giacchetti S, et al. 18F-FDG PET/CT for the early evaluation of response to neoadjuvant treatment in triple-negative breast cancer: influence of the chemotherapy regimen. *J Nucl Med.* Apr 2016;57(4):536-543. PMID 26697967

24. Groheux D, Majdoub M, Sanna A, et al. Early metabolic response to neoadjuvant treatment: FDG PET/CT criteria according to breast cancer subtype. *Radiology.* Nov 2015;277(2):358-371. PMID 25915099

25. van Ramshorst MS, Teixeira SC, Koolen BB, et al. Additional value of 18F-FDG PET/CT response evaluation in axillary nodes during neoadjuvant therapy for triple-negative and HER2-positive breast cancer. *Cancer Imaging.* May 25 2017;17(1):15. PMID 28545563

26. Schmitz AMT, Teixeira SC, Pengel KE, et al. Monitoring tumor response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy using MRI and 18F-FDG PET/CT in breast cancer subtypes. *PLoS One.* May 2017;12(5):e0176782. PMID 28531188

27. Riedl CC, Pinker K, Ulaner GA, et al. Comparison of FDG-PET/CT and contrast-enhanced CT for monitoring therapy response in patients with metastatic breast cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Aug 2017;44(9):1428-1437. PMID 28462446

28. Groheux D, Hindie E, Marty M, et al. (1)(8)F-FDG-PET/CT in staging, restaging, and treatment response assessment of male breast cancer. *Eur J Radiol.* Oct 2014;83(10):1925-1933. PMID 24985086

29. Hulikal N, Gajjala SR, Kalawat TC, et al. Utility of [18F] fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computed tomography (FDG PET/CT) in the initial staging and response assessment of locally advanced breast cancer patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Indian J Surg Oncol.* Dec 2015;6(4):330-336. PMID 27065657

30. Cong L, Wang S, Gao T, et al. The predictive value of 18F-FDG PET for pathological response of primary tumor in patients with esophageal cancer during or after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy: a meta-analysis. *Jpn J Clin Oncol.* Dec 2016;46(12):1118-1126. PMID 27702836

31. Fang P, Musall BC, Son JB, et al. Multimodal imaging of pathologic response to chemoradiation in esophageal cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* Mar 2 2018. PMID 29685377

32. van Rossum PS, Fried DV, Zhang L, et al. The value of 18F-FDG PET before and after induction chemotherapy for the early prediction of a poor pathologic response to subsequent preoperative chemoradiotherapy in oesophageal adenocarcinoma. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Jan 2017;44(1):71-80. PMID 27511188

33. Hagen PV, Heijl MV, Henegouwen MI, et al. Prediction of disease-free survival using relative change in FDG-uptake early during neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for potentially curable esophageal cancer: A prospective cohort study. *Dis Esophagus.* Feb 01 2017;30(2):1-7. PMID 27001344

34. Odawara S, Kitajima K, Katsuura T, et al. Tumor response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with esophageal cancer assessed with CT and FDG-PET/CT - RECIST 1.1 vs. PERCIST 1.0. *Eur J Radiol.* Apr 2018;101:65-71. PMID 29571803

35. Manoharan V, Lee S, Chong S, et al. Serial imaging using [18F]Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography and histopathologic assessment in predicting survival in a population of surgically resectable distal oesophageal and gastric adenocarcinoma following neoadjuvant therapy. *Ann Nucl Med.* May 2017;31(4):315-323. PMID 28299585

36. Treglia G, Mirk P, Stefanelli A, et al. 18F-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography in evaluating treatment response to imatinib or other drugs in gastrointestinal stromal tumors: a systematic review. *Clin Imaging.* May-Jun 2012;36(3):167-175. PMID 22542374

37. Podoloff DA, Advani RH, Allred C, et al. NCCN task force report: positron emission tomography (PET)/computed tomography (CT) scanning in cancer. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw.* May 2007;5(Suppl 1):S1-22; quiz S23-22. PMID 17509259

38. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: Soft Tissue Sarcoma. Verizon 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/sarcoma.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

39. Helsen N, Van den Wyngaert T, Carp L, et al. FDG-PET/CT for treatment response assessment in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic performance. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Jun 2018;45(6):1063-1071. PMID 29478080

40. Min M, Lin P, Liney G, et al. A review of the predictive role of functional imaging in patients with mucosal primary head and neck cancer treated with radiation therapy. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol.* Feb 2017;61(1):99-123. PMID 27469298

41. Castelli J, De Bari B, Depeursinge A, et al. Overview of the predictive value of quantitative 18 FDG PET in head and neck cancer treated with chemoradiotherapy. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol.* Dec 2016;108:40-51. PMID 27931839

42. Dos Anjos RF, Dos Anjos DA, Vieira DL, et al. Effectiveness of FDG-PET/CT for evaluating early response to induction chemotherapy in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: A systematic review. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Aug 2016;95(32):e4450. PMID 27512861

43. Adams HJA, Kwee TC. Proportion of false-positive lesions at interim and end-of-treatment FDG-PET in lymphoma as determined by histology: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Radiol.* Nov 2016;85(11):1963-1970. PMID 27776647

44. Sickinger MT, von Tresckow B, Kobe C, et al. Positron emission tomography-adapted therapy for first-line treatment in individuals with Hodgkin lymphoma. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* Jan 09 2015;1:CD010533. PMID 25572491

45. Radford J, Illidge T, Counsell N, et al. Results of a trial of PET-directed therapy for early-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma. *N Engl J Med.* Apr 23 2015;372(17):1598-1607. PMID 25901426

46. Picardi M, De Renzo A, Pane F, et al. Randomized comparison of consolidation radiation versus observation in bulky Hodgkin's lymphoma with post-chemotherapy negative positron emission tomography scans. *Leuk Lymphoma.* Sep 2007;48(9):1721-1727. PMID 17786707

47. Raemaekers JM, Andre MP, Federico M, et al. Omitting radiotherapy in early positron emission tomography-negative stage I/II Hodgkin lymphoma is associated with an increased risk of early relapse: Clinical results of the preplanned interim analysis of the randomized EORTC/LYSA/FIL H10 trial. *J Clin Oncol.* Apr 20 2014;32(12):1188-1194. PMID 24637998

48. Deniz K, O'Mahony S, Ross G, et al. Breast cancer in women after treatment for Hodgkin's disease. *Lancet Oncol.* Apr 2003;4(4):207-214. PMID 12681264

49. Travis LB, Gospodarowicz M, Curtis RE, et al. Lung cancer following chemotherapy and radiotherapy for Hodgkin's disease. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* Feb 6 2002;94(3):182-192. PMID 11830608

50. Galper SL, Yu JB, Mauch PM, et al. Clinically significant cardiac disease in patients with Hodgkin lymphoma treated with mediastinal irradiation. *Blood.* Jan 13 2011;117(2):412-418. PMID 20858859

51.   Swerdlow AJ, Higgins CD, Smith P, et al. Myocardial infarction mortality risk after treatment for Hodgkin disease: a collaborative British cohort study. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* Feb 7 2007;99(3):206-214. PMID 17284715

52.   Casasnovas RO, Ysebaert L, Thieblemont C, et al. A FDG-PET driven consolidation strategy in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: Final results of a randomized phase II study. *Blood.* Jul 12 2017. PMID 28701367

53.   Wong-Sefidan I, Byrtek M, Zhou X, et al. [18F] Positron emission tomography response after rituximab-containing induction therapy in follicular lymphoma is an independent predictor of survival after adjustment for FLIPI in academic and community-based practice. *Leuk Lymphoma.* Apr 2017;58(4):809-815. PMID 27562750

54.   Johnson P, Federico M, Kirkwood A, et al. Adapted treatment guided by interim PET-CT scan in advanced Hodgkin's lymphoma. *N Engl J Med.* Jun 23 2016;374(25):2419-2429. PMID 27332902

55.   Raemaekers JM. Early FDG-PET adapted treatment improved the outcome of early FDG-PET positive patients with stages I/II Hodgkin lymphoma (HL): final results of the randomized Intergroup EORTC/LYSA/FIL H10 trial. Paper presented at: 13th International Conference on Malignant Lymphoma; 2015; Lugano, Switzerland.

56.   André MPE, Girinsky T, Federico M, et al. Early positron emission tomography response-adapted treatment in stage I and II Hodgkin lymphoma: final results of the randomized EORTC/LYSA/FIL H10 Trial. *J Clin Oncol.* Jun 01 2017;35(16):1786-1794. PMID 28291393

57.   Dann EJ, Bar-Shalom R, Tamir A, et al. Risk-adapted BEACOPP regimen can reduce the cumulative dose of chemotherapy for standard and high-risk Hodgkin lymphoma with no impairment of outcome. *Blood.* Feb 1 2007;109(3):905-909. PMID 17018856

58.   Dann EJ, Blumenfeld Z, Bar-Shalom R, et al. A 10-year experience with treatment of high and standard risk Hodgkin disease: six cycles of tailored BEACOPP, with interim scintigraphy, are effective and female fertility is preserved. *Am J Hematol.* Jan 2012;87(1):32-36. PMID 21956220

59.   Iltis A, Eder V, Blasco H, et al. Decisional early interim (18)F-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography after two cycles of chemotherapy in de novo Hodgkin lymphoma. *Acta Haematol.* 2015;133(2):172-178. PMID 25301496

60.   Pardal E, Coronado M, Martin A, et al. Intensification treatment based on early FDG-PET in patients with high-risk diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: a phase II GELTAMO trial. *Br J Haematol.* Nov 2014;167(3):327-336. PMID 25066542

61.   Kasamon YL, Wahl RL, Ziessman HA, et al. Phase II study of risk-adapted therapy of newly diagnosed, aggressive non-Hodgkin lymphoma based on midtreatment FDG-PET scanning. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant.* Feb 2009;15(2):242-248. PMID 19167684

62.   Kedmi M, Apel A, Davidson T, et al. High-risk, advanced-stage hodgkin lymphoma: the impact of combined escalated BEACOPP and ABVD treatment in patients who rapidly achieve metabolic complete remission on interim FDG-PET/CT scan. *Acta Haematol.* 2016;135(3):156-161. PMID 26588173

63.   Press OW, Li H, Schoder H, et al. US Intergroup Trial of response-adapted therapy for stage iii to iv hodgkin lymphoma using early interim fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography imaging: Southwest Oncology Group S0816. *J Clin Oncol.* Jun 10 2016;34(17):2020-2027. PMID 27069074

64.   Engert A, Haverkamp H, Kobe C, et al. Reduced-intensity chemotherapy and PET-guided radiotherapy in patients with advanced stage Hodgkin's lymphoma (HD15 trial): a randomised, open-label, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. *Lancet.* May 12 2012;379(9828):1791-1799. PMID 22480758

65.   Zinzani PL, Broccoli A, Gioia DM, et al. Interim positron emission tomography response-adapted therapy in advanced-stage Hodgkin lymphoma: final results of the phase II part of the HD0801 Study. *J Clin Oncol.* Apr 20 2016;34(12):1376-1385. PMID 26884559

66.   Han EJ, O JH, Yoon H, et al. FDG PET/CT response in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: Reader variability and association with clinical outcome. *Medicine (Baltimore).* Sep 2016;95(39):e4983. PMID 27684851

67.   Kanazu M, Maruyama K, Ando M, et al. Early pharmacodynamic assessment using (1)(8)F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron-emission tomography on molecular targeted therapy and cytotoxic

chemotherapy for clinical outcome prediction. *Clin Lung Cancer.* May 2014;15(3):182-187. PMID 24518101

68. Stefano A, Russo G, Ippolito M, et al. Evaluation of erlotinib treatment response in non-small cell lung cancer using metabolic and anatomic criteria. *Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* May 9 2016;60(3):264-273. PMID 24809275

69. Tiseo M, Ippolito M, Scarlattei M, et al. Predictive and prognostic value of early response assessment using 18FDG-PET in advanced non-small cell lung cancer patients treated with erlotinib. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol.* Feb 2014;73(2):299-307. PMID 24258456

70. Tsuchida T, Morikawa M, Demura Y, et al. Imaging the early response to chemotherapy in advanced lung cancer with diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging compared to fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography and computed tomography. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* Jul 2013;38(1):80-88. PMID 23239463

71. Usmanij EA, de Geus-Oei LF, Troost EG, et al. 18F-FDG PET early response evaluation of locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer treated with concomitant chemoradiotherapy. *J Nucl Med.* Sep 2013;54(9):1528-1534. PMID 23864719

72. Podoloff DA, Ball DW, Ben-Josef E, et al. NCCN task force: clinical utility of PET in a variety of tumor types. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw.* Jun 2009;7(Suppl 2):S1-26. PMID 19555588

73. Grootjans W, Usmanij EA, Oyen WJ, et al. Performance of automatic image segmentation algorithms for calculating total lesion glycolysis for early response monitoring in non-small cell lung cancer patients during concomitant chemoradiotherapy. *Radiother Oncol.* Jun 2016;119(3):473-479. PMID 27178141

74. Han EJ, Yang YJ, Park JC, et al. Prognostic value of early response assessment using 18F-FDG PET/CT in chemotherapy-treated patients with non-small-cell lung cancer. *Nucl Med Commun.* Dec 2015;36(12):1187-1194. PMID 26375438

75. Nygard L, Vogelius IR, Fischer BM, et al. Early lesion-specific (18)F-FDG PET response to chemotherapy predicts time to lesion progression in locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Radiother Oncol.* Mar 2016;118(3):460-464. PMID 26806265

76. Mattoli MV, Massaccesi M, Castelluccia A, et al. The predictive value of 18F-FDG PET-CT for assessing the clinical outcomes in locally advanced NSCLC patients after a new induction treatment: low-dose fractionated radiotherapy with concurrent chemotherapy. *Radiat Oncol.* Jan 05 2017;12(1):4. PMID 28057034

77. Crandall JP, Tahari AK, Juergens RA, et al. A comparison of FLT to FDG PET/CT in the early assessment of chemotherapy response in stages IB-IIIA resectable NSCLC. *EJNMMI Res.* Dec 2017;7(1):8. PMID 28102506

78. de Jong EE, van Elmpt W, Leijenaar RT, et al. [18F]FDG PET/CT-based response assessment of stage IV non-small cell lung cancer treated with paclitaxel-carboplatin-bevacizumab with or without nitroglycerin patches. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Jan 2017;44(1):8-16. PMID 27600280

79. Suppiah S, Chang WL, Hassan HA, et al. Systematic review on the accuracy of positron emission tomography/computed tomography and positron emission tomography/magnetic resonance imaging in the management of ovarian cancer: Is functional information really needed? *World J Nucl Med.* Jul-Sep 2017;16(3):176-185. PMID 28670174

80. Beckers RCJ, Lambregts DMJ, Lahaye MJ, et al. Advanced imaging to predict response to chemotherapy in colorectal liver metastases - a systematic review. *HPB (Oxford).* Nov 28 2018 20(2). PMID 29196021

81. Facey K, Bradbury I, Laking G, et al. Overview of the clinical effectiveness of positron emission tomography imaging in selected cancers. *Health Technol Assess.* Oct 2007;11(44):iii-iv, xi-267. PMID 17999839

82. Engelmann BE, Loft A, Kjaer A, et al. Positron emission tomography/computed tomography and biomarkers for early treatment response evaluation in metastatic colon cancer. *Oncologist.* Feb 2014;19(2):164-172. PMID 24451199

83. Hong YS, Kim HO, Kim KP, et al. 3'-Deoxy-3'-18F-fluorothymidine PET for the early prediction of response to leucovorin, 5-fluorouracil, and oxaliplatin therapy in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Nucl Med.* Aug 2013;54(8):1209-1216. PMID 23804324

84. Li C, Lan X, Yuan H, et al. (18)F-FDG PET predicts pathological response to preoperative chemoradiotherapy in patients with primary rectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Ann Nucl Med.* Jun 2014;28(5):436-446. PMID 24623152

85. Memon S, Lynch AC, Akhurst T, et al. Systematic review of FDG-PET prediction of complete pathological response and survival in rectal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol.* Oct 2014;21(11):3598-3607. PMID 24802909

86. Formiga MN, Fanelli MF, Dettino AL, et al. Is early response by (18)F-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography-computed tomography a predictor of long-term outcome in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer? *J Gastrointest Oncol.* Jun 2016;7(3):365-372. PMID 27284468

87. Hendlisz A, Deleporte A, Delaunoit T, et al. The prognostic significance of metabolic response heterogeneity in metastatic colorectal cancer. *PLoS One.* Sep 2015;10(9):e0138341. PMID 26421426

88. Kim SJ, Chang S. Volumetric parameters changes of sequential 18F-FDG PET/CT for early prediction of recurrence and death in patients with locally advanced rectal cancer treated with preoperative chemoradiotherapy. *Clin Nucl Med.* Dec 2015;40(12):930-935. PMID 26204222

89. Koo PJ, Kim SJ, Chang S, et al. Interim fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computed tomography to predict pathologic response to preoperative chemoradiotherapy and prognosis in patients with locally advanced rectal cancer. *Clin Colorectal Cancer.* Dec 2016;15(4):e213-e219. PMID 27316919

90. Nishimura G, Yabuki K, Hata M, et al. Imaging strategy for response evaluation to chemoradiotherapy of the nodal disease in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Int J Clin Oncol.* Aug 2016;21(4):658-667. PMID 26710795

91. Travaini LL, Zampino MG, Colandrea M, et al. PET/CT with fluorodeoxyglucose during neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced rectal cancer. *Ecancermedicalscience.* Mar 2016;10:629. PMID 27110285

92. Woff E, Hendlisz A, Garcia C, et al. Monitoring metabolic response using FDG PET-CT during targeted therapy for metastatic colorectal cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Sep 2016;43(10):1792-1801. PMID 27072811

93. Skougaard K, Nielsen D, Jensen BV, et al. Early 18F-FDG-PET/CT as a predictive marker for treatment response and survival in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer treated with irinotecan and cetuximab. *Acta Oncol.* Sep - Oct 2016;55(9-10):1175-1182. PMID 27548393

94. Garcia Vicente AM, Soriano Castrejon A, Leon Martin A, et al. Early and delayed prediction of axillary lymph node neoadjuvant response by (18)F-FDG PET/CT in patients with locally advanced breast cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* Jul 2014;41(7):1309-1318. PMID 24744045

95. Koolen BB, Valdes Olmos RA, Wesseling J, et al. Early assessment of axillary response with (1)(8)F-FDG PET/CT during neoadjuvant chemotherapy in stage II-III breast cancer: implications for surgical management of the axilla. *Ann Surg Oncol.* Jul 2013;20(7):2227-2235. PMID 23456316

96. Giannatempo P, Alessi A, Miceli R, et al. Interim fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography for early metabolic assessment of therapeutic response to chemotherapy for metastatic transitional cell carcinoma. *Clin Genitourin Cancer.* Dec 2014;12(6):433-439. PMID 24787972

97. Truong MT, Viswanathan C, Godoy MB, et al. Malignant pleural mesothelioma: role of CT, MRI, and PET/CT in staging evaluation and treatment considerations. *Semin Roentgenol.* Oct 2013;48(4):323-334. PMID 24034264

98. Francis RJ, Byrne MJ, van der Schaaf AA, et al. Early prediction of response to chemotherapy and survival in malignant pleural mesothelioma using a novel semiautomated 3-dimensional volume-based analysis of serial 18F-FDG PET scans. *J Nucl Med.* Sep 2007;48(9):1449-1458. PMID 17704250

99. Bhatnagar P, Subesinghe M, Patel C, et al. Functional imaging for radiation treatment planning, response assessment, and adaptive therapy in head and neck cancer. *Radiographics.* Nov-Dec 2013;33(7):1909-1929. PMID 24224586

100. Hoang JK, Das SK, Choudhury KR, et al. Using FDG-PET to measure early treatment response in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: quantifying intrinsic variability in order to understand treatment-induced change. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Jul 2013;34(7):1428-1433. PMID 23391836

101. Lalami Y, Garcia C, Flamen P, et al. Phase II trial evaluating the efficacy of sorafenib (BAY 43-9006) and correlating early fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography-CT response to outcome in

patients with recurrent and/or metastatic head and neck cancer. *Head Neck.* Mar 2016;38(3):347-354. PMID 25332069

102. Wong KH, Panek R, Welsh L, et al. The predictive value of early assessment after 1 cycle of induction chemotherapy with 18F-FDG PET/CT and diffusion-weighted MRI for response to radical chemoradiotherapy in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *J Nucl Med.* Dec 2016;57(12):1843-1850. PMID 27417648

103. Wilson JM, Mukherjee S, Brunner TB, et al. Correlation of 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography parameters with patterns of disease progression in locally advanced pancreatic cancer after definitive chemoradiotherapy. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol).* Jun 2017;29(6):370-377. PMID 28190636

104. Eary JF, Conrad EU, O'Sullivan J, et al. Sarcoma mid-therapy [F-18]fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (FDG PET) and patient outcome. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Jan 15 2014;96(2):152-158. PMID 24430415

105. Hyun OJ, Luber BS, Leal JP, et al. Response to early treatment evaluated with 18F-FDG PET and PERCIST 1.0 predicts survival in patients with ewing sarcoma family of tumors treated with a monoclonal antibody to the insulinlike growth factor 1 receptor. *J Nucl Med.* May 2016;57(5):735-740. PMID 26795289

106. Farnebo J, Gryback P, Harmenberg U, et al. Volumetric FDG-PET predicts overall and progression-free survival after 14 days of targeted therapy in metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *BMC Cancer.* Jun 06 2014;14:408. PMID 24906441

107. Chen JL, Appelbaum DE, Kocherginsky M, et al. FDG-PET as a predictive biomarker for therapy with everolimus in metastatic renal cell cancer. *Cancer Med.* Aug 2013;2(4):545-552. PMID 24156027

108. Gilles R, de Geus-Oei LF, Mulders PF, et al. Immunotherapy response evaluation with (18)F-FDG-PET in patients with advanced stage renal cell carcinoma. *World J Urol.* Aug 2013;31(4):841-846. PMID 21739122

109. Horn KP, Yap JT, Agarwal N, et al. FDG and FLT-PET for Early measurement of response to 37.5 mg daily sunitinib therapy in metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer Imaging.* Sep 3 2015;15:15. PMID 26335224

110. American College of Radiology (ACR) and the Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR). ACR–SPR practice guideline for performing FDG-PET/CT in oncology, revised 2016. https://www.acr.org/~/media/ACR/Documents/PGTS/guidelines/FDG_PET_CT.pdf. Accessed August 14, 2017.

111. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: bladder cancer. Version 5.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/bladder.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

112. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: breast cancer. Version 1.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/breast.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

113. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: central nervous system cancers. Version 1.2018 http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cns.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

114. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: cervical cancer. Version 1.2019. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cervical.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

115. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: colon cancer. Version 3.1018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/colon.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

116. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Esophageal and Esophagogastric Junction Cancers. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/esophageal.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

117. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: head and neck cancers. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/head-and-neck.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

118. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Hepatobiliary Cancers. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hepatobiliary.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

119. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Hodgkin Lymphoma. Version 3.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hodgkins.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

120. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: melanoma. Version 3.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/melanoma.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

121. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: malignant pleural mesothelioma. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/mpm.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

122. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: multiple myeloma. Version 1.2019. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/myeloma.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

123. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: B-cells lymphomas. Version 4.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/b-cell.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

124. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: T-cell lymphomas. Version 5.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/t-cell.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

125. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: primary cutaneous B-cell lymphomas. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/pcbcl.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

126. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: non-small cell lung cancer. Version 6.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/nscl.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

127. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: ovarian cancer. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/ovarian.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

128. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: pancreatic adenocarcinoma. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/pancreatic.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

129. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: prostate cancer. Version 4.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

130. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: rectal cancer. Version 3.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/rectal.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

131. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: small cell lung cancer. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/sclc.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

132. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: thyroid cancer. Version 1.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/thyroid.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

133. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN). NCCN Clinical practice guidelines in oncology: uterine neoplasms. Version 2.2018. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/uterine.pdf. Accessed August 23, 2018.

134. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Positron Emission Tomography (FDG) for Oncologic Conditions (220.6.17). 2014; https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/ncd-details.aspx?ncdid=331. Accessed August 23, 2018.

Other References

1. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas, Medical Advisory Committee meeting, April 24, 2003 (see Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Newsletter, Blue Shield Report MAC–02-03).
2. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas, Oncology Liaison Committee meeting, February 18, 2003 (see Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Newsletter, Blue Shield Report MAC–02-03).
3. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas, Radiology Liaison Committee meeting, February 11, 2003 (see Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Newsletter, Blue Shield Report MAC–02-03).
4. MCMC, Medical Care Ombudsman Program (MCOP), August 11, 2006, MCOP ID 1071-0720.
5. Considine oncology consultant (#372), January 23, 2007, Reference: Semin Nucl Med. 2006 Jan; 36(1):93-104. Links Positron emission tomography in gynecologic cancer. Yen TC, Lai CH.
6. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas Radiology Liaison Committee, February 2009.