

# **PET in PTCL**

Anne-Ségolène Cottereau Tarec El Galaly Martin Hutchings

(n) AALBORG UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL



# PET in PTCLs

 $\Rightarrow$ Role of PET in PTCLs

- What we know
  - Summary of published studies
- Ongoing cooperative LYSA and Danish study (n=142)
- ⇒Is PET able to give prognostic information to stratify risk patient categories?
  - At baseline
  - After treatment : interim and end of treatment PET.

# FDG avidity

Histology	No. of Patients	FDG Avid (%)
Angioimmunoblastic T-cell lymphoma	31	78-100
Peripheral T-cell lymphoma	93	86-98
Anaplastic large T-cell lymphoma	37	94-100*
	=161	

#### Barrington S, 2014, J Clin Oncol

		Sex, No. of Patients		Type of Disease, No. of Patients/Total				Maximum
of nts	Male	Female	No. of Patients/ Total (%)	Cutaneous	Nodal	Visceral	Field of View, <sup>a</sup> No. of Patients	Standardized Uptake Value, Mean (Range)
	24	10	33/34 (97)	8/33	29/33	17/33	7	12.3 (2.8-42.5)
	11	5	15/16 (94)	4/15	15/15	8/15	3	22.9 (5.3–51.0)
	7	11	14/18 (78)	0/14	14/14	7/14	0	12.6 (4.8-29.2)
C r	of its	nts Male 24 11 7	nts Male Female 24 10 11 5 7 11	Male Female No. of Patients/ Total (%)   24 10 33/34 (97)   11 5 15/16 (94)   7 11 14/18 (78)	Male Female No. of Patients/ Total (%) Cutaneous   24 10 33/34 (97) 8/33   11 5 15/16 (94) 4/15   7 11 14/18 (78) 0/14	Male Female No. of Patients/ Total (%) Cutaneous Nodal   24 10 33/34 (97) 8/33 29/33   11 5 15/16 (94) 4/15 15/15   7 11 14/18 (78) 0/14 14/14	of its Male Female No. of Patients/ Total (%) Cutaneous Nodal Visceral   24 10 33/34 (97) 8/33 29/33 17/33   11 5 15/16 (94) 4/15 15/15 8/15   7 11 14/18 (78) 0/14 14/14 7/14	Male Female No. of Patients/ Total (%) Cutaneous Nodal Visceral Field of View, <sup>a</sup> No. of Patients   24 10 33/34 (97) 8/33 29/33 17/33 7   11 5 15/16 (94) 4/15 15/15 8/15 3   7 11 14/18 (78) 0/14 14/14 7/14 0

#### TABLE I: Summary of PET/CT Findings in All Cases of T-Cell Lymphoma

#### Feeney J, 2010, AJR

## Intensity of uptake



Cottereau, El Galaly et al. LYSA and Danish groups

## AITL

#### SUVmax=7.3 TMTV=635 cm<sup>3</sup>



#### ALK + ALCL SUVmax=39 TMTV=352 cm<sup>3</sup>



## Heterogeneous group of lymphoma

- Uptake not only based on tumor cells but also on microenvironmental cells
- Different molecular profile
  - AITL
  - ALCL
  - PTCL NOS:
    - -> not currently well classified by morphological diagnosis



#### Iqbal et al, Blood, 2014



# PET at Staging

- Detection of additional disease sites
  - 50% of the patients
  - 5% of changing stage
- Extranodal sites
  - Bone marrow, lung, gastro intestinal tract, skin, liver.
  - At least 2 EN sites:
    - predictive of outcome
    - Included in IPI

Broussais et al, Leuk Lymphoma, 2013 Gallamini et al, Blood 2014

Casulo et al, Leuk lymphoma, 2013

# Extra nodal disease sites







## Bone marrow involvement

- BMI detect by bone marrow biopsy is an adverse factor.
- BMI PET + : defined by at least one focal uptake
- Danish group (124 patients)
  - 11% PET + in bone marrow.
  - Sensitivity of PET to detect positive BMB : Se=19%
  - BMI PET+ : not predictive of outcome

#### El Galaly, 2015, Am. J.Hematol

- Lysa group
  - 117 patients, from 6 centers
  - 22% PET + in bone marrow.
  - Sensitivity of PET to detect + BMB : Se=29%
  - BMI PET+: Not predictive of outcome

#### Cottereau et al, abstract, J Nucl Med 2016

#### => PET cannot replace bone marrow biopsy!

## Spleen involvement

- $\Rightarrow$  SI PET: defined by focal FDG uptake or diffuse FDG uptake higher than the liver.
- $\Rightarrow$  SPM: > 13cm in vertical length





Prognostic value of spleen involvement (SIPET or SPM)

Lysa/Danish groups study (116+26=142)

- SIPET slighly predictive of PFS
- Comparable to SPM (>13cm)



## Total metabolic tumor volume



71% (65-77%) vs 26% (20-32%)

80% (75-85%) vs 50% (42-58%)





## Total metabolic tumor volume



71% (65-77%) vs 26% (20-32%)

80% (75-85%) vs 50% (42-58%)



## According to each histologic subtypes



## TMTV combined with PIT







# **GOELAMS study**

Retrospective study, MFU= 24 months

- 54 patients with Non cutaneous T/NK lymphomas
- CHOP-like regimen

3NK 1panniculitis

• PET reporting: IHP or 3-point scale (low/moderate/high)

(negative PET if normal or one lesion grade 1)







Cahu X, 2011, Ann Oncol

## **PTCL database of Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer**

Retrospective study, MFU=40 months

- 95 patients with Non cutaneous T/NK lymphomas
- CHOP-like regimen
- PET reporting : PET+ve =FDG uptake > liver background



#### interim n=50 (2-10 cycles) with 39 PTCL

10NK

3EATI

## Oncologist<sup>®</sup> Prognostic Value of Interim Positron Emission Tomography With Peripheral T-Cell Lymphoma

CINZIA PELLEGRINI, LISA ARGNANI, ALESSANDRO BROCCOLI, VITTORIO STEFONI, ENRICO DERENZINI, LETIZIA GANDOLFI, E ROBERTO MAGLIE, STEFANO PILERI, PIER LUIGI ZINZANI

• Retrospective

2014

• 34 patients (2 NK), treated with CHOP 21



## Interim PET (after C3)

## Oncologist<sup>®</sup> Prognostic Value of Interim Positron Emission Tomography With Peripheral T-Cell Lymphoma

CINZIA PELLEGRINI, LISA ARGNANI, ALESSANDRO BROCCOLI, VITTORIO STEFONI, ENRICO DERENZINI, LETIZIA GANDOLFI, E ROBERTO MAGLIE, STEFANO PILERI, PIER LUIGI ZINZANI

• Retrospective

2014

• 34 patients (2 NK), treated with CHOP 21



## **Interim PET (after C3)**



Prognostic Value of Interim and Posttherapy <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT in Patients with Mature T-Cell and Natural Killer Cell Lymphomas

Ya-Jun Li, Zhi-Ming Li, Xi-Ya Xia, Hui-Qiang Huang, Zhong-Jun Xia, Tong-Yu Lin, Su Li, Yi Xia, Xiu-Yu Cai and Wen-Qi Jiang

Retrospective study, MFU= 19.5months

- 88 patients with T/NK lymphomas
- CHOP, EPOCH, triple therapy (CHOP-B, IMVP-16, DHAP) or GEMOX
- PET reporting: IHP

interim n=62 (1-4cycles) with 28 non ENKL

**44NK** 

**3EATL** 





Prognostic Value of Interim and Posttherapy <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT in Patients with Mature T-Cell and Natural Killer Cell Lymphomas

Ya-Jun Li, Zhi-Ming Li, Xi-Ya Xia, Hui-Qiang Huang, Zhong-Jun Xia, Tong-Yu Lin, Su Li, Yi Xia, Xiu-Yu Cai and Wen-Qi Jiang

Retrospective study, MFU= 19.5months

- 88 patients with T/NK lymphomas
- CHOP, EPOCH, triple therapy (CHOP-B, IMVP-16, DHAP) or GEMOX
- PET reporting: IHP

**Eot PET n=57** (with 30 non ENKL)

**44NK** 

**3EATL** 



Post-therapy <sup>18</sup>F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography for predicting outcome in patients with peripheral **T cell lymphoma** 

Naoto Tomita · Yukako Hattori · Shin Fujisawa · Chizuko Hashimoto · Jun Taguchi · Hirotaka Takasaki · Rika Sakai · Ukihide Tateishi · Yoshiaki Ishigatsubo

Retrospective study, MFU= 19.5months

- 36 patients: 16 PTCL NOS and 20 AITL  ${\color{black}\bullet}$
- THP-ADR (83%), THP-COP  ${\color{black}\bullet}$
- **PET reporting: IHP**  ${\color{black}\bullet}$







2015

EOT PET

Prognostic significance of interim PET/CT based on visual, SUV-based, and MTV-based assessment in the treatment of peripheral T-cell lymphoma

## **Prospective** study, MFU= 40.3months

- 63 patients with NK/PTCL
- CHOP/CHOP like regimen
- PET reporting: Deauville 5-PS

## interim n=63 (3-4cycles)

#### median PFS 27 vs 5 months







Jung et al, 2015

## Hematology

## AJH

#### Utility of interim and end-of-treatment PET/CT in peripheral T-cell lymphomas: A review of 124 patients

Tarec Christoffer El-Galaly ⊠, Martin Bjerregård Pedersen, Martin Hutchings, Karen Juul Mylam, Jakob Madsen, Anne Ortved Gang, Martin Bøgsted, Peter de Nully Brown, Annika Loft, Anne Lerberg Nielsen, Helle Westergreen Hendel, Victor Iyer, Lars Christian Gormsen

- 72 PTCL patients; interim PET (2-4 cycles)
- PET reporting: 5 DS

PFS





Utility of <sup>18</sup>fluoro-deoxyglucose positron emission tomography for prognosis and response assessments in a phase 2 study of romidepsin in patients with relapsed or refractory peripheral T-cell lymphoma



January 2015 Horwtiz et al.

Prospective phase 2 study, MFU= 22months

- 130 patients with relapsed/refractory PTCL
- PET reporting :IHP

CT responders:

CR/Cru/PR



#### PET End of treatment n=26

Year	Study	Treatment	PET criteria	Nb of PTCL	Interim PET	Nb of PTCL	EOT PET
2011	<i>Cahu et al.</i> Ann Oncol	100% CHOP	IHP	44	<i>3-4 cycles</i> NS	31	NS
2013	<i>Li et al.</i> JNM	64% CHOP	IHP	62	<i>1-4 cycles</i> PFS, OS	57	PFS ,OS
2013	<i>Casulo et al.</i> Leuk Lymphoma	38% CHOP 48% CHOP/ICE	+ if> liver	50	<i>2-10 cycles</i> PFS		
2014	<i>Pellegrini et al.</i> The oncologist	100% CHOP 21	IHP	36	<i>3 cycles</i> PFS,OS		
2015	<i>Horwitz et al</i> . Ann Oncol	Relapse/refractory romidepsine	IHP			26	Duration of response
2015	<i>Jung et al.</i> BMC	84% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	63	<i>3-4 cycles</i> PFS		
2015	<i>Tomita et al.</i> Ann Hem	СНОР ТНР-СОР	IHP			36	PFS, OS
2015	<i>El Galaly et al.</i> Am. J. Hematol	88% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	72	2-4 cycles NS		
2016	<i>Cordoba et al.</i> Menton	CHOP/CHOEP	5 DS			29	PFS, OS

Year	Study	Treatment	PET criteria	Nb of PTCL	Interim PET	Nb of PTCL	EOT PET
2011	<i>Cahu et al.</i> Ann Oncol	100% CHOP	IHP	44	<i>3-4 cycles</i> NS	31	NS
2013	<i>Li et al.</i> JNM	64% CHOP	IHP	62	<i>1-4 cycles</i> PFS, OS	57	PFS ,OS
2013	<i>Casulo et al.</i> Leuk Lymphoma	38% CHOP 48% CHOP/ICE	+ if> liver	50	<i>2-10 cycles</i> PFS		
2014	<i>Pellegrini et al.</i> The oncologist	100% CHOP 21	IHP	36	<i>3 cycles</i> PFS,OS		
2015	<i>Horwitz et al</i> . Ann Oncol	Relapse/refractory romidepsine	IHP			26	Duration of response
2015	<i>Jung et al.</i> BMC	84% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	63	<i>3-4 cycles</i> PFS		
2015	<i>Tomita et al.</i> Ann Hem	CHOP THP-COP	IHP			36	PFS, OS
2015	<i>El Galaly et al.</i> Am. J. Hematol	88% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	72	2-4 cycles NS		
2016	<i>Cordoba et al.</i> Menton	CHOP/CHOEP	5 DS			29	PFS, OS

Year	Study	Treatment	PET criteria	Nb of PTCL	Interim PET	Nb of PTCL	EOT PET
2011	<i>Cahu et al.</i> Ann Oncol	100% CHOP	IHP	44	<i>3-4 cycles</i> NS	31	NS
2013	<i>Li et al.</i> JNM	64% CHOP		62	<i>1-4 cycles</i> PFS, OS	57	PFS ,OS
2013	<i>Casulo et al.</i> Leuk Lymphoma	38% CHOP 48% CHOP/ICE	+ if> liver	50	<i>2-10 cycles</i> PFS		
2014	<i>Pellegrini et al.</i> The oncologist	100% CHOP 21		36	<i>3 cycles</i> PFS,OS		
2015	<i>Horwitz et al.</i> Ann Oncol	Relapse/refractory romidepsine	IHP			26	Duration of response
2015	<i>Jung et al.</i> BMC	84% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 D S	63	<i>3-4 cycles</i> PFS		
2015	<i>Tomita et al.</i> Ann Hem	CHOP THP-COP				36	PFS, OS
2015	<i>El Galaly et al.</i> Am. J. Hematol	88% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	72	2-4 cycles NS		
2016	<i>Cordoba et al.</i> Menton	?	5 DS			50	PFS, OS

Year	Study	Treatment	PET criteria	Nb of PTCL	Interim PET	Nb of PTCL	EOT PET
2011	<i>Cahu et al.</i> Ann Oncol	100% CHOP	IHP	44.	<i>3-4 cycles</i> NS	31	N
2013	<i>Li et al.</i> JNM	64% CHOP	IHP	62	<i>1-4 cycles</i> PFS, OS	57	PFS ,OS
2013	<i>Casulo et al.</i> Leuk Lymphoma	38% CHOP 48% CHOP/ICE	+ if> liver	50	<i>2-10 cycles</i> PFS		
2014	<i>Pellegrini et al.</i> The oncologist	100% CHOP 21	IHP	34	<i>3 cycles</i> PFS,OS		
2015	<i>Horwitz et al</i> . Ann Oncol	Relapse/refractory romidepsine	IHP			26	Duration of response
2015	<i>Jung et al.</i> BMC	84% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	63	<i>3-4 cycles</i> PFS		
2015	<i>Tomita et al.</i> Ann Hem	СНОР ТНР-СОР	IHP			36	PFS, OS
2015	<i>El Galaly et al.</i> Am. J. Hematol	88% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	72	2-4 cycles NS		
2016	<i>Cordoba et al.</i> Menton	CHOP/CHOEP	5 DS			29	PFS, OS

Year	Study	Treatment	PET criteria	Nb of PTCL	Interim PET	Nb of PTCL	EOT PET
2011	<i>Cahu et al.</i> Ann Oncol	100% CHOP	IHP	44	<i>3-4 cycles</i> NS	31	S
2013	<i>Li et al.</i> JNM	64% CHOP	IHP	<del>62</del> 28	<i>1-4 cycles</i> PFS, OS	<del>57</del> 30	PFS ,OS
2013	<i>Casulo et al.</i> Leuk Lymphoma	38% CHOP 48% CHOP/ICE	+ if> liver	<del>50</del> 39	<i>2-10 cycles</i> PFS		
2014	<i>Pellegrini et al.</i> The oncologist	100% CHOP 21	IHP	<del>34</del> 32	<i>3 cycles</i> PFS,OS		
2015	<i>Horwitz et al</i> . Ann Oncol	Relapse/refractory romidepsine	IHP			26	Duration of response
2015	<i>Jung et al.</i> BMC	84% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	<del>63</del> 36	<i>3-4 cycles</i> PFS		
2015	<i>Tomita et al.</i> Ann Hem	СНОР ТНР-СОР	IHP			36	PFS, OS
2015	<i>El Galaly et al.</i> Am. J. Hematol	88% CHOP/ CHOP like	5 DS	72	<i>2-4 cycles</i> NS		
2016	<i>Cordoba et al.</i> Menton	CHOP/CHOEP	5 DS			29	PFS, OS

# LYSA and Danish cooperative study preliminary results

- 142patients
  - 116 from 6 LYSA centers
  - 26 from the Danish group
- 84% CHOP/CHOP like regimen
- 22% ASCT
- 87% stage 3-4
- 32% positive BMB
- 49% IPI 3-5; 47% PIT 2-4
- Median follow up: 2 years
- 51% 2y-PFS, 67% 2y-OS



# **PET evaluation**

- All patients had a baseline PET (n=142)
- Interim PET
  - After 2cycles (n=43)
  - After 3 or 4 cycles (n=95)
- End of treatment PET (n=96)
  - after first line of chemotherapy
- PET reporting: Deauville scale (4-5 = positive)

# End of Treatment PET n=96



2yPFS: 83% vs 6%

2yOS : 94% vs 27%

## Total metabolic tumor volume



# Conclusions

- PET/CT is useful **at baseline** for PTCL
  - Staging
  - Prediction of prognostic : TMVT is a promising tool.
    - need to be confirmed on a prospective cohort
    - Validate the TMTV optimal threshold
- Response assessment by PET/CT
  - interim and end of treatment
  - predictive of outcome, as others aggressive lymphoma.
  - independent from IPI or PIT score
  - in all PTCL subtypes except ALCL ALK+

# Conclusion

- To be further investigated
  - From retrospective data, increasing the number of patients available (from the different groups participating of the meeting?)
  - From prospective studies with homogenous treatment
    - LYSA trials (Revail, Rochop).
- Mix of different histologies with different microenvironnement
  - Need to explore each subtypes separately
  - To understand the link between
    - FDG uptake and histology
    - PET parameters and molecular bio markers : Ex: TMTV and IDH2 in AITL patients.



## Thank you for your attention

Acknowledgement : Lars Jelstrup and Johan Lofgren















