Initial Experience in Staging Primary Oesophageal/Gastroesophageal Cancer with 18F-FDG PET/MRI

Amy R Sharkey (✉ amyrose.sharkey@gstt.nhs.uk)

School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0916-9123>

Bert-Ram Sah

University of Bern

Samuel J Withey

School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences

Shaheel Bhuvra

King's college London and guy's and St Thomas PET Centre, London

Radhouene Neji

MR Research Collaborations, Siemens Healthcare

Sami Jejeli

King's College London and Guys and St Thomas PET Centre

Adrian Green

King's College London School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences

Gary JR Cook

King's College London and Guy's and St Thomas' PET Centre, London

Vicky Goh

King's College London School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences

Research Article

Keywords: PET/CT, PET/MR, oesophageal cancer, gastroesophageal cancer

Posted Date: September 27th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-904741/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background

¹⁸F-Fluorodesoxyglucose Positron-emission tomography magnetic resonance imaging (18F-FDG PET/MRI) may improve cancer staging by combining sensitive cancer detection with high contrast resolution and detail. We compared the diagnostic performance of 18F-FDG PET/MRI to ¹⁸F-Fluorodesoxyglucose Positron-emission tomography computed tomography (18F-FDG PET/CT) for staging oesophageal/gastroesophageal cancer.

Following ethical approval and informed consent, participants with newly diagnosed primary oesophageal/gastroesophageal cancer were enrolled. Exclusions included prior/concurrent malignancy. Following 324±28 MBq 18F-FDG administration and 60-minute uptake, PET/CT was performed; immediately followed by integrated PET/MRI from skull base to mid-thigh. PET/CT was interpreted by two dual-accredited nuclear medicine physicians; PET/MRI by a dual-accredited nuclear medicine physician/radiologist and cancer radiologist in consensus. Per-participant staging was compared with the tumour board consensus staging using the McNemar test, with statistical significance at 5%.

Results

22/26 participants (20 male; mean±SD age 68.8±8.7 years) completed 18F-FDG PET/CT and PET/MRI. Compared to the tumour board, the primary tumour was staged concordantly in 55% (12/22) with PET/MRI and 36% (8/22) with PET/CT; the nodal stage was concordant in 45% (10/22) with PET/MRI and 50% (11/22) with PET/CT. There was no statistical difference in PET/CT and PET/MRI staging performance ($p>0.05$, for T and N staging). The staging of distant metastases was concordant with the tumour board in 95% (21/22) with both PET/MRI and PET/CT. Of participants with distant metastatic disease, PET/MRI detected additional metastases in 30% (3/10).

Conclusion

In this preliminary study, compared to 18F-FDG PET/CT, 18F-FDG PET/MRI showed non-significant higher concordance with T-staging, but no difference with N or M-staging. Additional metastases detected by 18F-FDG PET/MRI may be of additive clinical value.

Background

Oesophageal cancer, including cancer extending to the gastroesophageal junction, remains a leading cause of cancer death worldwide [1]. Late presentation results in poor overall survival, with 5-year survival rates ranging from 15–25% [2]. Curative treatment combines neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy with surgery, while palliative treatment options include chemotherapy and local management, such as radiotherapy and endoscopic stenting [2]–[4]. Optimal use of staging techniques is essential to predict prognosis and to tailor treatment to achieve the best possible outcomes.

Current clinical pathways incorporate contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT) and 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computed tomography (18F-FDG PET/CT) for staging patients planned for curative surgery [5]. Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) may also be performed for very localized tumours, and some gastroesophageal cancers may undergo a staging laparoscopy (where appropriate). There are limitations to this staging approach; 18F-FDG PET/CT has a high sensitivity for metastatic disease, however diagnostic accuracy remains suboptimal for locoregional staging [6]. Conversely, EUS has a high performance for local staging, but may not be successful in up to 45% of patients [7].

MRI offers superior soft-tissue contrast and high anatomical resolution, an advantage in locoregional and distant staging [8]–[10]. To date, exploration of the hybrid diagnostic utility of 18F-FDG PET/MRI in oesophageal cancer is limited. Lee et al. [11] published a retrospective study from a sequential PET/MRI system, finding 18F-FDG PET/MRI demonstrated acceptable accuracy for T staging compared with EUS, and higher accuracy than EUS and 18F-FDG PET/CT for prediction of nodal staging, albeit at a statistically insignificant level. Linder et al. [12] have more recently published a series of 16 patients undergoing 18F-FDG-PET/MRI for preoperative staging of oesophageal or gastroesophageal cancer, finding 18F-FDG-PET/MRI and 18F-FDG-PET/CT correlated well for most measured values with discrepancies mainly in the assessment of the T-stage.

We hypothesized that integrated 18F-FDG PET/MRI may streamline and improve staging compared to our current clinical practice by combining sensitive molecular imaging with high contrast anatomical imaging. Therefore, the primary aim of our prospective study was to compare the diagnostic performance of integrated 18F-FDG PET/MRI for staging primary oesophageal/ gastroesophageal cancers compared to our current clinical practice (contrast-enhanced CT and 18F-FDG PET/CT), with secondary aims of comparing the SUVmax in 18F-FDG PET/CT vs. 18F-FDG PET/MRI, and assessing correlations between ADCmean and corresponding SUVmax values.

Materials And Methods

Participants

Research ethics committee approval and informed consent were obtained for this prospective single-centre feasibility study (Research Ethics Committee number: 14/LO/0220). Twenty-six participants with newly-diagnosed, histologically-proven oesophageal/ gastroesophageal cancer were eligible and enrolled from 2016 to 2018. Participants were excluded if there was a prior or concurrent malignancy, and if they did not complete the 18F-FDG PET/MRI scan.

Imaging

18F-FDG PET/CT

Participants were injected with 324 ± 28 MBq ^{18}F -FDG following a 4-6 hour fast and after blood glucose levels were verified as ≤ 10.0 mmol/L. Imaging was performed on two identical scanners (Discovery 710, GE Healthcare, Chicago, IL, USA). Image acquisition was performed 60 minutes post tracer injection from skull base to mid-thigh (5-8 bed positions; 3 minutes per bed position). PET images were reconstructed with a time-of-flight ordered subset expectation maximization algorithm (2 iterations, 24 subsets) with a reconstructed slice thickness of 3.27 mm and pixel size 4.7 mm. The non-contrast CT component was acquired at 140 kVp with Smart mA (15-100 mA).

18F-FDG PET/MRI

The average time period from the start of the ^{18}F -FDG PET/CT to the start of the ^{18}F -FDG PET/MRI was 52.5 ± 18.1 minutes. ^{18}F -FDG PET/MRI was performed on an integrated system (Siemens Biograph mMR, Erlangen, Germany) straight after completion of the PET/CT acquisition. This was acquired from the skull base to mid-thigh (4-5 bed positions, 4 minutes per bed position). For each bed position a 2-point Dixon volume-interpolated breath-hold examination (VIBE) sequence was applied to derive an attenuation map (μ -map) based on 4 tissue types: air, lung, soft-tissue and fat. Other sequences per bed position included: T1-weighted Dixon VIBE, T2-weighted half-fourier-acquired single-shot turbo spin-echo (HASTE) and free breathing diffusion-weighted sequences (DWI, b values of 50 and 900 s/mm^2). Additional T1-weighted post gadolinium contrast agent axial sequences of the liver and coronal sequence of the thorax were performed (Acquisition parameters: Supplemental Table 1). The PET images were reconstructed with a 3D iterative method (3 iterations, 21 subsets), with a voxel size of $2.3 \times 2.3 \times 5 \text{ mm}$; full width at half maximum of 4mm; absolute scatter correction.

Image interpretation

18F-FDG PET/CT

^{18}F -FDG PET/CT was interpreted by two dual-accredited nuclear medicine physicians in consensus. The location of the primary tumour and location and number of involved nodes (defined by FDG uptake or size, as per clinical practice) and distant metastases were recorded. A TNM stage was assigned for each participant according to the 8th edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer TNM (tumour-node-metastasis) staging system [13]. Primary tumour SUVmax was also measured.

18F-FDG PET/MRI

^{18}F -FDG PET/MRI image interpretation was performed by a dual-accredited nuclear medicine physician/radiologist and cancer radiologist in consensus, blinded to other imaging and outcome. Again, location of the primary tumour and location and number of involved nodes and distant metastases were recorded. The TNM stage was assigned for each participant. Primary tumour SUVmax and ADCmean value were also measured.

Tumour board consensus staging

The final TNM stage, as documented by the tumour board consensus staging prior to treatment, was defined by all standard investigations, including imaging with contrast-enhanced CT, 18F-FDG PET/CT, EUS (where applicable) and staging laparoscopy (where applicable), but excluding 18F- FDG PET/MRI. Of note, EUS was not a suitable investigation for many of our patients, and was only performed on 4/22 participants in this cohort. The tumour board decision involved the consensus of cancer radiologists, nuclear medicine physicians, clinical and medical oncologists, upper gastrointestinal surgeons, and other members of the multi-disciplinary team.

Follow-up

Participants were followed up as per normal clinical practice, with a 3-year follow-up period detailed in this study.

Statistical analysis

Per-participant diagnostic performance of 18F-FDG PET/MRI and 18F-FDG PET/CT was compared with tumour board staging set as the reference standard, using the McNemar test, with statistical significance at 5%.

The SUVmax recorded on 18F-FDG PET/MRI and 18F-FDG PET/CT were compared using the Mann-Whitney test.

Correlation between the ADCmean and SUVmax values on 18F-FDG PET/MRI were compared using Spearman’s rank-order correlation.

Further descriptive analysis was carried out on a case-by-case basis to determine if the 18F-FDG PET/MRI study provided any additive information to the 18F-FDG PET/CT, especially for nodal or distant metastases.

Results

Participants

26 participants with newly diagnosed oesophageal/ gastroesophageal cancer were enrolled in this study. 22/26 participants (20 male; 69±9 years at time of 18F-FDG PET/CT imaging) underwent both standard investigations and 18F-FDG PET/MRI. 4/26 participants were excluded due to non-completion of 18F-FDG PET/MRI. The participant flow diagram is shown in Figure 1.

Table 1 describes participant and tumour characteristics. Participants were followed up for 3 years, with 3/22 participants were lost to follow up. 3/19 participants with follow up remain alive and are disease-free, all of whom had a non-adenocarcinoma sub type (two squamous cell, 1 small cell), and thus predictably better outcomes.

Table 1. Participant and tumour characteristics, treatment and outcome.

Participant characteristics	
Sex	20 Male (91%): 2 Female (9%)
Mean ± SD age (years)	68.8±8.7
Tumour location:	
Upper oesophagus	0
Mid oesophagus	1
Distal oesophagus	8
Gastroesophageal	13
Cancer type:	
Adenocarcinoma	18
Squamous cell carcinoma	3
Small cell carcinoma	1
Treatment:	
Neoadjuvant therapy + surgery	3
Definitive chemoradiotherapy	2
Surgery only	1
Palliative chemotherapy	7
Palliative radiotherapy ± chemotherapy	4
Declined treatment	1
Unknown	4
Outcome:	
Alive	3
Deceased	16
Unknown	3

Staging

18F-FDG PET/CT staging, 18F-FDG PET/MRI staging and tumour board consensus staging is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparison of TNM staging for 18F-FDG PET/CT, 18F-FDG PET/MRI and tumour board consensus. Participant 13 had no increased tumour FDG uptake compared to background.

	18F-FDG PET/ CT			18F-FDG PET/ MRI			Tumour board consensus		
Participant	T	N	M	T	N	M	T	N	M
1	3	3	1	3	3	1	3	2	1
2	3	1	1	4	1	1	3	1	0
3	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	2	1
4	2	2	0	3	2	0	3	2	0
5	2	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0
6	2	2	0	4	1	0	3	1	0
7	2	1	0	3	1	0	4	1	0
8	3	1	0	3	1	0	3	1	0
9	2	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0
10	3	2	0	3	2	0	3	1	0
11	2	3	1	3	3	1	3	2	1
12	3	1	0	3	1	0	3	2	0
13	3	1	0	3	1	0	3	1	0
14	2	1	0	4	2	0	3	1	0
15	3	3	0	3	3	0	4	2	0
16	3	2	1	3	3	1	3	1	1
17	2	3	1	2	3	1	3	3	1
18	2	2	1	3	1	1	3	3	1
19	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	1
20	2	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	0
21	3	2	1	4	2	1	4	3	1
22	4	2	1	4	2	1	4	2	1

T-staging

Using the tumour board consensus as a reference standard, there was T3 cancer in 18/22 (82%) participants, and T4 cancer in 4/22 (18%) participants. The primary tumour stage was concordant with the tumour board consensus decision in 12/22 (54%) participants with 18F-FDG PET/MRI (over-staged 3, under-staged 7), and 8/22 (36%) participants with 18F-FDG PET/CT (over-staged 0, under-staged 14). There was no statistically significant difference between the modalities in terms of consensus with tumour board decision (p=0.69)

N-staging

Using the tumour board consensus as a reference standard, 2/22 (9%) participants had a nodal stage of N0, 9/22 (41%) participants had N1, 8/22 (36%) participants had N2, and 3/22 (14%) participants had N3. The nodal stage was concordant with the tumour board consensus decision in 11/22 (50%) participants using 18F-FDG PET/CT (6 over-staged, 5 under-staged), and 10/22 (45%) participants using 18F-FDG PET/MRI (6 over-staged, 6 under-staged). Again, there was no statistically significant difference between the modalities in terms of consensus with the tumour board decision ($p=0.99$)

M-staging

Using the tumour board consensus as a reference standard, 9/22 (41%) participants had distant metastases and 13/22 (59%) participants did not have distant metastases. The staging of metastatic spread was concordant with the tumour board consensus decision in 21/22 (95%) participants using 18F-FDG PET/CT (1 over-staged), and 21/22 (95%) participants using 18F-FDG PET/ MRI (1 over-staged). Of note, the same participant was staged discordantly on both modalities, as both 18F-FDG PET/CT and 18F-FDG PET/MRI detected peritoneal disease which was not appreciated on the contrast-enhanced CT study.

Comparison of SUVmax between 18F-FDG PET/CT and 18F-FDG PET/MRI

Table 3 summarises primary tumour SUVmax for 18F-FDG PET/CT and subsequent 18F-FDG PET/MRI for each participant. As shown, participant 13 had no tumour FDG uptake above background. The average time from the start of the 18F-FDG PET/CT to the start of the 18F-FDG PET/MRI was 52.5 +/- 18.1 minutes, noting that PET/CT acquisitions lasted 20 to 30 minutes depending on the number of bed positions and that participants subsequently emptied their bladders, transferred to the PET/MRI scanner in the same department and had coils fitted as part of the PET/MRI setup. The SUVmax was generally higher on 18F-FDG PET/MRI, as shown by the primary tumour delta SUVmax, likely primarily resulting from the increased time for uptake, although technical differences in the attenuation correction methods between PET/CT and PET/MRI could also have influenced differences. The average primary tumour SUVmax on PET/CT was 18.0 +/- 12.4, versus an average SUVmax on PET/MRI of 22.5 +/- 13.7 (Mann-Whitney, $p<0.001$).

Table 3. Primary tumour SUVmax for 18F-FDG PET/CT and PET/MRI and diffusion-weighted MRI mean apparent diffusion co-efficient, ADCmean.

Participant	PET/CT SUV_{max}	PET/MRI SUV_{max}	ΔSUV_{max} (%)	ADC_{mean} ($\times 10^{-3} \text{mm}^2/\text{s}$)
1	14.6	17.1	17	1.68
2	51.9	51.9	0	1.29
3	11.3	17.3	53	1.89
4	7.9	11.7	48	0.79
5	11.5	16.8	46	1.47
6	11.5	17.1	49	1.26
7	4	5.3	33	1.81
8	20.7	22.8	10	0.93
9	7.2	11.8	64	1.95
10	15.1	17	13	1.43
11	8.8	12.4	41	1.22
12	16.8	18.6	11	1.99
13	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.59
14	23.2	39.4	70	1.23
15	41.4	45.5	10	1.19
16	20.6	21.6	5	1.16
17	30	43.6	45	0.93
18	28.9	31.9	10	1.69
19	7.2	7.9	10	1.84
20	25.1	28.6	14	1.33
21	13.3	20.4	53	0.83
22	24.9	35.4	42	1.16

Association between SUV_{max} and ADC_{mean} with 18F-FDG PET/MRI

Table 3 also summarises primary tumour mean apparent diffusion co-efficient (ADC_{mean}) for each participant. There was no correlation between SUV_{max} and the corresponding ADC_{mean} value, with a Spearman correlation coefficient of 0.05, p=0.83.

Additional information with 18F-FDG PET/MRI

Differences in the imaging modalities are demonstrated in Figure 2, showing differences in primary tumour uptake in a gastroesophageal adenocarcinoma on 18F-FDG PET/CT vs. 18F-FDG PET/MRI.

In terms of nodal evaluation, 18F-FDG PET/MRI did not improve nodal staging compared to 18F-FDG PET/CT. There was a difference between 18F-FDG PET/CT and 18F-FDG PET/MRI in 4/22 patients; with a lower number of nodes on 18F-FDG PET/MRI in 3/4 cases; in one case, this was due to bowel gas artefact obscuring the node.

In 3/10 (30%) patients with distant metastases, more metastases were demonstrated on 18F-FDG PET/MRI compared to 18F-FDG PET/CT. In two cases, additional sites of peritoneal disease were demonstrated on 18F-FDG PET/MRI; in the third case, additional liver metastases were detected (Figure 3). Although these findings are not captured in the comparative M staging (which offers only a binary 0 or 1), they could be important clinically and prognostically, suggesting that 18F-FDG PET/MRI may offer additional clinical benefit in some patients.

Discussion

The primary tumour was concordantly staged with the tumour board consensus staging in 54% (12/22) of participants with 18F-FDG PET/MRI, and 36% (8/22) with 18F-FDG PET/CT. Nodal staging was concordant with the tumour board consensus decision in 45% (10/22) with 18F-FDG PET/MRI and 50% (11/22) with 18F-FDG PET/CT. Our results show that within this small cohort, there is no statistically significant difference in T and N staging on 18F-FDG PET/CT and 18F-FDG PET/MRI, although 18F-FDG PET/MRI provides a non-significant higher concordance with the tumour board decision in terms of T staging, i.e. 54% (12/22) vs. 36% (8/22).

In terms of M staging, 18F-FDG PET/CT and 18F-FDG PET/MRI both exhibit 95% (21/22) concordance with tumour board decision, although, of note, 18F-FDG PET/MRI detected additional metastases in 3/10 participants with M1 disease. Comparing the staging to the tumour board consensus, the participants with discordant staging on 18F-FDG PET/CT tended to be the same participants with discordant staging on 18F-FDG PET/MRI. This is in keeping with other studies, also finding that 18F-FDG PET/MRI offers similar levels of diagnostic accuracy as 18F-FDG PET/CT; Linder et al.[12] found that comparison of oesophageal tumour SUV measurements revealed strong correlations, without significant differences between 18F-FDG-PET/MRI or 18F-FDG-PET/CT.

Early studies showed disappointing results for the role of conventional MR imaging compared with CT in oesophageal cancer staging[14], [15], describing low accuracy in staging the tumours, mainly because of difficulty in detecting tumour invasion through the muscle layer into peri-oesophageal fat[14]. However, MRI technology has advanced substantially since these initial studies. Furthermore, 18F-FDG PET/CT has emerged as a useful adjunct to conventional staging methods in oesophageal cancer and is of particular importance for the detection of unexpected distant metastases and recurrent disease[16]. As a combined modality, 18F-FDG PET/MRI may offer improvement in diagnostic accuracy, and also offers timesaving (a single scan, performed on a single attendance) and reduced radiation exposure compared with 18F-FDG PET/CT.

Wider studies in this sphere, such as that of Martin et al.[17], which did not look specifically at oesophageal cancer, suggested that these benefits could be realised, finding 18F-FDG PET/MRI facilitates staging comparable to that of 18F-FDG PET/CT and improves lesion detectability in selected cancers, potentially helping to promote fast, efficient local and whole-body staging in one step, when additional MRI is recommended. Furthermore, their results confirmed the potential for a clinically relevant reduction of radiation exposure by using 18F-FDG PET/MRI instead of 18F-FDG PET/CT—a finding that is of particular interest for younger patients, considering the cumulative radiation dose for staging, therapy monitoring, and aftercare.

There are limited studies looking specifically at 18F-FDG PET/MRI in oesophageal cancer, with results broadly in agreement. Lee et al.[11], in a retrospective study of sequential 18F-FDG PET/MRI of 19 patients with non-metastatic oesophageal cancer, found that although 18F-FDG PET /MR is inferior to EUS, it was feasible for the identification of oesophageal wall layers, which was limited for CT and impossible for 18F-FDG PET/CT, suggesting 18F-FDG PET/MRI offers a diagnostic benefit for patients with oesophageal cancer in whom EUS is not suitable or appropriate. Our study did not include EUS results, as although EUS is conventionally included as part of the staging process for patients with localised tumours, as only 4/22 participants enrolled underwent an EUS, highlighting the number of patients for whom EUS may not be suitable.

Moving beyond diagnostics, 18F-FDG PET/MRI may also be useful in response evaluation. In a pilot study using 18F-FDG PET/MRI to evaluate the response of neoadjuvant therapy to predict resectability in patients with gastroesophageal junction adenocarcinoma, Belmouhand et al.[18] found 18F-FDG PET/MRI response evaluation to be highly sensitive when predicting resectability, suggesting 18F-FDG PET/MRI may have a future role in this scenario.

Limitations

First, the small sample size in this exploratory study limits the generalisability of these findings. Second, we included a heterogeneous population of adenocarcinoma, squamous cell and small cell carcinoma. Although this is reflective of our clinical practice, our numbers are not large enough to allow subgroup analysis to compare the modalities across different oesophageal cancer subtypes. Third, all participants underwent 18F-FDG PET/CT first followed by 18F-FDG PET/MRI. It is known that many malignant lesions will continue to increase target-to-background 18F-FDG uptake with delayed imaging[19], [20] and the absence of randomisation may bias the outcome of the comparison in favour of higher sensitivity for 18F-FDG PET/MRI. Fourth, the majority of our participants underwent neoadjuvant therapy prior to surgery (if they went on to have surgery), limiting direct comparison with a contemporaneous histopathological reference standard for T and N status. This is a fundamental limitation of this study, as the reference standard (tumour board consensus staging) is based on standard investigations rather than histopathology, and therefore is influenced by the results of contrast-enhanced CT and 18F-FDG PET/CT.

Conclusion

Our preliminary study has shown non-inferiority of 18F-FDG PET/MRI compared to 18F-FDG PET/CT for oesophageal/ gastroesophageal TNM staging. However, 18F-FDG PET/MRI does capture additional information, such as additional metastases, which may be of further clinical value.

Abbreviations

18F-FDG PET/CT

¹⁸F-Fluorodesoxyglucose Positron-emission tomography computed tomography

18F-FDG PET/MRI

¹⁸F-Fluorodesoxyglucose Positron-emission tomography magnetic resonance imaging

TNM staging

tumour-nodes-metastasis staging

SUV max

maximum standardized uptake value

ADC

Apparent diffusion coefficient

EUS

endoscopic ultrasound

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Institutional Review Board approval was obtained. Research ethics committee approval were obtained for this prospective single-centre study (REC number: 14/LO/0220).

Consent for publication: Written informed consent was obtained from all participants in this study. No individual details are included.

Availability of data and material: Not applicable

Competing interests: King's College London & Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Trust hold a collaborative research agreement with Siemens Healthcare. Dr Radhouene Neji is an employee of Siemens Healthcare. All other authors had control of the data.

Funding: The authors acknowledge financial support from: the Department of Health via the NIHR Comprehensive Biomedical Research Centre award to Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust in partnership with King's College London/King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Wellcome EPSRC Centre for Medical Engineering at King's College London (WT 203148/Z/16/Z), and Cancer Research UK National Cancer Imaging Translational Accelerator Award (C4278/A27066).

Authors' contributions:

AS: substantial contributions to the conception, analysis and interpretation of data, drafted the work or substantively revised it.

BS: substantial contributions to the conception, analysis and interpretation of data

SW: interpretation of data

SB: interpretation of data

RN: design of the work

SJ: acquisition of data

AG: acquisition of data

CG: substantial contributions to the conception, substantively revised work

VG: substantial contributions to the conception, substantively revised work

Acknowledgements: The Guy's & St Thomas' Oesophago-Gastric Research Group include the following (in alphabetical order): CR Baker, F Chang, S Chicklore, M Cominos, A Coombes, AR Davies, S George, B Gill-Barman, JN Dunn, JA Gossage, N Griffin, M Hill, O Hynes, C Iezzi, A Jacques, M Kelly, U Mahadeva, N Maissey, R McEwan, J Meenan, S Ngan, K Owczarczyk, A Qureshi, A Reyhani, M Subesinghe, G Tham, J Waters, SS Zeki.

References

1. Enzinger PC, Mayer RJ, "Esophageal Cancer," *New Engl J Medicine*, vol. 349, no. 23, pp. 2241–2252, 2003, doi: 10.1056/nejmra035010
2. Pennathur A, Gibson MK, Jobe BA, Luketich JD (2013) Oesophageal carcinoma. *Lancet* 381(9864):400–412. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(12)60643-6
3. van Hagen P et al (2012) Preoperative Chemoradiotherapy for Esophageal or Junctional Cancer. *New Engl J Medicine* 366(22):2074–2084. doi:10.1056/nejmoa1112088
4. Sjoquist KM et al (2011) Survival after neoadjuvant chemotherapy or chemoradiotherapy for resectable oesophageal carcinoma: an updated meta-analysis. *Lancet Oncol* 12(7):681–692. doi:10.1016/s1470-2045(11)70142-5
5. Lordick F, Mariette C, Haustermans K, Obermannová R, Arnold D, Committee EG, "Oesophageal cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up," *Ann Oncol*, 27, no. suppl_5, pp. v50–v57, 2016, doi:10.1093/annonc/mdw329
6. van Vliet EPM, Heijenbrok-Kal MH, Hunink MGM, Kuipers EJ, Siersema PD (2008) Staging investigations for oesophageal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Brit J Cancer* 98(3):547–557. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6604200

7. Kelly S et al (2001) A systematic review of the staging performance of endoscopic ultrasound in gastro-oesophageal carcinoma. *Gut* 49(4):534. doi:10.1136/gut.49.4.534
8. Riddell AM, Davies DC, Allum WH, Wotherspoon AC, Richardson C, Brown G (2007) High-Resolution MRI in Evaluation of the Surgical Anatomy of the Esophagus and Posterior Mediastinum. *Am J Roentgenol* 188(1):W37–W43. doi:10.2214/ajr.05.1795
9. Riddell AM et al (2006) Potential of Surface-Coil MRI for Staging of Esophageal Cancer. *Am J Roentgenol* 187(5):1280–1287. doi:10.2214/ajr.05.0559
10. Riddell AM, Allum WH, Thompson JN, Wotherspoon AC, Richardson C, Brown G (2007) The appearances of oesophageal carcinoma demonstrated on high-resolution, T2-weighted MRI, with histopathological correlation. *Eur Radiol* 17(2):391–399. doi:10.1007/s00330-006-0363-6
11. Lee G et al (2014) Clinical Implication of PET/MR Imaging in Preoperative Esophageal Cancer Staging: Comparison with PET/CT, Endoscopic Ultrasonography, and CT. *J Nucl Med* 55(8):1242–1247. doi:10.2967/jnumed.114.138974
12. Linder G, Korsavidou-Hult N, Bjerner T, Ahlström H, Hedberg J (2019) 18F-FDG-PET/MRI in preoperative staging of oesophageal and gastroesophageal junctional cancer. *Clin Radiol* 74(9):718–725. doi:10.1016/j.crad.2019.05.016
13. Rice TW, Patil DT, Blackstone EH (2017) 8th edition AJCC/UICC staging of cancers of the esophagus and esophagogastric junction: application to clinical practice. *Ann Cardiothorac Surg* 6(2):119–130. doi:10.21037/acs.2017.03.14
14. Quint LE, Glazer GM, Orringer MB (1985) Esophageal imaging by MR and CT: study of normal anatomy and neoplasms. " *Radiology* 156(3):727–731. doi:10.1148/radiology.156.3.4023234
15. Takashima S et al (1991) Carcinoma of the esophagus: CT vs MR imaging in determining resectability. " *Am J Roentgenol* 156(2):297–302. doi:10.2214/ajr.156.2.1898802
16. van Rossum PSN et al (2015) Imaging of oesophageal cancer with FDG-PET/CT and MRI. *Clin Radiol* 70(1):81–95. doi:10.1016/j.crad.2014.07.017
17. Martin O et al., "PET/MRI versus PET/CT in whole-body staging: results from a unicenter observational study in 1003 subsequent examinations," *J Nucl Med*, vol. 61, no. 8, p. jnumed.119.233940, 2019, doi: 10.2967/jnumed.119.233940
18. Belmouhand M et al (2019) Early response evaluation of neoadjuvant therapy with PET/MRI to predict resectability in patients with adenocarcinoma of the esophagogastric junction. *Abdom Radiol* 44(3):836–844. doi:10.1007/s00261-018-1841-4
19. Chan W et al (2011) Dual-time-point 18F-FDG-PET/CT imaging in the assessment of suspected malignancy. *J Med Imag Radiat On* 55(4):379–390. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9485.2011.02287.x
20. Kumar R, Loving VA, Chauhan A, Zhuang H, Mitchell S, Alavi A (2005) Potential of dual-time-point imaging to improve breast cancer diagnosis with (18)F-FDG PET. " *J Nucl Medicine Official Publ Soc Nucl Medicine* 46(11):1819–1824

Figures

Figure 1

Participant flow diagram

Figure 2

A & B show a gastro-oesophageal adenocarcinoma, where uptake is noted on 18F-FDG PET/MRI (B), but lower corresponding uptake is noted on the 18F-FDG PET/CT (A). SUVmax was 9.4 on the 18F-FDG PET/MRI vs. 3.4 on the 18F-FDG PET/CT. C & D show a lower esophageal adenocarcinoma, for which corresponding uptake is noted on both 18F-FDG PET/CT (C) and 18F-FDG PET/MRI (D). The SUVmax was 11.8 on the 18F-FDG PET/MRI vs. 7.2 on the 18F-FDG PET/CT.

Figure 3

Oesophageal adenocarcinoma with additional liver metastases demonstrated by MRI. A non- FDG avid sub centimetre metastasis (highlighted by arrow) is demonstrated on diffusion- weighted and post contrast enhanced MRI, which was not detected by 18F-FDG PET/CT or contrast-enhanced CT

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [EJNMMAAppendix1.docx](#)