The majority of head and neck cancers is of epithelial origin with squamous cell carcinoma being the most common one [1]. Radiotherapy or combined radiochemotherapy is the main therapeutic option implemented as adjuvant or neoadjuvant approach. In recent years, sophisticated radiation dose planning using morphological and functional imaging modalities and the combination has evolved and has been proposed as a base for individualized radiotherapy planning [2]. However, until now, the clinical standard diagnostic tools to calculate the gross tumour volume (GTV) are computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance tomography imaging (MRI) [3]. While the radiotherapy regimens have been developed over the past decades from volumetric intensity-modulated arc therapy (VMAT) over intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) to possibly intensity-modulated proton therapy (IMPT) [4], there is an urgent need to specify the planning target volume of the tumour. The aim of improving the precision in tumour delineation of head and neck cancers is the reduction of the tumour recurrence rate and the minimization of side effects of the radiotherapy by sparing peritumoural normal tissue. Biological dose adaptation radiotherapy based on molecular and structural imaging has become an important field of research in the recent years [5, 6].

The standard tracer in oncology fluorine labelled fluorodeoxyglucose ([18F]-FDG) has been evaluated with respect to the potential to deliver a valid prognosis based on the initial or interim PET/CT scans in a large number of studies [7]. These studies demonstrated a high predictive value of post therapy FDG uptake [8]. Radiotherapy planning studies using [18F]-FDG-PET/CT or [18F]-FDG-PET/MRI resulted in an improved detection of the gross tumour volume (GTV) in comparison with structural imaging (either CT or MRI) alone [9–11]. On the other hand, the limitations of [18F]-FDG-PET have to be considered when it comes to the specificity of the uptake since several structures in the neck show physiological or inflammation-related uptake of glucose influencing the correct contouring of the tumour significantly [9]. Another aspect that has to be taken into account is the value of interim imaging during treatment as an early treatment evaluation [12]. Also, in this setting, the lacking specificity of FDG with respect to the correlation to viable tumour cells has been reported.

Beyond metabolic imaging using FDG, also other molecular imaging biomarkers have been evaluated. The most promising ones being proliferation and hypoxia tracers. These tracers have been studied with regard to their potential to improve radiotherapy planning and evaluation of therapy success [5, 6].

The proliferation has been evaluated using radiolabelled thymidine analogue (FLT) [5, 6]. In general the studies pointed out a facilitation of therapy regimen selection and improved prediction of outcome in comparison with FDG [13]. The concept of detecting the tumour and defining tumour cells with radioresistance was evaluated implementing different hypoxia-delineating radiotracers, namely [18F]-FMISO, [18F]-FAZA and [18F]-HX4. For all these tracers, the tracer uptake correlated with the grade of hypoxia in the viable tumour cells [14]. Especially molecular imaging using the most promising hypoxia-related radiotracer [18F]-HX4, it effectively demonstrates changes in hypoxia by detecting the extent of hypoxic cells in the tumour volume during radiotherapy [15].

Unfortunately, all hypoxia tracers have one thing in common, they show only low to moderate tumour to background ratios and visualize only a small subpopulation of the tumour...
mass which disqualify the tracers for valuable radiotherapy planning [9].

In epithelial tumours, cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs) make up to 90% of the entire tumour volume, providing the base of the tumour stroma. They have been shown to facilitate cancer progression via supporting of the tumour cell growth extracellular matrix remodelling, angiogenesis promoting and mediation of tumour promoting inflammation [16]. One important protein CAFs express is the fibroblast activation protein (FAP). Recently gallium-68 labelled quinoline-based PET tracers that act as FAP inhibitors have been introduced ([68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI) [17, 18].

[68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI has shown excellent tumour to background ratios in oncologic imaging [17]. It is of note that a large variety of solid and non-solid tumours can be delineated using this innovative radiotracer [19]. Especially in head and neck cancers, [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI is very favourable because of its biodistribution with moderate to high tumour uptake and a low background activity in the surrounding tissue (especially normal lymphatic tissue like the tonsils) and the brain [18].

In this issue, Syed et al. evaluated the usefulness of implementing [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI PET data into the gross tumour volume delineation for targeted radiotherapy in head and neck cancers [20]. They compared conventional morphological radiation planning employing contrast enhanced CT with the performance of [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI in a total of 14 patients. FAPI displayed a high uptake within the tumour lesions (SUVmax 14.62 ± 4.44) and just a low background uptake within the salivary glands (SUVmax 1.76 ± 0.31). Using different SUV thresholds for automated contouring of the tumour lesions resulted in significantly larger median potentially to be irradiated volumes. Including all available clinical and imaging information a thresholding of three times the individual SUVmax of healthy tissue seemed to be reasonable. A merging of the CT and FAPI-based GTVs resulted in an approximately two times larger volume. The authors present first evidence of the value of FAP inhibitors in the biological based radiotherapy planning approach. However, next to a direct histopathological correlation, it is of large importance to also get information on the outcome of patients treated based on FAPI PET/CT data and by that get a confirmation of the assumed large potential of this new tracer.

Compared with earlier [18F]-FDG studies the results of the study using [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI seem to be very promising with respect to sensitivity and specificity. It is expected that especially the differentiation between tumour, physiological or inflammatory tracer uptake will be superior using [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI compared with the previously briefly discussed radiotracers [21].

As already shown by the recent ground-breaking studies using [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI in different tumour entities as a diagnostic tool, the current study gives an impressive insight into the potential of FAPI as a block buster in image-guided radiotherapy of head and neck cancers, where the well-established [18F]-FDG radiotracer has to face its limitations.

It is of great importance now that the nuclear medicine community will stand together and cooperate with radiation oncologists to accelerate the scientific research for [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI in radiotherapy planning, since this pioneering work by Syed et al. showed the immense potential of this radiotracer. Prospective trials are needed to outline a possible indispensability of [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI in the future of multimodal biological-guided head and neck cancer radiotherapy planning.

Funding information Open Access funding provided by Projekt DEAL.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Studies with human participants or animals This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article’s Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

1. Adeyemi BF, Adekunle LV, Kolude BM, Akang EE, Lawoyin JO. Head and neck cancer—a clinicopathological study in a tertiary care center. J Natl Med Assoc. 2008;100:690–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0027-9684(15)31343-2.

2. Jimenez-Ortega E, Ureba A, Baeza JA, Barbeiro AR, Balcerzyk M, Parnado-Gallego A, et al. Accurate, robust and harmonized implementation of morpho-functional imaging in treatment planning for personalized radiotherapy. PLoS One. 2019;14:e0210549. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210549.

3. Gregoire V, Evans M, Le QT, Bourhis J, Budač V, Chen A, et al. Delineation of the primary tumour Clinical Target Volumes (CTV-P) in laryngeal, hypopharyngeal, oropharyngeal and oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma: AIRO, CACA, DAHANCA, EORTC, GEORCC, GORTEC, HKNPCSG, HNCIG, IAG-KHT, LPRHHT, NCIC CTG, NCR, NRG Oncology, PHNS, SBRT, SOMERA, SRO, SSHNO, TROG consensus guidelines. Radiother Oncol. 2018;126:3–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2017.10.016.
4. Moreno AC, Frank SJ, Garden AS, Rosenthal DI, Fuller CD, Gunn GB, et al. Intensity modulated proton therapy (IMPT)–the future of IMRT for head and neck cancer. Oral Oncol. 2019;88:66–74.
5. Eisenmenger LB. Non-FDG radiopharmaceuticals in head and neck PET imaging: current techniques and future directions. Semin Ultrasound CT MR. 2019;40(5):424–33. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.sult.2019.07.006.
6. Hamming-Vrieze O, Navran A, Al-Mamgani A, Vogel WV. Biological PET-guided adaptive radiotherapy for dose escalation in head and neck cancer: a systematic review. Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2018;62:349.
7. Li Y, Awan MJ, Chang T, Lavertu P, Zender C, Rezaee R, et al. Post-radiotherapy PET/CT for predicting treatment outcomes in head and neck cancer after postoperative radiotherapy. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2019;46:794–800.
8. Kohler A, Löck S, Appold S, Bandurska-Luque A, Hoberück S, et al. Comparison of subjective evaluation versus objective algorithm in the interpretation of follow-up FDG-PET/CT scans after radiochemotherapy in head and neck cancer patients. Nucl Instrum Meth B. 2019;58:93–100.
9. Hoeben BA, Bussink J, Troost EG, Oyen WJ, Kaanders JH. Molecular PET imaging for biology-guided adaptive radiotherapy of head and neck cancer. Acta Oncol. 2013;52:1257–71.
10. Besenyi Z, Hideghety K, Lengyel Z, Farkas S, Bakos A. Comparison of 18F-FDG-PET/CT and CT tumour volume delineation in head and neck cancer patients. J Nucl Med Radiat Ther. 2018;9:2.
11. Morsing A, Hildebrandt MG, Vilstrup MH, Wallenius SE, Gerke O, Petersen H, et al. Hybrid PET/MRI in major cancers: a scoping review. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2019;46(10):2138–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-019-04402-8.
12. Garibaldi C, Ronchi S, Cremonesi M, Gilardi L, Travaini L, Ferrari M, et al. Interim (18)F-FDG-PET/CT during chemoradiation therapy in the management of head and neck cancer patients: a systematic review. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2017;98:555–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2017.02.217.
13. Kishino T, Hoshikawa H, Nishiyama Y, Yamamoto Y, Mori N. Usefulness of 3′-deoxy-3′-18F-fluorothymidine PET for predicting early response to chemoradiotherapy in head and neck cancer. J Nucl Med. 2012;53:1521–7. https://doi.org/10.2967/jnumed.111.099200.
14. Hohenstein NA, Chan JW, Wu SY, Tahir P, Yom SS. Diagnosis, staging, radiation treatment response assessment, and outcome prognostication of head and neck cancers using PET imaging: a systematic review. PET Clin. 2020;15:65–75.
15. Zegers CM, Hoebers FJ, van Elmont W, Bons JA, Öllers MC, Troost EG, et al. Evaluation of tumour hypoxia during radiotherapy using [18 F] HX4 PET imaging and blood biomarkers in patients with head and neck cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2016;43:2139–46.
16. Monteran I, Erez N. The dark side of fibroblasts: cancer-associated fibroblasts as mediators of immunosuppression in the tumor microenvironment. Front Immunol. 2019;10:1835. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2019.01835.
17. Lindner T, Loktev A, Altmann A, Giesel F, Kratochwil C, Debus J, et al. Development of quinoline-based theranostic ligands for the targeting of fibroblast activation protein. J Nucl Med. 2018;59:1415–22.
18. Giesel FL, Kratochwil C, Lindner T, Marschalek MM, Loktev A, Lehnert W, et al. 68Ga-FAPI PET/CT: biodistribution and preliminary dosimetry estimate of 2 DOTA-containing FAP-targeting agents in patients with various cancers. J Nucl Med. 2019;60:386–92.
19. Kratochwil C, Flechsig P, Lindner T, Abderrahim L, Altmann A, Mier W, et al. 68Ga-FAPI PET/CT: tracer uptake in 28 different kinds of cancer. J Nucl Med. 2019;60:801–5.
20. Syed M, Flechsig P, Liermann J, et al. Fibroblast activation protein inhibitor (FAPI) PET for diagnostics and advanced targeted radiotherapy in head and neck cancers. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-020-04859-y.
21. Chen H, Pang Y, Wu J, Zhao L, Hao B, Wu J, et al. Comparison of [68Ga]Ga-DOTA-FAPI-04 and [18F] FDG PET/CT for the diagnosis of primary and metastatic lesions in patients with various types of cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-020-04769-z.

Publisher’s note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.