**18**F-FDG PET/CT total lesion glycolysis is associated with circulating tumor cell counts in patients with stage I to IIIA non-small cell lung cancer
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**Background:** In non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), 18F-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (18F-FDG) uptake determined by PET and presence of circulating tumor cells (CTCs) in the peripheral blood independently predict outcomes. For 18F-FDG PET/CT staging interpretation, standardized uptake values (SUV\text{max/avg}) are routinely used in clinical reporting. The goal was to investigate whether 18F-FDG uptake measured by SUV\text{max/avg}, but also measures of metabolic tumor volume (MTV) and total lesion glycolysis (TLG) (MTV × SUV\text{avg}), are associated with CTCs.

**Methods:** Prospectively, 7.5 mL blood was drawn from NSCLC patients at the time of staging 18F-FDG PET/CT and from healthy control subjects. CTCs were identified by immunofluorescent staining (CK8/18/19\textsuperscript{pos}/EpCAM\textsuperscript{pos}/CD45\textsuperscript{neg}/DAPI\textsuperscript{pos} nucleus). 18F-FDG PET/CTs were analyzed for SUV\text{max}, SUV\text{avg}, MTV, and TLG.

**Results:** In 16 NSCLC patients with stage I–IIIA, MTV and TLG, in contrast to SUV\text{max} and SUV\text{avg}, were positively associated with CTCs (linear regression analysis). No CTCs were detectable in 20 healthy control subjects.

**Conclusions:** This pilot study demonstrates that 18F-FDG PET/CT TLG correlates with CTCs in NSCLC patients without distant metastases. TLG might be a more appropriate marker for hematogenous micrometastatic potential than SUVs.
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**Introduction**

Five-year survival of non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients remains low at 18% (1). 18F-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (18F-FDG) PET/CT, representing active tumor biology based on glucose metabolism, is the standard imaging modality for NSCLC staging (2). 18F-FDG uptake
parameters are predictive of poor outcome in NSCLC and other cancer types (3,4). Increased $^{18}$F-FDG uptake on PET is associated with higher tumor glucose metabolism, which correlates with metastatic spread (5). Standardized uptake values ($\text{SUV}_{\text{avg/max}}$) are parameters typically reported in staging PET imaging for NSCLC, calculated as the ratio of radioactivity per unit volume of a region of interest (ROI) to the activity per unit whole body volume (6). However, combined measures of metabolic and volumetric tumor information, such as metabolic tumor volume (MTV) and total lesion glycolysis (TLG) (calculated as $\text{MTV} \times \text{SUV}_{\text{avg}}$), may be a more appropriate predictor for micrometastatic spread than SUVs (7,8).

Circulating tumor cells (CTCs)—defined as CK$^{\text{pos}}$/EpCAM$^{\text{pos}}$/CD45$^{\text{neg}}$ with a DAPI$^{\text{pos}}$ nucleus—are found in the blood of cancer patients and correlate negatively with survival in NSCLC (9). CTCs have been implicated in development of metastases (10). Due to their simple detection, CTC liquid biomarker research is a most active field in translational oncology. The linkage between CTCs and tumor glucose metabolism is poorly understood (11). Since both CTCs and PET activity are associated with metastatic spread, we hypothesized that metabolic PET parameters correlate with CTCs in NSCLC.

This is a pilot study that demonstrates that TLG is associated with CTCs in non-metastatic NSCLC patients, in contrast to $\text{SUV}_{\text{max/avg}}$. Results suggest that TLG may be a better marker than SUVs for micrometastatic spread of NSCLC.

**Methods**

**Subjects**

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained (IRB2010166/IRB2004401-VA). Prospectively, treatment-naïve NSCLC patients that underwent staging for surgery for stage I-IIIA (AJCC 8$^{\text{th}}$ ed.) between July 2016 to December 2017 and healthy never-smokers were enrolled and signed informed consents.

$^{18}$F-FDG-PET/CT uptake parameter associations with CTCs

To associate metabolic parameters with CTCs, linear regression analyses were performed (Figure 2). We found a significant positive association between MTV and CTCs [slope = 0.13, 95% CI, (0.03, 0.23), $F(1,15)=7.60$, $P=0.016$, $r^2=0.35$], and TLG and CTCs [slope = 0.03, 95% CI, (0.01, 0.05), $F(1,15)=9.81$, $P=0.007$, $r^2=0.41$]. No significant correlations between $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$ and CTCs [slope = -0.21, 95% CI, (-0.93, 0.51), $F(1,15)=0.38$, $P=0.546$, $r^2=0.03$] or $\text{SUV}_{\text{avg}}$ and CTCs [slope = -0.42, 95% CI, (-1.79, 0.95), $F(1,15)=0.43$, $P=0.522$, $r^2=0.03$] were found. There was no
Table 1  Subjects’ clinicopathological characteristics, $^{18}$F-FDG PET/CT and CTC results

| Characteristic | N       | Median (range) |
|---------------|---------|----------------|
| Total subjects analyzed | 36      |                |
| NSCLC         | 16      |                |
| Age           | 63 [48–79] |                |
| Gender        |         |                |
| Females       | 8 (50%) |                |
| Males         | 8 (50%) |                |
| AJCC stages (8th ed.) |        |                |
| I             | 11 (68.8%) |                |
| II            | 3 (18.8%) |                |
| IIIA          | 2 (12.4%) |                |
| pT stage      |         |                |
| pT1           | 8 (50%)  |                |
| pT2           | 6 (37.5%) |                |
| pT3           | 1 (6.3%)  |                |
| pT4           | 1 (6.2%)  |                |
| pN stage      |         |                |
| pN0           | 13 (82.2%) |                |
| pN1           | 2 (12.5%) |                |
| pN2           | 1 (6.3%)  |                |
| Histology     |         |                |
| Adenocarcinoma | 8 (50%)  |                |
| Squamous cell  | 7 (43.8%) |                |
| Large-cell neuroendocrine | 1 (6.2%) |                |
| Treatments received |        |                |
| No treatment  | 9 (56.3%) |                |
| Adjuvant chemotherapy | 6 (37.5%) |                |
| Adjuvant chemotherapy and radiation | 1 (6.2%) |                |
| CTCs/7.5 mL of blood | 16/16 (100%) | 19 [13–48] |
| $^{18}$F-FDG PET/CT parameters | | |
| $\text{SUV}_{max}$ | 12.37 (2.37–27.39) | |
| $\text{SUV}_{avg}$ | 7.50 (1.62–14.37) | |
| TLG           | 64.73 (2.61–798.0) | |
| MTV           | 10.26 (1.10–164.2) | |
| Healthy never-smoker controls | 20 | |
| Age           | 44 (28–69) | |
| Gender        |         |                |
| Females       | 10 (50%) |                |
| Males         | 10 (50%) |                |
| CTCs/7.5 mL of blood | 0/20 | 0 |

CTC, circulating tumor cell; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer; TLG, total lesion glycolysis; MTV, metabolic tumor volume.
Figure 1 CTC analysis. (A) At the time of staging, CTCs were identified in 7.5 mL of blood by immunofluorescent staining. Presented are staining patterns of three CTCs from different NSCLC patients. (B) CTC counts in NSCLC patients and healthy never-smoking controls (bars: mean ± standard error of the mean). CTC, circulating tumor cell; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer.

Figure 2 Relationship between $^{18}$F-FDG PET/CT metabolic uptake parameters and CTCs in NSCLC. Linear regression graphs are shown. MTV and TLG were positively associated with CTCs. CTC, circulating tumor cell; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer.
significant association between pathologic tumor size (pT) and CTCs, or pT and metabolic parameters.

A multivariate linear regression analysis predicting CTCs from MTV, controlling for AJCC stage, was performed. This overall model was not significant \(F(2,13)=2.20, P=0.061\)—due to a non-significant slope for stage. The intercept was 18.06 [95% CI, (8.23, 27.89)]. MTV was a significant predictor for CTCs [slope= 0.13, 95% CI, (0.02, 0.23), P=0.008]. AJCC stage was not a significant predictor for CTCs [slope= -0.25, 95% CI, (-5.74, 6.24), P=0.930]. Residuals for MTV were normally distributed and homoscedastic. The \(r^2\) was 0.35 in this multivariate regression model. Similarly, we did a multivariate linear regression predicting CTCs from TLG, controlling for stage. The regression model was significant \(F(2,13)=5.01, P=0.024\). The intercept was 14.50 [95% CI, (4.57, 24.44)]. TLG was a significant predictor for CTCs [slope= 0.03, 95% CI, (0.01, 0.05), P=0.008]. Stage was not a significant predictor for CTCs [slope= 1.91, 95% CI, (-3.72, 7.53), P=0.477]. Residuals for TLG were normally distributed and homoscedastic. The \(r^2\) was 0.44 in this multivariate linear regression.

This pilot study results suggest that MTV and TLG, in contrast to SUV\(_{\text{max/avg}}\), are potential predictors for micrometastatic hematogenous spread measured by CTCs in NSCLC patients (Figure 3).

**Discussion**

SUV\(_{\text{max}}\) is the standard metabolic parameter applied for clinical NSCLC staging (15). However the TLG, a measure that takes the metabolic tumor volume burden into account, may provide a better reflection of cancer biology (7). Our findings suggest that in addition to MTV, TLG is a more accurate marker than SUVs for micrometastatic hematogenous spread represented by CTCs. Correlation of SUV\(_{\text{max}}\) with poor outcome in NSCLC has been suggested, but conflicting data exist (3,5,16). Independently, \(^{18}\)F-FDG PET/CT TLG and CTCs in the blood predict increased risk of recurrence in NSCLC, but the association of \(^{18}\)F-FDG uptake parameters with CTCs is poorly understood (11,17-19). We performed metabolic
18F-FDG PET/CT analysis in primary lung tumors, but not in loco-regional lymph node metastases (if present). Although we did not include NSCLC patients with distant metastases, the study is limited by population heterogeneity. The majority of patients had lung tumors with no loco-regional nodal metastases, but three patients had ipsilateral intrapulmonary/hilar and/or mediastinal lymph node metastases.

In metastatic NSCLC patients undergoing chemotherapy, a correlation between a decrease in CTCs and SUV<sub>max</sub> has been demonstrated (19). In another cohort of metastatic NSCLC patients that often have multiple tumor sites with different metabolic uptake, no correlation between CTCs and metabolic parameters, including TLG, was noted (20). In contrast, our study focused on non-metastatic NSCLC patients that might be less diverse than metastatic patients, which may explain why an association between TLG and CTCs was observed. In a comparable group of NSCLC patients undergoing surgery, presence of CTCs one month after resection correlated with SUV<sub>max</sub>, but TLG was not analyzed in this study (17). In a heterogeneous group of NSCLC patients of all stages, CTCs detected by a non-EpCAM-based method neither correlated with SUV<sub>max</sub>, nor TLG (18). Interestingly, presence of CTC clusters (≥2 CTCs in aggregate) was associated with TLG, but it needs to be taken into consideration that clusters are more prevalent in metastatic NSCLC (21). EpCAM-independent detection technologies yield higher CTC counts due to down-regulation of EpCAM during epithelial-mesenchymal transition of cancer cells (18). However, we chose to identify CTCs as CK<sup>pos</sup>/EpCAM<sup>pos</sup>—in alignment with the FDA-approved definition (22). This pilot study links TLG to CTCs in non-metastatic NSCLC patients. Although we exclusively studied patients with local tumors or loco-regional nodal disease (without distant metastases), the extent of tumor burden varied amongst patients which may affect glucose metabolism and CTC shedding. Interpretation of our results are limited by small sample size and should be confirmed in larger cohorts.

**Conclusions**

18F-FDG PET/CT TLG, in contrast to SUVs, is associated with presence of CTCs in stage I-IIIA NSCLC patients. TLG might be an appropriate marker than SUVs for micrometastatic spread of NSCLC measured by CTCs in the blood.
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