

Comparison of PET Textural Metrics in Different Platforms based on Phantom Studies

A. Kordonis¹, K. Niapou¹, S. Paisiou¹, M.-E. Tomazinaki¹, A. Karaiskou¹, N. Bertsekas¹, P. Rondogianni², A. Samartzis¹

¹Medical Physics Dpt, "Evangelismos" General Hospital of Athens, Ypsilantou 45-47, Athens 10676 ²Nuclear Medicine Dpt, "Evangelismos" General Hospital of Athens, Ypsilantou 45-47, Athens, 10676



- > Radiomics aims to extract quantitative and reproducible information from diagnostic images that are crucial for treatment planning and cancer prognosis.
- > Radiomic features capture tissue and lesion characteristics alone or in combination with demographic and histological data could potentially benefit clinicians for therapy response and prognosis in various types of cancer.
- > Their determination are of maximum importance for clinicians!



1. Background-Aim



For the purposes of this study, SUV and MTV indices are calculated with different, commercial (GE) and scientific (LifeX) tools, and they are eventually compared through experiments with NEMA IQ phantom.

tumor

SUV is defined as the measured radioactivity within the ROI that is normalized to the average radioactivity concentration in the body, following equation:

> Concentration in Region of Interest **SUV** Injected Activity(MBq) *Patient Weight(kg)*

MTV is defined as the volume of tumor tissue that demonstrated metabolic activity at or above the calculated threshold of disease measurability.

Both are subject to reconstruction algorithms, clock accuracy and biological processes, such as plasma glucose levels, tumor type, motion artifacts and body size.

1g~1ml

2. Materials & Methods

For the purposes of this study, we used:



PET-NEMA/IEC Body Phantom



GE Mi DR PET/CT Scanner



- ✓ AW VCAR, Commercial software product by GE Healthcare
- ✓ Intuitive User Interface
- ✓ Automatic segmentation and volumetric quantifications of tumors



- ✓ free and easy-to-use platform
- ✓ User-defined region of interest (ROI) or volume of interest (VOI)
- ✓ Automatic calculation of radiomic features



2. Materials & Methods

Phantom Preparation:

- 1. Stuff one quarter of NEMA IEC phantom with deionized water
- 2. Inject 53.67 MBq ¹⁸F into the background volume
- 3. Use a new syringe to fill three spheres (diameter's: 22 mm, 13 mm and 10 mm respectively) of the phantom with the background activity
- 4. Fill the remaining background volume with deionized water until full

iniuge recons	Image	Recons
---------------	-------	--------

- VUE Point FX GE commercial algorithm
- 2 iterations
- 16 subsets*

Import images to LifeX & GE AW platforms

Phantom Part	Radioactive Concentration (kBq/ml)	
Background	5.3 *	
Spheres	21.2	
Sphere-to-Background Ratio	4	

*Injected activity and image reconstruction to simulate clinical practice

truction:

3. Results

GE AW 3.2:

- Adaptive Threshold 42%
- ROIs set by the user in all views
- Isosurface-based calculation

LifeX:

- Relative Threshold 42%
- No Adaptive Threshold mode
- ROIs set by the user
- Voxel-by-Voxel calculation



	SUV _{max}		
Sphere	GE AW 3.2	LifeX	
#1	7.92	7.06	
#2	7.12	6.76	
#3	6.13	4.23	



- SUV_{max} values range for different segmentation modes
- MTV relative errors <10%
- Small ROIs achieve smaller MTV values
- Self-normalization to each sphere, results in similar MTV values
- Adaptive threshold experiments may affect the results

MTV (cm ³)			RE(%)
Sphere	GE AW 3.2	LifeX	
#1	2.52	2.73	8.33
#2	1.22	1.31	7.38
#3	0.90	0.86	4.44

4. Conclusions

- \succ For larger spheres, the SUV_{max} values of the two softwares are closely aligned.
- Slight underestimation in the SUV_{max} value of the smaller spheres (LifeX), does not eventually affect the MTV values due to self-normalization.
- \blacktriangleright Limited variation of MTV values, with a relative error ~ 10%
- > Both systems demonstrate similar MTV results, making them suitable for diagnostic purposes.
- \blacktriangleright Phantom experiments for β parameter (LifeX) determination in order to study adaptive threshold mode is required.
- \succ Further investigation on clinical cases with respect to different kinds of tumors, radioisotopes and patient profiles needs to be studied.

[1] C. Nioche, F. Orlhac, S. Boughdad et al. : "LIFEx: A Freeware for Radiomic Feature Calculation in Multimodality Imaging to Accelerate Advances in the Characterization of Tumor Heterogeneity ", Cancer Res (2018) 78 (16): 4786–4789, doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-18-0125</u> [2] M. E. Mayerhoefer, A.Materka, G. L., I. Häggström, P. Szczypiński, P. Gibbs and G. Cook: "Introduction *Radiomics* ", Journal of Nuclear Medicine (2020), 61 (4) to https://doi.org/10.2967/jnumed.118.222893 [3] Y.-P. Zhang, X.-Y. Zhang, Y. T. C., B. Li : "Artificial intelligence-driven radiomics study in cancer: the role of feature engineering and modeling ", Military Medical Research (2023) 10 (1):

22, doi:<u>10.1186/s40779-023-00458-8</u>

[4] M. C. Adams, T. G. Turkington, J. M. Wilson and T. Z. Wong: "A Systematic Review of the Factors Affecting Accuracy of SUV Measurements", American Journal of Roentgenology (2010) 195 (2), doi: https://doi.org/10.2214/AJR.10.4923

[5] H. J. Im , T. Bradshaw , M. Solaiyappan , S. Cho . "Current Methods to Define Metabolic Tumor Volume in Positron Emission Tomography: Which One is Better?" Nucl Med Mol Imaging (2018) 52 (1): 5-15. doi: <u>10.1007/s13139-017-0493-6</u>

[6] GE Healthcare (n.d.) AW Server 3.2 User Guide, Direction 5719556-1EN, Revision 3. GE Healthcare.

488-495; doi: