



HAL
open science

Accuracy of peritoneal carcinomatosis extent diagnosis by initial FDG PET CT in epithelial ovarian cancer: A multicentre study of the FRANCOGYN research group

J Delvallée, Lauranne Rossard, Sofiane Bendifallah, Cyril Touboul, Pierre Collinet, Alexandre Bricou, Cyrille Huchon, Vincent Vincent.Lavoue@chu-Rennes.Fr Lavoué, Gilles Body, Lobna Ouldamer

► To cite this version:

J Delvallée, Lauranne Rossard, Sofiane Bendifallah, Cyril Touboul, Pierre Collinet, et al.. Accuracy of peritoneal carcinomatosis extent diagnosis by initial FDG PET CT in epithelial ovarian cancer: A multicentre study of the FRANCOGYN research group. *Journal of Gynecology Obstetrics and Human Reproduction*, 2020, 49 (9), pp.101867. 10.1016/j.jogoh.2020.101867. hal-02931557

HAL Id: hal-02931557

<https://hal.science/hal-02931557>

Submitted on 7 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Accuracy of peritoneal carcinomatosis extent diagnosis by initial FDG PET CT in epithelial ovarian cancer: a multicentre study of the FRANCOGYN research group

Julie Delvallée^{1,2}, Lauranne Rossard¹, Sofiane Bendifallah^{3,4}, Cyril Touboul⁵, Pierre Collinet⁶, Alexandre Bricou⁷, Cyrille Huchon⁸, Vincent Lavoue⁹, Gilles Body^{1,2}, Lobna Ouldamer^{1,2}

¹Department of Gynecology, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Tours, Tours, France; ²INSERM U1069; Université François-Rabelais, Tours, France, ³Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Hôpital Tenon, Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris, GRC-6 UPMC, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris 6, France. ⁴UMR S 707, Epidemiology, Information Systems, Modeling, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France; ⁵Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Centre Hospitalier Intercommunal, Créteil, France ; ⁶Department of Gynecological surgery, Jeanne de Flandre University Hospital, Lille, France ⁶Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Institute Alix de Champagne University hospital, Reims, France ; ⁷Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Jean-Verdier University Hospital, Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), France ⁸Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Intercommunal Hospital Centre of Poissy-Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 78103, Poissy, France ⁹Department of Gynecological surgery, CHU de Rennes, Service de Gynécologie, Hopital Sud, 16 bd de Bulgarie, Rennes, FRANCE; Université de Rennes 1, France; ER440, Oncogenesis, Stress and Signalling, CRLCC Eugène Marquis, Rennes, France.

Corresponding author:

Lobna Ouldamer

Service de Gynécologie

2 Boulevard Tonnellé

37044 Tours (France)

Phone: +33 2 47 47 47 41

Fax: +33 2 47 47 92 73

Email: l.ouldamer@chu-tours.fr

Short title: PETCT in epithelial ovarian cancer

No funding for this study

1

2 **Introduction**

3

4 Ovarian cancer (OC) is the seventh leading cause of female cancer with 4,615 new cases in
5 2012 and 3,140 deaths in France. In parallel with the aging population, the incidence of
6 ovarian cancer has also been increasing (1,2). The average age of diagnosis is approximately
7 63 years old (1). The most important risk factor for ovarian cancer is genetic: about 10% of
8 ovarian cancers occur in a context of genetic predisposition (mainly BRCA 1/2 mutation) and
9 then occur before the age of 60 years. Unlike for breast or colon cancer, there is no organised
10 screening programme, because no diagnostic test is sufficiently sensitive and specific for the
11 detection of OC especially at an early-stage.

12 The majority of ovarian cancers are of the epithelial type (90%). Other types, includes stromal
13 tumours (granulosa/sex cords) and germ cell tumours (3). Since diagnosis is often late, three
14 quarters of these cancers are diagnosed at an advanced stage (stages IIIB to IV). Its prognosis
15 remains poor. 5-year overall survival, all stages combined, is approximately 45% with poorer
16 prognosis for stages III and IV (between 20-40% and around 10%, respectively) (1,4).

17 The diagnostic approach, in case of discovery of a pelvic mass, includes performing
18 abdominal and pelvic ultrasounds, determining serum tumour marker levels (CA 125, CA 19-
19 9 and ACE) and thoracic-abdominal-pelvic computerised tomography (CT) to characterise the
20 lesion. This exploration can be completed to determine the mass and extent of lesions by
21 pelvic imaging such as MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) or 2-[18F]-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-
22 glucose (FDG)-positron-emission tomography (PET) CT according to ASCO
23 recommendations (5). The standard evaluation is based on surgical staging as recommended
24 by the International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics (FIGO).

25 The primary surgery must be a complete cytoreduction surgery with no macroscopic residual
26 disease whenever feasible because it determines the patient 's survival: a residual tumour <1
27 cm is associated with a worse prognosis when compared to surgery without macroscopic
28 residual disease (4,6,7). PET CT appears sensitive using the Standardised Uptake Value
29 (SUV) to diagnose peritoneal carcinomatosis or the presence of lymphatic or visceral
30 metastases (8-10), but the initial assessment of disease extension remains difficult since the
31 tumour volume is hard to assess and is still performed during exploratory laparoscopy (6).

32 The main objective of the present study was to evaluate the diagnostic reliability of FDG PET
33 CT for peritoneal carcinomatosis extent in epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC), performed before
34 any treatment and to compare it with peroperative observations/ histology samples obtained
35 during upfront laparotomy/ laparoscopy in the setting of a multicentre study.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 **Material and methods**

49

50 Patients

51 We conducted a retrospective study using maintained databases from 7 French referral
52 gynaecologic oncology institutions from a research group network. The databases registered
53 all patients diagnosed with ovarian cancer at any stage between January 2000 and December
54 2016. The research protocol was approved by our Institutional Review Board.

55

56 Inclusion

57 All patients treated for EOC, who underwent FDG PET CT at the beginning of management,
58 were included, irrespective of whether the surgical treatment was a frontline cytoreduction
59 surgery or a laparoscopy followed by neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Please note that all PET
60 CTs were performed with 18 Fluorodeoxyglucose (18 FDG). The extension of peritoneal
61 carcinomatosis was given by peroperative findings/ histological results in case of frontline
62 cytoreductive surgery or peroperative findings of exploratory laparoscopy. For lymph node
63 involvement, it was analysed only in women who underwent lymphadenectomy.

64 Exclusion criteria: All patients who did not undergo surgery at diagnosis be it laparotomy
65 with cytoreductive surgery or an exploratory laparoscopy before chemotherapy.

66 Procedures

67 All patients underwent clinical examination. Preoperative workup included at least a
68 PET CT and for most of them a standard abdominal – pelvic computed tomography scan (CT
69 – scan).

70 PET images were obtained using a combined 16-section PET/computed tomography (CT)
71 camera 60 minutes following the intravenous injection, with 2 minutes per bed position. The
72 field of view was the whole body. CT images were obtained with contrast media injection and
73 interpreted by experienced radiologists.

74 Experienced nuclear physicians in each participant centre independently estimated FDG
75 uptake while blinded to the clinical characteristics of each subject.

76 PET images were classified as positive if there was focal or multifocal FDG uptake and
77 negative if there was no uptake or residual physiological FDG uptake. A quantitative analysis
78 was also performed, in which a maximum standardised uptake value (SUVmax)

79 All surgeries were performed by a qualified gynaecologic oncologist. Initial
80 management consisted in explorative surgery (laparoscopy) to confirm the diagnosis,
81 determine the extent of the peritoneal spread and the resectability of the disease. Decision to
82 proceed to either primary frontline cytoreductive surgery or neoadjuvant chemotherapy
83 followed by interval debulking surgery was at the discretion of the surgeon. This decision was
84 based on the extent of the disease, surgical experience and on patient comorbidities and the
85 ability to withstand a radical procedure. Cytoreductive surgeries were always performed with
86 intent to achieve no macroscopic residual disease. It included at least a midline laparotomy,
87 total hysterectomy, bilateral salpingo – oophorectomy and infragastric omentectomy. A more
88 extensive surgery was performed when indicated and could involve digestive tract resections,
89 upper abdominal resections such as diaphragmatic resection, splenectomy, lymph node
90 dissection and any other gesture to obtain no residual disease.

91

92 The initial stage of the disease was determined according to the classification of the
93 International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) and TNM seventh edition
94 (12, 13).

95 In order to obtain an exhaustive collection, the histological types of ovarian tumours collected
96 were those described by WHO (14, 15).

97

98 Statistical analysis

99

100 Descriptive parameters were expressed as the mean (\pm Standard Deviation [SD]) and median
101 [range] when indicated. Frequencies were presented as percentages. Demographic, clinical,
102 biological, and radiological characteristics are summarised by continuous variables and
103 categorical variables and were analysed using the Student's test.

104

105 For continuous variables, we used t-tests. Overall survival time was calculated in months
106 from the date of diagnostic to death or the date of last follow-up for surviving patients. The
107 Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate the survival distribution. Patients alive at the end-
108 point have been censored. Effects were expressed as hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% confidence
109 intervals as appropriate. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Data were
110 managed in an Excel database (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA) and analysed using software
111 R 3.1.2 Package Hmisc, Design and Survival libraries (16).

112

113

114

115 **Results**

116 During the study period, 980 women were treated for an epithelial ovarian cancer within our
117 research group centres. Ninety patients (9.2%) were included in the present study and
118 received a PET CT scan before surgery or any treatment.

119 The characteristics of the study population are summarised in Table 1.

120 At diagnosis, 80% of the patients had advanced stage III or IV disease (47 and 25 patients
121 respectively). There were nine cases (10%) where the stage was not specified but described as
122 locally advanced (III or IV). Table 2.

123

124 Regarding the management, 3 patients did not have cytoreductive surgery but only one or
125 more laparoscopies (3/90 or 3.3%), 41 patients underwent frontline cytoreductive surgery
126 (41/90 i.e. 45.6%) followed on average by 4 courses of adjuvant chemotherapy. Thirty-two
127 patients underwent interval surgery considered as complete (35.6%) and 14 were operated on
128 interval surgery considered as incomplete (15.5%). On average, the number of neo-adjuvant
129 courses was 4.

130 In our population, epithelial ovarian tumours were mostly serous (66/90, 73.3%),
131 endometrioid (8/90, 8.9%) and undifferentiated adenocarcinoma (8/90, 8.9%).

132 To differentiate ovarian, unilateral or bilateral involvement, PET CT was reliable for the
133 serous type in 69.6% of the cases, for the mucinous type in 66.6% and for the endometrioid
134 type in 66.7% of the cases. For an extension to the cupola, PET CT was reliable in 57.1% for
135 the serous type. For omentum invasion, the prediction was 66.7% for the mucinous type and
136 48.1% for the serous type. Small intestine disease was confirmed in 75% of cases for the
137 endometrioid, 75% for the mucinous 75% and 47.5% for the serous type. The involvement of

138 the colon was found in 87.5% of the cases for the endometrioid, 75% for the mucinous and
139 58% for the serous types. For the serous type, there were 53 cases of high grade, and 5 low
140 grade.

141 The prediction accuracy of peritoneal carcinomatosis on the initial PET by comparing the
142 histological data of the surgical specimens is presented on table 3

143 There was no link between the value of CA 125 and the reliability of PET CT.

144 Eighty patients had a standard CT scan at diagnosis that was evaluated for diagnostic
145 reliability and compared to PET CT. The accuracy of prediction of peritoneal carcinomatosis
146 extent on the initial CT is presented on table 4

147

148 The mean follow-up in our population was 28 months (1- 342). Overall survival for the entire
149 population was 60% at 5 years.

150

151

152 **Discussion**

153 The aim of our study was to evaluate the diagnosis reliability of PET CT for peritoneal
154 carcinomatosis extent in EOC, performed before any treatment and to compare it with
155 histology samples obtained during laparotomy and/ or per-operative observations during
156 laparoscopy in the framework of a multicentre study conducted by the FRANCOGYN
157 research group.

158 EOC prognosis is strongly related to its local and regional extension: the FIGO and TNM
159 classifications take into account peritoneal carcinomatosis in staging (1,2). Tumours without
160 peritoneal carcinomatosis may be considered to be at lower risk of recurrence taking into
161 account tumour volume and abdominopelvic extension. In addition, size and capsular rupture
162 of lymph nodes are important prognostic factors significantly associated with both overall and
163 recurrence-free survival (1,4,7,17,18).

164 According to the European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO), PET CT is not
165 recommended for the initial management of EOC (19). The recommendations of the
166 American Society of Cancerology and Oncology (ASCO) regarding the evaluation of
167 peritoneal carcinomatosis and the neoadjuvant chemotherapy response, unchanged since then,
168 are:

169 - The initial evaluation is based on imaging with injected time, if possible abdominal-pelvic
170 CT with chest sections in order to evaluate any possible diaphragmatic extension, in order to
171 specify tumour involvement, laparoscopic evaluation may be considered or second-line
172 imaging such as PET CT or pelvic MRI,

173 - Histological evidence of ovarian origin should be provided, failing that the follow-up will be
174 performed on the fluctuations of CA 125 and the ratio CA 125 / ACE: a value greater than 25
175 evokes a gynaecological origin (20).

176 The French recommendations (HAS) remain vague concerning the indication of PET CT in
177 this context, it evokes it in the pre-therapeutic assessment in case of a disease difficult to
178 characterise or when NAC is scheduled. In his meta-analysis, Lee shows that CT scans are a
179 good tool for evaluating tumour mass during preoperative evaluation and that the value of
180 hypermetabolism is associated with early recurrence (6). These data are included in the study
181 by Klumpp et al, which preoperatively evaluated the location and extent of peritoneal
182 carcinomatosis, but this study concerned a very small population (n = 15), suggesting a
183 probable reading of the images by only one professional (21). This examination can be used
184 as part of protocols, within nomograms, for the prediction of incomplete cytoreduction
185 (22,23). The combination of abdominopelvic CT / PET CT provides the best assessment of
186 carcinomatosis extent, although surgical exploration allows the most reliable findings with
187 possible pathological confirmation (24).

188 PET CT is a recent nuclear imaging technique with good sensitivity (Se) and specificity (Sp)
189 for the diagnosis of peritoneal carcinomatosis extent, reported at around 90% for both
190 parameters in the literature (21,25). The strength of this imaging technique lies in its positive
191 predictive value (PPV) greater than 95% and a correct negative predictive value (NPV) close
192 to 75%. These data are concordant with the meta-analysis of Limei in 2013, although the
193 diagnosis performance is heterogeneous according to the studies (26). The results are similar
194 in the meta-analysis by Li in 2015 with a Specificity greater than 85% and a Sensitivity close to
195 95% (27). Thus, these two meta-analyses tend to define PET CT as a good diagnostic tool for
196 peritoneal carcinomatosis extent diagnosis, without separating the initial diagnosis and

197 recurrence situations. Diagnosis accuracy is reported to be close to 90% in both of these
198 studies, Suppiah et al's meta-analysis reported in 2017 a value of 87% (28).

199 PET CT are presented as imaging that can be used to abstain from interval laparoscopic re-
200 evaluation in the case of NAC when detecting peritoneal carcinomatosis implants **less than 2**
201 **cm in size and positive lymph nodes or persistent diaphragmatic lesions** (28). The study by De
202 Iaco, which concerned peritoneal carcinomatosis – all comers – highlights a good correlation
203 between PET CT and surgical exploration for lesions greater than 5 mm, with no interest in
204 metastatic lymphadenopathy (29). These data are to be taken with caution since the authors
205 are equally interested in peritoneal carcinomatosis during the initial diagnosis and during
206 recurrence, on digestive pathologies with a significant proportion of male patients mixing
207 different cancers and situations.

208 By combining data from two different situations, the prediction of lesions artificially
209 increases as well as the Sensitivity and Specificity of the examination. In addition, the
210 definition of peritoneal carcinomatosis was multimodal and does not rely solely on PET CT: it
211 contrasts with other imaging or histological analysis or operative findings (6,26,28).

212 The advantage of PET CT lies in the diagnosis of diaphragmatic localisations and metastatic
213 recurrence, at an undeveloped stage since all parasitic signals are excluded and only implants
214 linked to the disease are visualised (28,30-32). This detection capacity seems to increase with
215 the CA 125 level and when the conventional imaging techniques are taken in default:
216 identification of the areas of interest (33). However, in the previously mentioned meta-
217 analyses, neither pelvic lymph node nor para-aortic involvement was assessed (6,26,28).

218 The correlation between the size measured in PET CT and the histological size varies
219 according to the tumour phenotype (34). Thus, SUVs are lower for ovarian mucinous cancers
220 than digestive tumours but with higher diffusion coefficients (35,36). In our study, the

221 correlation was better for the endometrioid and mucinous types, which is consistent with the
222 studies on digestive neoplasia but is contradictory for the serous type. In the literature, the
223 histological type influences SUVs: values are higher for serous or endometrioid profiles.

224 PET CT in the context of the NAC make it possible to evaluate the efficacy of the treatment,
225 and to guide the clinician in evaluating the tumour residue at the end of treatment (37).
226 Regarding surgical management, primary surgery with adjuvant chemotherapy appears to
227 improve the overall survival of patients compared to a NAC (17,38,39). The major criterion,
228 however, remains the presence of a macroscopic residual disease (40).

229 The strength of our study lies in its multicentre nature and the number of patients included.
230 However, we cannot rule out inherent retrospective bias. The first cytoreduction or NAC
231 indications were at the discretion of the surgeon in each centre and may represent a
232 recruitment bias. However, all participating centres are regional reference centres that apply
233 French / European standards after discussion in multidisciplinary consultation committee.

234 During the data collection period, there was little change in the classifications (FIGO and
235 TNM) and in the surgical techniques (digestive resection, resection or peritoneal fulguration).
236 On the other hand, the PET technique and especially the machines used are constantly
237 evolving: this results in a better current definition of lesions. In older studies, lesions could be
238 "forgotten" because of insufficient detection. Current machines tend to cuts of smaller
239 thickness but still thicker than those of CT (41).

240 The sensitivity and specificity values of our study may appear low compared to recent meta-
241 analyses as shown in table 5 (21,26-28). Our endpoint was stricter: initial assessment of
242 peritoneal carcinomatosis extent for an epithelial ovarian tumour, without defining minimum
243 detection size and excluding digestive causes and other causes of peritoneal carcinomatosis.
244 In the end, the diagnosis of peritoneal carcinomatosis is often obtained by histological

245 samples taken during surgery since the imaging techniques are often inaccurate for lesions of
246 small sizes.

247

248 **Conclusion**

249

250 The rates of false positives and false negatives in PET CT and abdominopelvic CT are not
251 negligible rendering laparoscopy a mandatory tool to evaluate the extent of peritoneal
252 carcinomatosis in case of advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. PET CT does not seem to be the
253 most efficient test for assessing the initial tumour extent. We should prefer abdominal-pelvic
254 CT as indicated in the current French recommendations. This test is better than the clinical
255 examination and abdominal-pelvic ultrasound to assess the extent of the disease, with a lower
256 price and shorter examination time and easier accessibility. The performance of PET CT
257 varies according to the nature of the tumour, the location of peritoneal carcinomatosis but also
258 the devices used. The correlation between histology and imaging is not perfect: it is an
259 examination to be reserved to supra diaphragmatic extension. The evolution of the techniques
260 will allow us to consider an improvement of the diagnostic performances and an evolution of
261 our surgical care.

262

263 **Declarations of interest:** none

264

265

266

267 **References**

268

- 269 **1. Les données - Institut National Du cancer [Internet]. [cited 2017 Jul 12].**
270 **[http://www.e-cancer.fr/Expertises-et-publications/Catalogue-des-publications/Guide-](http://www.e-cancer.fr/Expertises-et-publications/Catalogue-des-publications/Guide-ALD-Cancer-de-l-ovaire)**
271 **[ALD-Cancer-de-l-ovaire.](http://www.e-cancer.fr/Expertises-et-publications/Catalogue-des-publications/Guide-ALD-Cancer-de-l-ovaire)**
- 272 2. InVS, estimation des cancers en 2012
273 http://invs.santepubliquefrance.fr/surveillance/cancers/estimations_cancers/donnees_localisation/ovaire/comment_ovaire.pdf.
274
- 275 3. Le Frère-Belda A. Encyclopédie Médico Chirurgicale - Gynécologie - Classification
276 histopathologique des tumeurs ovariennes [Internet]. 2013. Available from: [http://www.em-](http://www.em-consulte.com/article/824680/classification-histopathologique-des-tumeurs-ovari)
277 [consulte.com/article/824680/classification-histopathologique-des-tumeurs-ovari.](http://www.em-consulte.com/article/824680/classification-histopathologique-des-tumeurs-ovari)
- 278 4. Musto A, Grassetto G, Marzola MC, Rampin L, Chondrogiannis S, Maffione AM, et
279 al. Management of epithelial ovarian cancer from diagnosis to restaging: an overview of the
280 role of imaging techniques with particular regard to the contribution of 18F-FDG PET/CT.
281 *Nucl Med Commun.* 2014 Jun;35(6):588–97.
- 282 5. Recommendations ASCO
283 [https://pilotguidelines.atlassian.net/wiki/display/NACTOVCA/Neoadjuvant+Chemotherapy+f](https://pilotguidelines.atlassian.net/wiki/display/NACTOVCA/Neoadjuvant+Chemotherapy+for+Ovarian+Cancer+Home)
284 [or+Ovarian+Cancer+Home.](https://pilotguidelines.atlassian.net/wiki/display/NACTOVCA/Neoadjuvant+Chemotherapy+for+Ovarian+Cancer+Home)
- 285 6. Lee M, Lee H, Cheon GJ, Kim HS, Chung HH, Kim J-W, et al. Prognostic value of
286 preoperative intratumoral FDG uptake heterogeneity in patients with epithelial ovarian
287 cancer. *Eur Radiol.* 2017 Jan;27(1):16–23.
- 288 7. Gallicchio R, Nardelli A, Venetucci A, Capacchione D, Pelagalli A, Sirignano C, et al.
289 F-18 FDG PET/CT metabolic tumour volume predicts overall survival in patients with
290 disseminated epithelial ovarian cancer. *Eur J Radiol.* 2017 Aug;93:107–13.
- 291 8. Lopez-Lopez V, Cascales-Campos PA, Gil J, Frutos L, Andrade RJ, Fuster-Quiñonero
292 M, et al. Use of (18)F-FDG PET/CT in the preoperative evaluation of patients diagnosed with
293 peritoneal carcinomatosis of ovarian origin, candidates to cytoreduction and hipec. A pending
294 issue. *Eur J Radiol.* 2016 Oct;85(10):1824–8.
- 295 9. Ohliger MA, Hope TA, Chapman JS, Chen L-M, Behr SC, Poder L. PET/MR Imaging
296 in Gynecologic Oncology. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am.* 2017 Aug;25(3):667–84.
- 297 10. Xu B, Ma J, Jiang G, Wang Y, Ma Q. Diagnostic value of positron emission
298 tomography (PET) and PET/computed tomography in recurrent/metastatic ovarian cancer: A
299 meta-analysis. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res.* 2017 Feb;43(2):378–86.
- 300 11. CIM-10 FR 2015 à usage PMSI | Publication ATIH [Internet]. Available from:
301 [http://www.atih.sante.fr/cim-10-fr-2015-usage-pmsi.](http://www.atih.sante.fr/cim-10-fr-2015-usage-pmsi)

- 302 12. Fédération Internationale de Gynécologie et d'Obstétrique - Classification des tumeurs
303 de l'ovaire [Internet]. 2014. Available from:
304 <http://www.figo.org/search?cx=%27006260962696807358306%3Ack4j2ap-11u&cof=FORID%3A11&ie=ISO-8859-1&query=classification>.
305
- 306 13. Kurman RJ, Carcangiu ML, Herrington CS. WHO classification of tumors of ovary.
307 In: Robert J Kurman, Maria Lusia Carcangiu, C. Simon Herrington, et al. eds. WHO
308 classification of tumors of female reproductive organs (4th edition). 2012.
- 309 14. Le Frère-Belda A. Encyclopédie Médico Chirurgicale - Gynécologie - Classification
310 histopathologique des tumeurs ovariennes [Internet]. 2013. Available from: <http://www.em-consulte.com/article/824680/classification-histopathologique-des-tumeurs-ovari>
311
- 312 15. Kurman RJ, Carcangiu ML, Herrington CS. WHO classification of tumors of ovary.
313 In: Robert J Kurman, Maria Lusia Carcangiu, C. Simon Herrington, et al. eds. WHO
314 classification of tumors of female reproductive organs (4th edition). 2012.
- 315 16. Logiciel R version 3.1.2 (package Hmisc, Design and Survival libraries) [Internet].
316 Available from: <http://www.cran.r-project.org/>.
- 317 17. Rosen B, Laframboise S, Ferguson S, Dodge J, Bernardini M, Murphy J, et al. The
318 impacts of neoadjuvant chemotherapy and of debulking surgery on survival from advanced
319 ovarian cancer. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2014 Sep;134(3):462–7.
- 320 18. Vergote I, Tropé CG, Amant F, Kristensen GB, Ehlen T, Johnson N, et al.
321 Neoadjuvant chemotherapy or primary surgery in stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer. *N Engl J*
322 *Med*. 2010 Sep 2;363(10):943–53.
- 323 19. Ledermann JA, Raja FA, Fotopoulou C, Gonzalez-Martin A, Colombo N, Sessa C, et
324 al. Newly diagnosed and relapsed epithelial ovarian carcinoma: ESMO Clinical Practice
325 Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol*. 2013 Oct 1;24(suppl 6):vi24-
326 vi32.
- 327 20. [http://www.asco.org/practice-guidelines/quality-guidelines/guidelines/gynecologic-](http://www.asco.org/practice-guidelines/quality-guidelines/guidelines/gynecologic-cancer#/13091)
328 [cancer#/13091](http://www.asco.org/practice-guidelines/quality-guidelines/guidelines/gynecologic-cancer#/13091).
- 329 21. Klumpp BD, Schwenzer N, Aschoff P, Miller S, Kramer U, Claussen CD, et al.
330 Preoperative assessment of peritoneal carcinomatosis: intraindividual comparison of 18F-
331 FDG PET/CT and MRI. *Abdom Imaging*. 2013 Feb;38(1):64–71.
- 332 22. Shim S-H, Lee SJ, Kim S-O, Kim S-N, Kim D-Y, Lee JJ, et al. Nomogram for
333 predicting incomplete cytoreduction in advanced ovarian cancer patients. *Gynecol Oncol*.
334 2015 Jan;136(1):30–6.
- 335 23. Risum S, Loft A, Engelholm SA, Høgdall E, Berthelsen AK, Nedergaard L, et al.
336 Positron emission tomography/computed tomography predictors of overall survival in stage
337 IIIC/IV ovarian cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer Off J Int Gynecol Cancer Soc*. 2012
338 Sep;22(7):1163–9.

- 339 24. Pfannenberg C, Königsrainer I, Aschoff P, Oksüz MO, Zieker D, Beckert S, et al.
340 (18)F-FDG-PET/CT to select patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis for cytoreductive
341 surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2009
342 May;16(5):1295–303.
- 343 25. Kim HW, Won KS, Zeon SK, Ahn B-C, Gayed IW. Peritoneal carcinomatosis in
344 patients with ovarian cancer: enhanced CT versus 18F-FDG PET/CT. *Clin Nucl Med*. 2013
345 Feb;38(2):93–7.
- 346 26. Limei Z, Yong C, Yan X, Shuai T, Jiangyan X, Zhiqing L. Accuracy of Positron
347 Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography in the Diagnosis and Restaging for Recurrent
348 Ovarian Cancer: A Meta-Analysis. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*. 2013 May;23(4):598–607.
- 349 27. Li J, Yan R, Lei J, Jiang C. Comparison of PET with PET/CT in detecting peritoneal
350 carcinomatosis: a meta-analysis. *Abdom Imaging*. 2015 Oct;40(7):2660–6.
- 351 28. Suppiah S, Chang WL, Hassan HA, Kaewput C, Asri AAA, Saad FFA, et al.
352 Systematic Review on the Accuracy of Positron Emission Tomography/Computed
353 Tomography and Positron Emission Tomography/Magnetic Resonance Imaging in the
354 Management of Ovarian Cancer: Is Functional Information Really Needed? *World J Nucl*
355 *Med*. 2017 Sep;16(3):176–85.
- 356 29. De Iaco P, Musto A, Orazi L, Zamagni C, Rosati M, Allegri V, et al. FDG-PET/CT in
357 advanced ovarian cancer staging: value and pitfalls in detecting lesions in different abdominal
358 and pelvic quadrants compared with laparoscopy. *Eur J Radiol*. 2011 Nov;80(2):e98-103.
- 359 30. Schmidt S, Meuli RA, Achtari C, Prior JO. Peritoneal carcinomatosis in primary
360 ovarian cancer staging: comparison between MDCT, MRI, and 18F-FDG PET/CT. *Clin Nucl*
361 *Med*. 2015 May;40(5):371–7.
- 362 31. Rubini G, Altini C, Notaristefano A, Merenda N, Rubini D, Stabile Ianora AA, et al.
363 [Peritoneal carcinomatosis from ovarian cancer: role of 18F-FDG-PET/CT and CA125].
364 *Recenti Prog Med*. 2012 Nov;103(11):510–4.
- 365 32. Chung HH, Lee M, Kim H-S, Kim J-W, Park N-H, Song YS, et al. Prognostic
366 implication of the metastatic lesion-to-ovarian cancer standardised uptake value ratio in
367 advanced serous epithelial ovarian cancer. *Eur Radiol*. 2017 Jun 7;
- 368 33. Thrall MM, DeLoia JA, Gallion H, Avril N. Clinical use of combined positron
369 emission tomography and computed tomography (FDG-PET/CT) in recurrent ovarian cancer.
370 *Gynecol Oncol*. 2007 Apr;105(1):17–22.
- 371 34. González García B, García Vicente AM, Jiménez Londoño GA, Pena Pardo FJ, Bellón
372 Guardia ME, Talavera Rubio MP, et al. (18)F-FDG PET/CT as predictor of tumour biology
373 and prognosis in epithelial ovarian carcinoma. *Rev Espanola Med Nucl E Imagen Mol*. 2017
374 Aug;36(4):233–40.
- 375 35. Schwenzer NF, Schmidt H, Gatidis S, Brendle C, Müller M, Königsrainer I, et al.

376 Measurement of apparent diffusion coefficient with simultaneous MR/positron emission
377 tomography in patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis: comparison with 18F-FDG-PET. *J*
378 *Magn Reson Imaging JMRI*. 2014 Nov;40(5):1121–8.

379 36. Konishi H, Takehara K, Kojima A, Okame S, Yamamoto Y, Shiroyama Y, et al.
380 Maximum standardized uptake value of fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission
381 tomography/computed tomography is a prognostic factor in ovarian clear cell
382 adenocarcinoma. *Int J Gynecol Cancer Off J Int Gynecol Cancer Soc*. 2014 Sep;24(7):1190–
383 4.

384 37. Khiewvan B, Torigian DA, Emamzadehfard S, Paydary K, Salavati A, Houshmand S,
385 et al. An update on the role of PET/CT and PET/MRI in ovarian cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol*
386 *Imaging*. 2017 Jun;44(6):1079–91.

387 38. Gill SE, McGree ME, Weaver AL, Cliby WA, Langstraat CL. Optimizing the
388 treatment of ovarian cancer: Neoadjuvant chemotherapy and interval debulking versus
389 primary debulking surgery for epithelial ovarian cancers likely to have suboptimal resection.
390 *Gynecol Oncol*. 2017 Feb;144(2):266–73.

391 39. Melamed A, Hinchcliff EM, Clemmer JT, Bregar AJ, Uppal S, Bostock I, et al.
392 Trends in the use of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for advanced ovarian cancer in the United
393 States. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2016 Nov;143(2):236–40.

394 40. Braicu EI, Fotopoulou C, Van Gorp T, Richter R, Chekerov R, Hall C, et al.
395 Preoperative HE4 expression in plasma predicts surgical outcome in primary ovarian cancer
396 patients: results from the OVCAD study. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2013 Feb;128(2):245–51.

397 41. Nougaret S, Addley HC, Colombo PE, Fujii S, Al Sharif SS, Tirumani SH, et al.
398 Ovarian carcinomatosis: how the radiologist can help plan the surgical approach. *Radiogr Rev*
399 *Publ Radiol Soc N Am Inc*. 2012 Oct;32(6):1775-1800; discussion 1800-1803.

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409 **Table 1** - Characteristics of the population.

410

Characteristics of the population.	n = 90
Age (years) mean \pm SD [range]	58.1 \pm 11.8 [30-85]
BMI (kg/m²) mean \pm SD [range]	24.4 \pm 5.2 [16.4-44]
Parity mean \pm SD [range]	1.6 \pm 1 [0-8]
Nulliparous (%)	23/90 (25.6%)
Post-Menopausal (%)	62 (68.9%)
Hormone replacement therapy (%)	20 (32.2%)
Follow up (month)	64.5 \pm 91 (6-264)
CA 125 at diagnosis	1158 (12-10 400)
CA 19-9 at diagnosis	157 (0-3093)
History of	
- appendectomy	21 (23.3%)
- unilateral adnexectomy	3 (3.3%)
Diabetes (%)	5/90 (5.5%)
HBP (%)	16/90 (17.8%)

411 SD: Standard Deviation; HTM: hormonal treatment of menopause; BMI: body index mass;

412 HBP: High Blood Pressure

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420 **Table 2** – FIGO stage.

421

422

FIGO stage	n = 90
I	7 (7.8%)
II	2 (2.2%)
III	47 (52.2%)
IV	25 (27.8%)
Unspecified	9 (10%)

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438 **Table 3** – Accuracy of peritoneal carcinomatosis diagnosis by FDG PET CT

439

	Omentum	SI	Colonic	Cupola	Ovary	Pelvic nodes	LA nodes	Global
Se	25%	7.3%	26.3%	44.4%	54.05%	30%	30.8%	60%
Sp	75%	97.4%	92.9%	75%	90.9%	83.3%	92.3%	97.2%
PPV	66.7%	75%	76.9%	50%	90.9%	50%	80%	96.3%
NPV	66.7%	50.7%	41.8%	29.4%	45.9%	33.3%	42.8%	34%
Accuracy	41.7%	50.6%	61.25%	64%	67.8%	62.9%	61.5%	76.25%

440

441 Se: Sensibility; Sp: Specificity; PPV: Positive predictive value; NPV: Negative predictive value; LA: lumbar aortic; SI: small
 442 intestine

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456 **Table 4** – Accuracy of peritoneal carcinomatosis diagnosis by CT

457

	Omentum	SI	Colic	Cupola	Ovary	Pelvic nodes	LA nodes
Se	60%	9%	21%	45.8%	80%	43%	40%
Sp	81%	97%	91.2%	93.3%	53%	78.6%	91%
PPV	85.7%	75%	70%	84.6%	77.8%	50%	80%
NPV	48.5%	54%	47%	31.7%	43.75%	27%	37.5%
Accuracy	67.2%	50%	56%	72.2%	71.1%	66.7%	67%

458 Se: Sensibility; Sp: Specificity; PPV: Positive predictive value; NPV: Negative predictive value; LA: lumbar aortic; SI: small
 459 intestine

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473 **Table 5** – Diagnosis value of PET CT in literature

474

Reference	Se	Sp	PPV	NPV	Accuracy	PC / n
Lee et al (9)	72	65	-	-	-	61/61
Klumpp et al.(24)	93	96	98	84	94	15/15
Risum et al.(26)	97	90	-	-	-	26/40
Pfannenbergl et al.(27)	63	89	93	52	-	22/22
Kim et al.(28)	96	90	93	95	94	26/40
Limei et al.(29)	89	90	-	-	-	1198/1747
Li et al.(30)	84	94	-	-	-	1291/1291
Suppiah et al.(31)	86,8	-	-	-	-	184/184
De Iaco et al.(32)	78,9	68,4	-	-	-	308/346

475 PC peritoneal carcinomatosis

476

477