



Experience in HL with 5PS

Sally Barrington



Concordance between 4 European Centres of PET reporting criteria designed for use in multicentre trials in Hodgkin lymphoma

S.F. Barrington, W. Qian, E.J. Somer, A. Franceschetto, B
Bagni, E. Brun, H. Almquist, A.Loft, L. Højgaard, M.Federico,
A.Gallamini, P.Smith, P.Johnson, J. Radford, M.J.O'Doherty

Methods

Baseline & 'interim' PET-CT

50 patients HL scored using 5PS

Anonymised saved as DICOM

Reported usual workstation

Independent & consensus reads





Results

Agreement on Positive (4,5) vs Negative (1,2,3)

- 44 patients independent read

Kappa = 0.85 (95% CI 0.74-0.96)

- 46 patients consensus read

Agreement on Positive (3,4,5) vs Negative (1,2)

- 41 patients independent read

Kappa = 0.79 (95%CI 0.67-0.90)

- 44 patients consensus read



Disagreement

- Pathological vs physiological or inflammatory uptake in cervical region
- Interpreting axillary uptake in patient scanned with arms down then arms up
- Interpretation of residual hilar uptake



Conclusion

- Very good agreement between 4 European centres using 5 point scale for reporting PET-CT – now 6 Centres
- Reporting criteria are sufficiently robust to be used in a multicentre setting.
- Audit - consistency can be maintained.
- The criteria remain robust if the threshold for 'positivity' is changed according to the clinical or research context.



The **PET** Imaging Centre at St Thomas'

<http://www.sthpetcentre.org.uk/>



Cf with Horning et al

- All PET-CT in our study
- Double reading at core labs
- More experience in interim PET in Europe
- HL vs DLBCL ?
- Role of therapy?