



**HAL**  
open science

# Valeur pronostique du volume métabolique chez les patients traités par immunothérapie pour un cancer broncho-pulmonaire non à petites cellules

David Chardin

► **To cite this version:**

David Chardin. Valeur pronostique du volume métabolique chez les patients traités par immunothérapie pour un cancer broncho-pulmonaire non à petites cellules. Médecine humaine et pathologie. 2020. dumas-03098234

**HAL Id: dumas-03098234**

**<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-03098234>**

Submitted on 5 Jan 2021

**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.

UNIVERSITE DE NICE SOPHIA-ANTIPOLIS

FACULTE DE MEDECINE DE NICE

THESE D'EXERCICE DE MEDECINE

Pour le

Diplôme d'état de Docteur en Médecine

**VALEUR PRONOSTIQUE DU VOLUME METABOLIQUE CHEZ LES PATIENTS  
TRAITES PAR IMMUNOTHERAPIE POUR UN CANCER BRONCHO-PULMONAIRE  
NON A PETITES CELLULES**

Présentée et soutenue publiquement le 22 septembre 2020

Par

**David CHARDIN**

Né le 16 Août 1991, à Grasse (06)

**DISCIPLINE : MEDECINE NUCLEAIRE**

**Jury de thèse :**

Président : M. le Professeur J.DARCOURT

Directeur de thèse : M. le Docteur O.HUMBERT

Assesseurs : M. le Professeur C.H.MARQUETTE

Mme. le Docteur J.OTTO

Mme. le Docteur M.PAQUET



**Liste des enseignants au 1er septembre 2019 à la Faculté de Médecine de Nice**

**Doyen**

**Pr. BAQUÉ Patrick**

**Vice-doyens**

**Pédagogie  
Recherche  
Etudiants**

**Pr. ALUNNI Véronique  
Pr DELLAMONICA jean  
M. JOUAN Robin**

**Chargé de mission projet Campus**

**Pr. PAQUIS Philippe**

Conservateur de la bibliothèque

Mme AMSELLE Danièle

Directrice administrative des services

Mme CALLEA Isabelle

Doyens Honoraires

M. RAMPAL Patrick  
M. BENCHIMOL Daniel

Liste des enseignants au 1er septembre 2019 à la Faculté de Médecine de Nice

PROFESSEURS CLASSE EXCEPTIONNELLE

M.	BAQUÉ Patrick	Anatomie - Chirurgie Générale (42.01)
M.	BERNARDIN Gilles	Réanimation Médicale (48.02)
Mme	BLANC-PEDEUTOUR Florence	Cancérologie – Génétique (47.02)
M.	BOILEAU Pascal	Chirurgie Orthopédique et Traumatologique (50.02)
M.	DARCOURT Jacques	Biophysique et Médecine Nucléaire (43.01)
M.	DRICI Milou-Daniel	Pharmacologie Clinique (48.03)
M.	ESNAULT Vincent	Néphrologie (52-03)
M.	FUZIBET Jean-Gabriel	Médecine Interne (53.01)
M.	GILSON Éric	Biologie Cellulaire (44.03)
M.	GUGENHEIM Jean	Chirurgie Digestive (52.02)
M.	HASSEN KHODJA Reda	Chirurgie Vasculaire (51.04)
M.	HÉBUTERNE Xavier	Nutrition (44.04)
M.	HOFMAN Paul	Anatomie et Cytologie Pathologiques (42.03)
Mme	ICHAÏ Carole	Anesthésiologie et Réanimation Chirurgicale (48.01)
M.	LACOUR Jean-Philippe	Dermato-Vénérologie (50.03)
M.	LEFTHERIOTIS Georges	Chirurgie vasculaire ; médecine vasculaire (51.04)
M.	MARQUETTE Charles-Hugo	Pneumologie (51.01)
M.	MARTY Pierre	Parasitologie et Mycologie (45.02)
M.	MICHIELS Jean-François	Anatomie et Cytologie Pathologiques (42.03)
M.	MOUROUX Jérôme	Chirurgie Thoracique et Cardiovasculaire (51.03)
Mme	PAQUIS Véronique	Génétique (47.04)
M.	PAQUIS Philippe	Neurochirurgie (49.02)
M.	PRADIER Christian	Épidémiologie, Économie de la Santé et Prévention (46.01)
M.	QUATREHOMME Gérald	Médecine Légale et Droit de la Santé (46.03)
M.	RAUCOULES-AIMÉ Marc	Anesthésie et Réanimation Chirurgicale (48.01)
M.	ROBERT Philippe	Psychiatrie d'Adultes (49.03)
M.	SCHNEIDER Stéphane	Nutrition (44.04)
M.	THYSS Antoine	Cancérologie, Radiothérapie (47.02)
M.	TRAN Albert	Hépatogastro-entérologie (52.01)

Liste des enseignants au 1er septembre 2019 à la Faculté de Médecine de Nice

PROFESSEURS PREMIERE CLASSE

Mme	ASKENAZY-GITTARD Florence	Pédopsychiatrie (49.04)
M.	BARRANGER Emmanuel	Gynécologie Obstétrique (54.03)
M.	BÉRARD Étienne	Pédiatrie (54.01)
M.	BONGAIN André	Gynécologie-Obstétrique (54.03)
Mme	BREUIL Véronique	Rhumatologie (50.01)
M.	CASTILLO Laurent	O.R.L. (55.01)
M.	CHEVALLIER Patrick	Radiologie et Imagerie Médicale (43.02)
M.	DE PERETTI Fernand	Anatomie-Chirurgie Orthopédique (42.01)
M.	FERRARI Émile	Cardiologie (51.02)
M.	FERRERO Jean-Marc	Cancérologie ; Radiothérapie (47.02)
M.	FONTAINE Denys	Neurochirurgie (49.02)
M.	GIBELIN Pierre	Cardiologie (51.02)
M.	HANNOUN-LEVI Jean-Michel	Cancérologie ; Radiothérapie (47.02)
M.	LEVRAUT Jacques	Médecine d'urgence (48.05)
M.	LONJON Michel	Neurochirurgie (49.02)
M.	MOUNIER Nicolas	Cancérologie, Radiothérapie (47.02)
M.	PADOVANI Bernard	Radiologie et Imagerie Médicale (43.02)
M.	PASSERON Thierry	Dermato-Vénérologie (50-03)
M.	PICHE Thierry	Gastro-entérologie (52.01)
Mme	RAYNAUD Dominique	Hématologie (47.01)
M.	ROSENTHAL Éric	Médecine Interne (53.01)
M.	STACCINI Pascal	Biostatistiques et Informatique Médicale (46.04)
M.	THOMAS Pierre	Neurologie (49.01)
M.	TROJANI Christophe	Chirurgie Orthopédique et Traumatologique (50.02)

Liste des enseignants au 1er septembre 2019 à la Faculté de Médecine de Nice

PROFESSEURS DEUXIEME CLASSE

Mme	ALUNNI Véronique	Médecine Légale et Droit de la Santé (46.03)
M.	ANTY Rodolphe	Gastro-entérologie (52.01)
M.	BAHADORAN Philippe	Cytologie et Histologie (42.02)
Mme	BAILLIF Stéphanie	Ophtalmologie (55.02)
Mme	BANNWARTH Sylvie	Génétique (47.04)
M.	BENIZRI Emmanuel	Chirurgie Générale (53.02)
M.	BENOIT Michel	Psychiatrie (49.03)
M.	BERTHET Jean-Philippe	Chirurgie Thoracique (51-03)
M.	BOZEC Alexandre	ORL- Cancérologie (47.02)
M.	BREAUD Jean	Chirurgie Infantile (54-02)
Mme	BUREL-VANDENBOS Fanny	Anatomie et Cytologie pathologiques (42.03)
M.	CHEVALIER Nicolas	Endocrinologie, Diabète et Maladies Métaboliques (54.04)
Mme	CHINETTI Giulia	Biochimie-Biologie Moléculaire (44.01)
M.	CLUZEAU Thomas	Hématologie (47.01)
M.	DELLAMONICA Jean	réanimation médicale (48.02)
M.	DELOTTE Jérôme	Gynécologie-obstétrique (54.03)
M	FAVRE Guillaume	Néphrologie (44-02)
M.	FOURNIER Jean-Paul	Thérapeutique (48-04)
Mme	GIORDANENGO Valérie	Bactériologie-Virologie (45.01)
Mme	GIOVANNINI-CHAMI Lisa	Pédiatrie (54.01)
M.	GUÉRIN Olivier	Méd. In ; Gériatrie (53.01)
M.	IANNELLI Antonio	Chirurgie Digestive (52.02)
M.	ILIE Marius	Anatomie et Cytologie pathologiques (42.03)
M	JEAN BAPTISTE Elixène	Chirurgie vasculaire (51.04)
M.	ROHRLICH Pierre	Pédiatrie (54.01)
M.	ROUX Christian	rhumatologie (50.01)
M.	RUIMY Raymond	Bactériologie-virologie (45.01)
Mme	SACCONI Sabrina	Neurologie (49.01)
M.	SADOUL Jean-Louis	Endocrinologie, Diabète et Maladies Métaboliques (54.04)
M.	VANBIERLIET Geoffroy	Gastro-entérologie (52.01)

Liste des enseignants au 1er septembre 2019 à la Faculté de Médecine de Nice

MAITRES DE CONFÉRENCES DES UNIVERSITÉS - PRATICIENS HOSPITALIERS

M.	AMBROSETTI Damien	Cytologie et Histologie (42.02)
Mme	BERNARD-POMIER Ghislaine	Immunologie (47.03)
M.	BRONSARD Nicolas	Anatomie Chirurgie Orthopédique et Traumatologique (42.01)
M.	CAMUZARD Olivier	Chirurgie Plastique (50-04)
Mme	CONTENTI-LIPRANDI Julie	Médecine d'urgence ( 48-04)
M.	DOGLIO Alain	Bactériologie-Virologie (45.01)
M	DOYEN Jérôme	Radiothérapie (47.02)
M.	FOSSÉ Thierry	Bactériologie-Virologie-Hygiène (45.01)
M.	GARRAFFO Rodolphe	Pharmacologie Fondamentale (48.03)
Mme	HINAULT Charlotte	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire (44.01)
M.	HUMBERT Olivier	Biophysique et Médecine Nucléaire (43.01)
Mme	LAMY Brigitte	Bactériologie-virologie ( 45.01)
Mme	LONG-MIRA Elodie	Cytologie et Histologie (42.02)
Mme	MAGNIÉ Marie-Noëlle	Physiologie (44.02)
M.	MASSALOU Damien	Chirurgie Viscérale ( 52-02)
Mme	MOCERI Pamela	Cardiologie (51.02)
M.	MONTAUDIE Henri	Dermatologie (50.03)
Mme	MUSSO-LASSALLE Sandra	Anatomie et Cytologie pathologiques (42.03)
M.	NAÏMI Mourad	Biochimie et Biologie moléculaire (44.01)
Mme	POMARES Christelle	Parasitologie et mycologie (45.02)
M.	SAVOLDELLI Charles	Chirurgie maxillo-faciale et stomatologie (55.03)
Mme	SEITZ-POLSKI barbara	Immunologie (47.03)
M.	SQUARA Fabien	Cardiologie (51.02)
M.	TESTA Jean	Épidémiologie Économie de la Santé et Prévention (46.01)
Mme	THUMMLER Susanne	Pédopsychiatrie ( 49-04)
M.	TOULON Pierre	Hématologie et Transfusion (47.01)



Liste des enseignants au 1er septembre 2019 à la Faculté de Médecine de Nice

**MAITRE DE CONFÉRENCES DES UNIVERSITÉS**

M. DARMON David Médecine Générale (53.03)  
Mme GROS Auriane Orthophonie (69)

**PROFESSEURS AGRÉGÉS**

Mme LANDI Rebecca Anglais

**PRATICIEN HOSPITALIER UNIVERSITAIRE**

M. DURAND Matthieu Urologie (52.04)  
M. SICARD Antoine Néphrologie (52-03)

**PROFESSEURS ASSOCIÉS**

M. GARDON Gilles Médecine Générale (53.03)  
Mme MONNIER Brigitte Médecine Générale (53.03)

**MAITRES DE CONFÉRENCES ASSOCIÉS**

Mme CASTA Céline Médecine Générale (53.03)  
M. GASPERINI Fabrice Médecine Générale (53.03)  
M. HOGU Nicolas Médecine Générale (53.03)

Liste des enseignants au 1er septembre 2019 à la Faculté de Médecine de Nice

Constitution du jury en qualité de 4ème membre

Professeurs Honoraires

M. AMIEL Jean	M. GASTAUD Pierre
M ALBERTINI Marc	M. GÉRARD Jean-Pierre
M. BALAS Daniel	M. GILLET Jean-Yves
M. BATT Michel	M. GRELLIER Patrick
M. BLAIVE Bruno	M. GRIMAUD Dominique
M. BOQUET Patrice	M. HOFLIGER Philippe
M. BOURGEON André	M. JOURDAN Jacques
M. BOUTTÉ Patrick	M. LAMBERT Jean-Claude
M. BRUNETON Jean-Noël	M. LAZDUNSKI Michel
Mme BUSSIERE Françoise	M. LEFEBVRE Jean-Claude
M. CAMOUS Jean-Pierre	M. LE FICHOUX Yves
M. CANIVET Bertrand	Mme LEBRETON Elisabeth
M. CASSUTO Jill-patrice	M. MARIANI Roger
M. CHATEL Marcel	M. MASSEYEFF René
M. COUSSEMENT Alain	M. MATTEI Mathieu
Mme CRENESSE Dominique	M. MOUIEL Jean
M. DARCOURT Guy	Mme MYQUEL Martine
M. DELLAMONICA Pierre	M. ORTONNE Jean-Paul
M. DELMONT Jean	M. PRINGUEY Dominique
M. DEMARD François	M. SANTINI Joseph
M. DESNUELLE Claude	M. SAUTRON Jean Baptiste
M. DOLISI Claude	M. SCHNEIDER Maurice
Mme EULLER-ZIEGLER Liana	M. TOUBOL Jacques
M. FENICHEL Patrick	M. TRAN Dinh Khiem
M . FRANCO Alain	M VAN OBBERGHEN Emmanuel
M. FREYCHET Pierre	M. ZIEGLER Gérard

M.C.U. Honoraires

M. ARNOLD Jacques	M. GIUDICELLI Jean
M. BASTERIS Bernard	M. MAGNÉ Jacques
M. BENOLIEL José	Mme MEMRAN Nadine
Mlle CHICHMANIAN Rose-Marie	M. MENGUAL Raymond
Mme DONZEAU Michèle	M. PHILIP Patrick
M. EMILIOZZI Roméo	M. POIRÉE Jean-Claude
M. FRANKEN Philippe	Mme ROURE Marie-Claire
M. GASTAUD Marcel	

## REMERCIEMENTS

**Au Pr Jacques Darcourt, Président du jury**, merci de me faire l'honneur de présider ce jury. Je vous remercie pour tout ce que vous avez pu m'apporter. Merci pour votre enseignement et votre accompagnement. Vous avez participé à développer mon intérêt initial pour la biophysique en PCEM1 et appris comment aborder notre spécialité pendant l'internat. Soyez assuré de mon profond respect et de ma gratitude.

**Au Pr Charles Hugo Marquette**, merci de me faire l'honneur de siéger dans mon jury de thèse. Je vous remercie pour votre enseignement au cours de l'externat et pour vos précieux conseils concernant la rédaction de ce travail qui ont sans aucun doute participé à sa publication. Soyez assuré de mon profond respect.

**Au Dr Josiane Otto**, merci de me faire l'honneur de siéger dans mon jury de thèse. Merci pour votre accueil et vos conseils au cours de mon passage en oncologie médicale pour mon premier stage d'internat. Veuillez trouver en ces lignes l'expression de mon plus profond respect.

**Au Dr Marie Paquet**, merci d'avoir accepté de faire partie de mon jury de thèse. Tu as été mon interne pendant mon stage d'externat en MN et à l'époque tu m'as montré l'intérêt de notre spécialité. Merci pour ta bonne humeur et ta gentillesse. Merci pour ton enseignement. J'ai beaucoup aimé travailler avec toi pendant l'internat et je suis heureux de pouvoir continuer par la suite.

**Au Dr Olivier Humbert**, mon maître et directeur de thèses, merci pour tout ce que tu m'as apporté et ce que tu continues de m'apporter par ton enseignement et ton accompagnement. Merci d'avoir dirigé ce travail de thèse mais également d'avoir dirigé mon travail de master et de diriger mon travail de thèse de science. Merci des opportunités que tu m'as permis de saisir. Merci pour ta bonne humeur permanente et ta patience. Je suis très heureux de continuer à travailler avec toi.

TABLE DES MATIERES
--------------------

<b>PREMIERE PARTIE : CONTEXTE DE L'ETUDE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>SECONDE PARTIE : ARTICLE .....</b>	<b>3</b>
TITLE & AUTHORS .....	3
ABSTRACT, KEYWORDS & ABBREVIATIONS .....	4
<i>Tumor Biomarkers, Lung Neoplasms, Immunotherapy</i> .....	4
ABBREVIATIONS .....	4
BACKGROUND .....	5
METHODS .....	6
<i>Population</i> .....	6
<sup>18</sup> F-FDG PET/CT exams .....	6
<i>Follow-up and clinical endpoints</i> .....	7
<i>Statistical analysis</i> .....	8
RESULTS .....	9
<i>Patients' characteristics (table 1)</i> .....	9
<i>Association between 18F-FDG PET/CT parameters and clinical factors</i> .....	11
<i>Association of clinical and PET/CT parameters with OS</i> .....	12
<i>Prediction of early treatment discontinuation</i> .....	13
DISCUSSION .....	14
CONCLUSIONS .....	17
REFERENCES: .....	18
FIGURE LEGENDS .....	21

## PREMIERE PARTIE : Contexte de l'étude

Malgré des progrès récents en terme de techniques de dépistage et de moyens thérapeutiques, le cancer broncho-pulmonaire reste la première cause de décès par cancer dans le monde <sup>1</sup>.

Récemment, une des plus grandes avancées thérapeutiques en oncologie a été l'avènement de l'immunothérapie par inhibiteurs des points de contrôle immunitaire (« immune-checkpoint inhibitors ») <sup>2</sup>.

Quand les chimiothérapies classiques ont pour principe d'exercer un effet cytotoxique direct sur les cellules en division, et donc les cellules cancéreuses, l'immunothérapie a pour but de rétablir la réponse immunitaire anti-tumorale. En effet, les cellules cancéreuses peuvent échapper aux lymphocytes T cytotoxiques, notamment par le biais d'un système de régulation qui met en jeu l'interaction entre le ligand « Programmed Death-Ligand 1 » (PDL-1) sur les cellules tumorales et son récepteur lymphocytaire « Programmed Death 1 » (PD1). L'immunothérapie par inhibiteurs de PDL-1 ou inhibiteurs de PD-1 vient inhiber ce système dit des « immune-checkpoints » et rétablir la réponse lymphocytaire anti-tumorale. Ce traitement a permis de significativement améliorer le pronostic des patients pour de nombreux cancers, notamment le cancer broncho-pulmonaire non à petites cellules (CBPNPC) <sup>3-6</sup>.

Cependant l'immunothérapie ne sera efficace que pour une partie des patients atteints de CBPNPC (environ 20% <sup>3-6</sup>) et pour certains patients l'immunothérapie peut entraîner une hyperprogression paradoxale de la maladie (15%) ou des effets secondaires immuno-induits (7 à 27%)<sup>3-6</sup>. De plus, l'immunothérapie représente un coût financier non négligeable. Il serait donc intéressant de pouvoir identifier précocement les patients pour qui l'immunothérapie aura le plus de chances d'être efficace.

A ce jour il n'existe pas de marqueur suffisamment précis pour identifier ces patients. L'expression tumorale de PDL1 est un marqueur associé à l'efficacité de l'immunothérapie mais même en son absence, celle-ci peut être efficace. Ainsi l'expression de PDL1 est un marqueur insuffisant pour sélectionner les patients <sup>7-9</sup>. De nouveaux marqueurs sont donc nécessaires.

La Tomographie par Émission de Positons (TEP) au <sup>18</sup>F-Fluorodeoxyglucose (<sup>18</sup>F-FDG) couplée à la tomographie par densitométrie (TDM) est une technique d'imagerie permettant d'étudier le métabolisme

glucidique in-vivo de manière non invasive. En effet, la TEP permet de quantifier l'accumulation relative du  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG, un analogue du glucose marqué au Fluor-18, élément radioactif émetteur de positon, dans chaque voxel de l'image. Dans le cadre du CBPNPC, les cellules étant fortement avides en glucose, la TEP-TDM au  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG permet de détecter avec une grande sensibilité l'ensemble des lésions malignes chez un patient.

De plus, on peut mesurer de manière semi-automatisée, le volume représenté par les voxels les plus intenses au sein d'un volume d'intérêt. On peut de cette manière, mesurer le volume correspondant à l'ensemble du tissu tumoral présentant une forte captation de  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG pour un patient, qu'on appelle « volume métabolique». De nombreuses méthodes existent pour mesurer le volume métabolique <sup>10</sup>. Cette mesure peut se faire manuellement, semi-automatiquement ou de manière automatisée. La mesure semi-automatisée est pour l'instant la plus utilisée et fait appel à des méthodes de seuillage.

Le volume métabolique pré-thérapeutique est un facteur pronostique fort pour les patients traités par chimiothérapie dans le cadre de nombreux cancers, notamment le CBPNPC <sup>11</sup>. Cependant la valeur pronostique du volume métabolique chez les patients traités par immunothérapie n'a que peu été étudiée.

Dans l'étude présentée ci-dessous, nous avons évalué la valeur prédictive et pronostique du volume métabolique pré-thérapeutique chez les patients traités par immunothérapie pour un cancer broncho-pulmonaire non à petites cellules au stade métastatique.

**Baseline metabolic tumor volume as a strong predictive and prognostic biomarker in non-small cell lung cancer patients treated with PD-1 inhibitors: A Prospective Study.**

*Publié le 23 Juillet 2020 dans le Journal for Immunotherapy of Cancer (doi: 10.1136/jitc-2020-000645)*

David CHARDIN<sup>1,2\*</sup> ; Marie PAQUET<sup>1</sup> ; Renaud SCHIAPPA<sup>3</sup> ; Jacques DARCOURT<sup>1,2</sup> ; Caroline BAILLEUX<sup>4</sup> ; Michel POUDENX<sup>4,5</sup> ; Aurélie SCHIAZZA<sup>1</sup> ; Marius ILIE<sup>5,7</sup> ; Jonathan BENZAQUEN<sup>6,7</sup> ; Nicolas MARTIN<sup>4</sup> ; Josiane OTTO<sup>4</sup> ; Olivier HUMBERT<sup>1,2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Department of Nuclear Medicine, Centre Antoine-Lacassagne, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, France.

<sup>2</sup> TIRO-UMR E 4320, Université Côte d'Azur / CEA, Nice, France.

<sup>3</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Health Data, Centre Antoine-Lacassagne, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, France.

<sup>4</sup> Department of Medical Oncology, Centre Antoine-Lacassagne, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, France.

<sup>5</sup> Laboratory of Clinical and Experimental Pathology, Hospital-Integrated Biobank (BB-0033-00025), Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, FHU OncoAge, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, France.

<sup>6</sup> Department of Pulmonary Medicine and Oncology, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, FHU OncoAge, Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, France.

<sup>7</sup> Institute of Research on Cancer and Ageing, Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, INSERM, Nice, France.

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Reliable predictive and prognostic markers are still lacking for patients treated with PD1-Inhibitors for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). The purpose of this study was to investigate the prognostic and predictive values of different baseline metabolic parameters, including metabolic tumor volume (MTV), from  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG PET/CT scans in patients with NSCLC treated with PD1-Inhibitors. **Methods:** Maximum and peak standardized uptake values, MTV and total lesion glycolysis (TLG) as well as clinical and biological parameters, were recorded in 75 prospectively included patients with NSCLC treated with PD1-Inhibitors. Associations between these parameters and overall survival (OS) were evaluated as well as their accuracy to predict early treatment discontinuation (ETD). **Results:** A high MTV and a high TLG were significantly associated with a lower OS ( $p < 0.001$ ). The median OS in patients with MTV above the median ( $36.5 \text{ cm}^3$ ) was 10.5 months (95% CI: 6.2 - upper limit: unreached) while the median OS in patients with MTV below the median was not reached. Patients with no prior chemotherapy had a poorer OS than patients which had received prior systemic treatment ( $p=0.04$ ). MTV and TLG could reliably predict ETD (ROC curve AUC = 0.76, 95% CI: 0.65-0.87 and 0.72, 95% CI: 0.62-0.84 respectively). **Conclusion:** MTV is a strong prognostic and predictive factor in NSCLC patients treated with PD1-Inhibitors and can be easily determined from routine  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG PET/CT scans. MTV, could help to personalize immunotherapy and be used to stratify patients in future clinical studies.

## KEY WORDS

Tumor Biomarkers, Lung Neoplasms, Immunotherapy

## ABBREVIATIONS

**AUC** : Area Under the Curve ; **CT** : Computed Tomography ; **ETD** : Early Treatment Discontinuation ;  **$^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG** :  $^{18}\text{F}$ -Fluorodeoxyglucose ; **IQR** : Inter-Quartile Range ; **irAEs** : immune related Adverse Events ; **MTV**: Metabolic Tumor Volume ; **NSCLC** : Non Small Cell Lung Cancer ; **OS** : Overall Survival ; **PD1** : Programmed Death Receptor 1 ; **PDL1** : Programmed Death Receptor Ligand 1 ; **PET** : Positron Emission Tomography ; **ROC curve** : Receiver Operating Characteristic curve ; **SUV<sub>peak</sub>** : Peak Standardized Uptake Value ; **SUV<sub>max</sub>** : Maximum Standardized Uptake Value ; **TLG** : Total Lesion glycolysis



## BACKGROUND

Treatment with immune checkpoint inhibitors such as Pembrolizumab or Nivolumab, significantly improves survival in patients with metastatic non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) compared to chemotherapy,<sup>3-6</sup>.

While this represents a major breakthrough in the treatment of metastatic non-small cell lung cancer, immunotherapy also has known limitations. All patients will not benefit from immunotherapy. Indeed, only one out of five patients will achieve an objective response,<sup>3-6</sup>. Furthermore, about 15% of patients experience rapid paradoxical progression, known as “hyperprogression”, associated with poor overall survival,<sup>12</sup>. Furthermore, since checkpoint inhibitors block the action of negative regulators of the cellular immune response, these treatments can cause immune-related adverse events (irAEs). As a result, severe toxicities (grade 3 or 4) occur in 7 to 27% of patients, depending on immunotherapy protocol,<sup>3-6,13</sup>.

Thus, there is a clear need to better select patients before immunotherapy. Despite significant efforts, no clinical, histological or genetic parameters have been identified to reliably predict the success of immunotherapy so far. Although PD-L1 expression is associated with objective response, PD-L1 testing alone appears to be insufficient for patient selection,<sup>7-9</sup>. Furthermore, the need for reliable selection criteria is emphasized by the high cost of immunotherapy,<sup>14</sup>.

For several malignancies, including NSCLC, metabolic tumor volume (MTV) derived from <sup>18</sup>F-Fluorodeoxyglucose Positron Emission Tomography–Computed Tomography (<sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT) studies has been shown to be a strong prognostic factor for overall survival (OS) in patients treated with chemotherapy or radiotherapy,<sup>11,15-18</sup>. However, only limited data exist on the prognostic relevance of MTV for immunotherapy.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the prognostic value of MTV and other metabolic parameters from baseline <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT, in patients with NSCLC treated with PD1-inhibitors and to evaluate their predictive value concerning early treatment discontinuation (ETD).

## **METHODS**

### **Population**

This study is part of a prospective study conducted in our institution investigating the value of standard <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT to monitor tumor response to immunotherapy,<sup>19</sup>. From October 2016 to March 2019, consecutive patients scheduled to initiate immunotherapy as their first or later line systemic treatment for advanced or metastatic NSCLC were prospectively included in this open, uncontrolled and non-randomized current-care study (FDG ECMI, n°ID-RCB: 2018-A02116-49). The study was approved by the regional ethics committee and regulatory agencies. Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants.

The inclusion criteria were: 1. pathologically proven metastatic NSCLC, irrespective of the histologic subtype, 2. indication to start immune checkpoints inhibitors in first or later line according to current recommendations, 3. ECOG performance status (PS) 0 to 2, 4. no prior immunotherapy. The exclusion criteria were: 1. clinical or biological contraindication for immune checkpoints inhibitors, 2. vulnerable patients as defined in Article L1121-5 to -8 of the French Public Health Code, 3. high glycaemia (>9 mmol/l) before PET scanning and, 4. a delay higher than 3 months between baseline PET and initiation of immunotherapy.

Patients received Pembrolizumab administered intravenously at a standard dose of 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks, or Nivolumab at a standard dose of 240 mg every 2 weeks, following guidelines.

### **<sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT exams**

<sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT scans were performed before the start of immunotherapy for every patient.

All <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT scans were performed using the same PET/CT system (Biograph mCT, Siemens healthcare, Erlangen, Germany). Patients were instructed to fast for at least 6 hours before the intravenous injection of 3 MBq/kg of <sup>18</sup>F-FDG. Sixty minutes later, a low-dose attenuation CT acquisition was performed (50kV, 50 mA, 5mm slice thickness) followed by a static 3D PET acquisition was performed from vertex to mid-thighs with image duration of 150 seconds per bed position, an axial field of view of 13 cm and a matrix of 256x256 pixels. Lastly a diagnostic CT scan was performed from vertex to mid-thighs, including a dedicated chest acquisition (auto-kV, auto-mA, 1mm slice

thickness) after a venous injection of iodinated contrast agent in the absence of allergy or renal impairment.

PET images were reconstructed using the ordered subsets expectation maximization (OSEM 3D) iterative algorithm (2 iterations, 21 subsets), with point-spread function and time-of-flight correction (Ultra-HD PET). The image voxel counts were calibrated to activity concentration (Bq/ml) and decay corrected using the time of tracer injection as the reference.

<sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT parameters were measured using PET/CT viewer,<sup>20,21</sup> a free plug in for FIJI,<sup>22</sup>. Images were reviewed by 2 nuclear medicine physicians. One nuclear medicine physician performed the segmentation, then the other reviewed it. In case of disagreement, segmentation was corrected by consensus. Pathological hypermetabolic foci obviously deemed to be due to the therapy-related inflammation or immune activation (for example symmetrical uptake in enlarged hilar/mediastinal lymph nodes, diffuse splenic uptake, colitis...) were excluded of the lesion analyses.

Peak standardized uptake values normalized by body weight ( $SUV_{peak}$ ) were calculated in 10-mm-diameter regions of interest placed on the highest uptake site of the tumors. The maximum Standardized Uptake Value ( $SUV_{max}$ ) was calculated for the most intense lesion. To assess tumor burden, the Metabolic Tumor Volume (MTV) was defined as the sum of volumes enclosed by a 41% isocontour around each tumor lesion voxel with the maximum <sup>18</sup>F-FDG uptake, as recommended by the European Association of Nuclear Medicine,<sup>23</sup>. Total lesion glycolysis (TLG) was obtained by multiplying the MTV by the mean SUV.

### **Follow-up and clinical endpoints**

The following clinical parameters were recorded: age at treatment initiation, gender, immunotherapy start date and molecule, prior treatments (surgery, radiotherapy, and systemic chemotherapy), TNM staging and presence of brain metastases. Histological characteristics included histological type and pre-treatment PD-L1 tumor expression when available.

Patients were followed during at least 6 months with regular clinical evaluations and standard of care imaging including follow-up brain Magnetic Resonance Imaging and systematic <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT studies after 7 weeks and 3 months of treatment. The delay between the initiation of the treatment and the decision to stop it, as well as the reason for this stop (tumor progression, toxicity, patient's refusal to continue the treatment) were recorded.

The primary endpoint was overall survival (OS) defined as the time from initial immunotherapy to death from any cause.

Early treatment discontinuation (ETD) was a secondary endpoint. Early treatment discontinuation was defined as a treatment period of less than 3 months. Confirmation of tumor progression and decisions to discontinue treatment were systematically made by a multidisciplinary review board considering clinical, biological and imaging data.

### **Statistical analysis**

Statistical analysis was performed using R, version 3.6.1. Continuous variables are summarized as medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) and categorical variables are summarized as numbers of patients and percentages. For continuous variables, statistical significance was determined using Student's t test or Wilcoxon's test. A p value of 0.05 or less was considered significant. Survival functions of subgroups of patients defined by  $SUV_{max}$ ,  $SUV_{peak}$ , MTV and TLG were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier product limit method and compared using the log-rank test. Univariate analysis was used to identify factors associated with OS. Factors identified as being significant in the univariate analysis ( $p < 0.05$ ) were then entered into a Cox multivariate regression analysis model. Forward stepwise multivariate regression analysis was then carried out to identify factors that were correlated with OS. In each step, variables with a p value  $< 0.05$  were entered and those with a p value  $> 0.10$  were removed.

The predictive values of the different PET parameters for ETD were estimated through ROC curve analysis. To estimate the accuracy with which MTV and TLG could predict ETD, sensitivity and specificity were estimated using the median values as dichotomizing values.

## RESULTS

### Patients' characteristics (table 1)

Table 1.

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Value</i>
Age (Years), median (range)	64 (42-83)
Age $\geq$ 75 years, n (%)	16 (21)
Male sex, n (%)	59 (79)
Histological type, n (%)	
Non-squamous cell carcinoma	63 (84)
Squamous cell carcinoma	12 (16)
Prior Surgery, n (%)	15 (20)
Prior Thoracic Radiotherapy, n (%)	24 (32)
PDL1 expression, n (%)	
< 50%	15 (20)
$\geq$ 50%	31 (41)
Unknown	29 (39)
Brain metastases, n (%)	25 (33)
Treated with radiotherapy	24 (32)
No radiotherapy treatment	1 (1)
Lines of previous systemic therapy, n (%)	
0	13 (17)
1	48 (64)
$\geq$ 2	14 (19)
Immunotherapy, n (%)	
Pembrolizumab	42 (56)
Nivolumab	33 (44)

Overall 79 patients were prospectively included. Among them, four patients were excluded of the analysis because of presence of only one hypermetabolic bone lesion concomitantly treated with radiation therapy (n=1); rapid clinical worsening followed by death before immunotherapy initiation (n=1); immunotherapy initiation more than 3 months after baseline PET/CT (n=1); treatment carried out in another facility (n=1). A total of 75 patients were therefore evaluated in this study.

Patients' clinical and biological characteristics at baseline are shown in Table 1. The patients were mainly men (78.7%), had non-squamous cell carcinoma (84%) and had undergone first line platinum-based chemotherapy with surgery and/or radiotherapy. Median patient age was 64 (IQR 58-72 years). All patients had a metastatic NSCLC. The histological subtype was squamous cell carcinoma in 16% (12/75) of patients and non-squamous cell carcinoma in 84% (63/75). PDL1 expression was known for 46/75 patients (61.3%).

The median delay between baseline PET and introduction of immunotherapy was 11 days (IQR 3-25 days).

On baseline  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG PET/CT studies, the median values for  $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$ ,  $\text{SUV}_{\text{peak}}$ , MTV, and TLG were 13.4 (IQR 9.4-17.7), 9.7 (IQR 6.9-12.9),  $36.5 \text{ cm}^3$  (IQR  $16.7\text{-}87.5 \text{ cm}^3$ ), and 267 (IQR 62.4-593), respectively. An example of of MTV measurement is represented in figure 1.

All patients were observed for at least 6 months from the start date of immunotherapy. The median follow-up was 12.3 months (IQR: 6.1-19.3 months). At the time of data cut-off for the analysis, 29 patients had died.

**Association between 18F-FDG PET/CT parameters and clinical factors (Table 2)**

Clinical parameter	Mean MTV (95% CI)	p-value	Mean TLG (95% CI)	p-value	Mean SUV <sub>max</sub> (95% CI)	p-value	Mean SUV <sub>peak</sub> (95% CI)	p-value
Age category								
<75 y	69.0 (43.4-94.6)	0.23	511 (259-764)	0.43	15.0 (12.6-17.4)	0.47	11.2 (9.3-13.1)	0.68
≥75y	69.0 (33.8-104)		437 (231-643)		15.0 (11.8-18.3)		10.2 (8.5-12.0)	
Gender								
male	77.3 (49.8-105)	0.18	584 (309-859)	0.21	14.5 (12.6-16.3)	0.86	10.5 (8.9-12.0)	0.98
female	47.7 (19.5-75.9)		269 (146-391)		16.4 (10.8-22.0)		12.3 (7.91-16.8)	
Histological type								
NSC	71.2 (46.7-96.6)	0.67	498 (264-733)	0.48	14.6 (12.3-16.8)	0.12	10.9 (9.1-12.6)	0.23
SC	55.0 (27.4-82.5)		479 (160-798)		17.3 (13.1-21.4)		11.8 (9.2-14.4)	
Prior chemotherapy								
yes	<b>55.3 (37.7-73.0)</b>	<b>0.04</b>	437 (213-662)	0.17	15.6 (13.3-18.0)	0.18	11.4 (9.62-13.2)	0.28
no	<b>134 (49.9-218)</b>		773 (312-1233)		12.0 (9.1-14.9)		9.1 (6.84-11.3)	
Prior local treatment								
yes	<b>45.4 (27.6-63.2)</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>242.6 (162-323)</b>	<b>0.02</b>	14.4 (10.6-18.2)	0.15	10.3 (7.42-13.1)	0.45
no	<b>86.6 (52.4-121)</b>		<b>684 (344-1023)</b>		15.4 (13.3-17.6)		11.6 (9.89-13.2)	
PDL1 expression								
<50%	66.9 (17.5 – 116)	0.14	479 (132-827)	0.35	18.2 (10.8-25.6)	0.56	13.3 (7.33-19.2)	0.87
≥50%	91.9 (48.2 – 136)		706 (259-1153)		14.4 (11.9-16.9)		10.7 (8.84-12.7)	

Table 2. Metabolic parameter values according to clinical characteristics and statistical associations between clinical and metabolic parameters.

(NSC : non squamous cell carcinoma, SC : squamous cell carcinoma, MTV: whole-body metabolic tumor volume, TLG: whole-body total lesion glycolysis.)

According to univariate analysis, patients who had not received previous chemotherapy had significantly higher MTVs (mean MTV: 134 vs 55 cm<sup>3</sup>, unilateral Wilcoxon test: p = 0.035). Similarly, patients who had not received previous local treatments (surgery or radiotherapy) had significantly higher MTVs and TLGs (mean MTV: 87 vs 45 cm<sup>3</sup>, t-test: p = 0.04 ; mean TLG : 684 vs 243, t-test : p=0.02).

Age, gender, histological type and PDL1 expression were not significantly associated to MTV, SUV<sub>max</sub>, SUV<sub>peak</sub> or TLG.

**Association of clinical and PET/CT parameters with OS (Table 3; Fig. 2 and 3)**

Table 3. Factors associated with overall survival in patients with NSCLC.

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Hazard Ratio</i>	<i>95% confidence interval</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Age >75 years <75 years	0.99 1(reference)	0.40 - 2.43	1
Gender Female Male	1.42 1(reference)	0.66 - 3.05	0.4
Brain Metastases Presence Absence	1.48 1(reference)	0.70 - 3.11	0.3
Histological type Non-squamous cell carcinoma Squamous cell carcinoma	0.83 1(reference)	0.34 - 2.05	0.7
PDL1 expression ≥50% <50%	0.80 1(reference)	0.44 - 3.55	0.7
Previous Chemotherapy None ≥1	2.09 1(reference)	0.84 - 5.19	0.11
MTV >36.5 <36.5	5.37 1(reference)	2.17 - 13.3	<0.0001
TLG >267 <267	5.05 1(reference)	2.05 - 12.5	0.0001
SUV <sub>max</sub> >13.4 <13.4	1.31 1(reference)	0.63 - 2.75	0.5
SUV <sub>peak</sub> >9.7 <9.7	1.15 1(reference)	0.55 - 2.40	0.7

*Logrank test results. MTV: metabolic tumor volume, TLG: total lesion glycolysis. Median values were used for cut-off.*

Higher MTV and TLG on baseline PET were significantly associated with poorer OS:

- The median OS in patients with MTV above the median was 10.5 months (95% CI: lower limit: 6.2, upper limit: unreached) while the median OS in patients with MTV below the median was not reached ( $p < 0.001$ , HR = 5.37, 95% CI: 2.17-13.3).
- The median OS in patients with TLG above the median was 10.5 months (95% CI: lower limit: 4.9, upper limit: unreached) while the median OS in patients with TLG below the median was not reached ( $p < 0.001$ , HR = 5.05, 95% CI: 2.05-12.5) (Fig. 2).



Age, gender, brain metastases, histological type, PDL1 tumor expression,  $SUV_{max}$  and  $SUV_{peak}$  were not statistically associated with OS (Fig.2 and 3). History of previous chemotherapy or local treatment did not appear to be statistically associated with OS after application of the Logrank test, but patients treated with first line immunotherapy had a significantly lower OS than patients who had previously been treated with chemotherapy based on a Gehan-Breslow generalized Wilcoxon test ( $p = 0.04$ ).

In a multivariate analysis including MTV, and history of previous chemotherapy and/or local treatment, MTV remained the only significant independent factor associated with OS (HR 4.50, 95% CI 1.89-10.7;  $p < 0.001$ ).

### **Prediction of early treatment discontinuation (ETD)**

Immunotherapy was discontinued less than 3 months after initiation for 27 patients (36%). The reasons for ETD were as follows: rapid progression of disease in 26 patients, immunotherapy related hepatitis for 1 patient.

ETD was a strong surrogate marker of overall survival as 23/27 (85.2%) patients with ETD died during follow up, with a median OS time of 4.63 (95% CI: 3.6-10.1). In comparison, among the 48 patients who did not have ETD, only 6/48 (12.5%) died during follow-up (the median OS time was not reached). OS was significantly shorter in patients who had ETD than for patients who were treated for at least 3 months (logrank test: HR = 15.9, 95% CI: 6.34-39.8,  $p < 0.00001$ ).

Mean MTV in patients who had ETD was significantly higher than in patients without ETD (T-test:  $p = 0.01$ ). There were no significant differences in terms of TLG ( $p=0.13$ ),  $SUV_{max}$  ( $p=0.56$ ) or  $SUV_{peak}$  ( $p=0.76$ ).

Fig. 4 shows the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for PET parameters to predict ETD. Only MTV (AUC = 0.76, 95% CI: 0.65-0.87) and TLG (AUC = 0.72, 95% CI: 0.62-0.84) could accurately predict ETD.  $SUV_{peak}$  and  $SUV_{max}$  had no predictive values. In our population, the best threshold values were 36.2  $cm^3$  for MTV and 294  $cm^3$  for TLG. Using the median MTV (36.5  $cm^3$ ) and TLG (267  $cm^3$ ) as threshold values, sensitivity and specificity were estimated to be 78% (95% CI: 62-93%) and 63% (95% CI: 49-76%) respectively for MTV and 74.1% (95% CI: 57.5 – 90.6%) and 64.5% (95% CI: 51.1 - 78.1%) respectively for TLG.

## DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the largest prospective study to indicate that a high baseline MTV is an important independent predictive and prognostic factor in patients with advanced NSCLC before treatment with immunotherapy as it can both predict early treatment discontinuation and poor overall survival.

The prognostic value of MTV on baseline  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG PET/CT in patients with various malignancies treated with chemotherapy or radiotherapy, including non-small cell lung cancer,<sup>17,18</sup> has been extensively studied. In contrast, data on the prognostic value of MTV in patients treated with immunotherapy are limited. In a recent retrospective study including 142 patients, Ito K. et al. demonstrated the prognostic value of baseline MTV for patients treated with ipilimumab for a melanoma,<sup>24</sup>. As in the current study,  $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\text{SUV}_{\text{peak}}$  were not associated to survival. Concurrently, in a recent study retrospectively analyzing 32 patients treated with immunotherapy for NSCLC,<sup>25</sup> Evangelista L. et al. found that the sum of  $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$  in all lesions ( $\text{SUV}_{\text{maxwb}}$ ) was significantly higher in non-responding patients than in responding patients. MTV and TLG were also higher but not statistically significant. In our study,  $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$  was not significantly associated with OS. The  $\text{SUV}_{\text{maxwb}}$  parameter described by Evangelista L. et al. takes into account  $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$  but also the number of lesions. The association with tumor response might therefore be linked to tumor burden rather than the intensity of  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG uptake. The absence of statistical significance concerning MTV and TLG could be due to the small number of patients and/or to the way tumor response was assessed.

Recent studies have shown the prognostic value of baseline tumor burden as assessed by CT in patients treated with immunotherapy for melanoma and NSCLC,<sup>26,27</sup>. The sum of the maximum diameters of target lesions on baseline CT-scans (baseline tumor size, BTS) was used as an index of tumor burden. A BTS above the median was associated with a worse OS. Conceptually, MTV seems to be a better marker of total tumor burden than BTS. Indeed, BTS is based on the diameters of a limited number of lesions (up to 5) which are subjectively selected. This selection is based not only on lesion size, but also on how well lesions are delineated on CT images. Poorly delineated lesions such as bone lesions are most often not taken into account. Furthermore, the shapes of the selected lesions are not taken into account. For each lesion, only a one-dimensional diameter is measured, which is quite different to a three-dimensional volume. In contrast, MTV from  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG PET/CT is a much more accurate

measurement of tumor volume, which takes into account all lesions with the exception of brain metastases.

Tumor burden appears to be associated with survival in patients treated with various immunotherapies for various malignancies. As immune checkpoint inhibitors are not targeted towards a specific malignancy and have shown efficacy in various types of cancers, we can assume that the mechanisms by which MTV is linked to survival is similar in those malignancies. Huang A. et al. have shown that the ratio between circulating reinvigorated CD8 T cells and tumor burden as assessed by CT could predict tumor response in patients treated with immunotherapy for a melanoma,<sup>28</sup>. We can hypothesize that patients with a high tumor burden have a generally lower reinvigorated CD8 T cells relative to tumor burden ratio, which would explain their lower survival rates.

In addition, we found that baseline MTV could predict ETD during immunotherapy. A time to progression lower than 3 months has already been reported to be a good surrogate marker of poor OS in patients treated with immunotherapy for NSCLC,<sup>29</sup>. Our results agree with these findings.

Hashimoto et al. recently published the results of a retrospective study highlighting the prognostic value of MTV and TLG for PFS and OS in 85 patients treated with anti-PD1 antibodies for a previously treated NSCLC,<sup>30</sup>. In another study, Castello et al. highlighted that a high MTV associated with a high derived neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio was associated with a higher risk of hyperprogressive disease and therefore to OS and PFS for 46 prospectively included patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors for a NSCLC,<sup>31</sup>.

Our study confirms these results on a larger prospective cohort and further emphasizes that MTV is a reliable, non-invasive prognostic biomarker for patients treated with immunotherapy for a NSCLC.

We found that the optimal MTV cutoff value to predict ETD in our population was 36.2 cm<sup>3</sup>. In their study Hashimoto et al. found an MTV value of 5 cm<sup>3</sup> to be the best cut-off value to predict OS and PFS, yet interestingly a value of 90cm<sup>3</sup> was also a good cut off value to predict PFS. In their study, Castello et al. did not report an optimal cut-off value for MTV but stated that an MTV value of 66cm<sup>3</sup> was considered low and a value of 148cm<sup>3</sup> was considered elevated. Moreover, overall MTV values varied between studies. Indeed, in our study, the median MTV value was 36.5 cm<sup>3</sup> compared to a median of 17.8cm<sup>3</sup> for Hashimoto et al. and a mean of 143.2cm<sup>3</sup> for Castello et al. These differences in MTV values can be due to differences between populations but also to differences between PET-CT procedures and segmentation methods,<sup>32</sup>. Indeed the injected dose of <sup>18</sup>F-FDG differs between studies, as well as

the PET-CT models and acquisition and reconstruction parameters. Furthermore while our segmentation method was similar to Castello et al., using a fixed threshold of 41% and 42% of the  $SUV_{max}$  respectively, Hashimoto et al. used a specific threshold for each patient, based on liver uptake. Standardized multicenter studies may be needed to find a robust optimal cut-off value for MTV. These different optimal MTV cut-off values can also indicate that while patients with a very low MTV clearly have a better outcome and those with a very high MTV clearly have a worse one, patients with more intermediate MTV values have less predictable outcomes. Other predictors may be of particular interest for patients with intermediate MTV values.

The strong prognostic value of MTV in patients treated with immunotherapy and its predictive value concerning ETD suggests several potential future clinical applications in patients with NSCLC undergoing immunotherapy. MTV could be considered for patient stratification before treatment decision. Even though immunotherapy has been shown to be superior to chemotherapy in NSCLC, response rates are still insufficient. Combining PD1 or PDL1 antibodies to chemotherapy or other immunotherapies could increase response rates and survival by boosting immune response or lowering tumor burden respectively, thus lowering the reinvigorated CD8 T cells to tumor burden ratio. In a randomized controlled trial in patients with metastatic or unresectable melanoma, the best overall response to ipilimumab was 19%, compared with 58% to a combination of ipilimumab and nivolumab. However, combination therapy also significantly increased the risk of irAEs with grade 3 or 4 toxicity occurring in 59% of patients treated with combination therapy, compared with 28% of patients receiving ipilimumab monotherapy,<sup>33</sup>. Phase 1/2 trials have foreshown similar results concerning NSCLC,<sup>34</sup>. In addition, combinations of immunotherapy and chemotherapy have been shown to be superior to chemotherapy as first line treatment for NSCLC,<sup>35,36</sup>.

Interestingly, in our population, we found that patients treated with first line immunotherapy had a significantly lower OS than patients who had previously been treated with chemotherapy and/or local treatments. This difference in survival may be explained by the fact that patients who had not received prior treatment had higher MTVs than patients previously treated with local treatment or chemotherapy. This would suggest that combined treatment protocols including a phase of chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy aiming to diminish MTV could be superior to immunotherapy alone in patients with high MTVs. This difference in survival might also possibly be due to a bias in patient selection. Indeed, in our analysis we compare patients who survived throughout a prior treatment phase to patients who have never received prior treatment. Patients who died during a prior treatment phase were not analyzed. A randomized control trial comparing first line treatment with an

association of chemotherapy-immunotherapy to first line treatment with immunotherapy alone could confirm or infirm our hypothesis.

Most importantly, our results suggest that while single agent immunotherapies might be sufficient to achieve response for patients with low MTV, patients with high MTV could benefit the most from combination therapies. Evidently, these hypotheses for future applications of MTV in clinical practice and research must be properly tested in prospective randomized clinical trials.

We recognize some limitations of this study.

- The methodology for MTV measurements (with a threshold value of 41% of  $SUV_{max}$  in each lesion) has been used in several previous studies, but more sophisticated approaches may provide more accurate volume measurements. Nevertheless, we believe that MTV as determined with our simple approach provides a reliable and reproducible estimate of whole-body tumor burden and would allow investigators to quantitatively compare tumor burden between individual patients. As discussed previously, standardization of MTV measurements is necessary to compare values between different centers.
- The minimum follow-up time of 6 months was not long enough to observe the median OS time in patients with MTV over the median, yet it was sufficient to observe a statistically significant difference in OS and PFS between patients with low or high MTV. While this difference exists, it might be underestimated due to insufficient follow-up duration.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Our findings indicate that total tumor burden in patients with advanced NSCLC as quantified by MTV based on  $^{18}F$ -FDG PET/CT is a strong independent prognostic factor for overall survival after immunotherapy and can be used to predict early treatment discontinuation.

MTV has the considerable advantage of being a non-invasive, whole body biomarker, available in routine clinical practice. Baseline MTV could therefore be a useful and simple tool to determine which of a single versus combined treatment protocol would be most beneficial for each patient. Ideally, randomized controlled trials should stratify patients based on baseline MTV.

## REFERENCES:

1. Bade BC, Dela Cruz CS. Lung Cancer 2020: Epidemiology, Etiology, and Prevention. *Clin Chest Med*. 2020;41(1):1-24. doi:10.1016/j.ccm.2019.10.001
2. Couzin-Frankel J. Breakthrough of the year 2013. Cancer immunotherapy. *Science*. 2013;342(6165):1432-1433. doi:10.1126/science.342.6165.1432
3. Borghaei H, Paz-Ares L, Horn L, et al. Nivolumab versus Docetaxel in Advanced Nonsquamous Non–Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;373(17):1627-1639. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1507643
4. Brahmer J, Reckamp KL, Baas P, et al. Nivolumab versus Docetaxel in Advanced Squamous-Cell Non–Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;373(2):123-135. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1504627
5. Herbst RS, Baas P, Kim D-W, et al. Pembrolizumab versus docetaxel for previously treated, PD-L1-positive, advanced non-small-cell lung cancer (KEYNOTE-010): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10027):1540-1550. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)01281-7
6. Reck M, Rodríguez-Abreu D, Robinson AG, et al. Pembrolizumab versus Chemotherapy for PD-L1–Positive Non–Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2016;375(19):1823-1833. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1606774
7. Gibney GT, Weiner LM, Atkins MB. Predictive biomarkers for checkpoint inhibitor-based immunotherapy. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2016;17(12):e542-e551. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(16)30406-5
8. Davis AA, Patel VG. The role of PD-L1 expression as a predictive biomarker: an analysis of all US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approvals of immune checkpoint inhibitors. *Journal for ImmunoTherapy of Cancer*. 2019;7(1):278. doi:10.1186/s40425-019-0768-9
9. Lantuejoul S, Tsao MS-, Cooper WA, et al. PD-L1 Testing for Lung Cancer in 2019: Perspective from the IASLC Pathology Committee. *J Thorac Oncol*. Published online December 20, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.jtho.2019.12.107
10. Im H-J, Bradshaw T, Solaiyappan M, Cho SY. Current Methods to Define Metabolic Tumor Volume in Positron Emission Tomography: Which One is Better? *Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2018;52(1):5-15. doi:10.1007/s13139-017-0493-6
11. Sharma A, Mohan A, Bhalla AS, et al. Role of Various Metabolic Parameters Derived From Baseline 18F-FDG PET/CT as Prognostic Markers in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients Undergoing Platinum-Based Chemotherapy. *Clin Nucl Med*. 2018;43(1):e8-e17. doi:10.1097/RLU.0000000000001886
12. Ferrara R, Mezquita L, Texier M, et al. Hyperprogressive Disease in Patients With Advanced Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Treated With PD-1/PD-L1 Inhibitors or With Single-Agent Chemotherapy. *JAMA Oncol*. 2018;4(11):1543-1552. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.3676
13. Xing P, Zhang F, Wang G, et al. Incidence rates of immune-related adverse events and their correlation with response in advanced solid tumours treated with NIVO or NIVO+IPI: a systematic

- review and meta-analysis. *Journal for ImmunoTherapy of Cancer*. 2019;7(1):341. doi:10.1186/s40425-019-0779-6
14. Verma V, Sprave T, Haque W, et al. A systematic review of the cost and cost-effectiveness studies of immune checkpoint inhibitors. *J Immunotherapy Cancer*. 2018;6(1):128. doi:10.1186/s40425-018-0442-7
  15. Kanoun S, Rossi C, Berriolo-Riedinger A, et al. Baseline metabolic tumour volume is an independent prognostic factor in Hodgkin lymphoma. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2014;41(9):1735-1743. doi:10.1007/s00259-014-2783-x
  16. Lee JW, Cho A, Lee J-H, et al. The role of metabolic tumor volume and total lesion glycolysis on <sup>18</sup>F-FDG PET/CT in the prognosis of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2014;41(10):1898-1906. doi:10.1007/s00259-014-2803-x
  17. Winther-Larsen A, Fledelius J, Sorensen BS, Meldgaard P. Metabolic tumor burden as marker of outcome in advanced EGFR wild-type NSCLC patients treated with erlotinib. *Lung Cancer*. 2016;94:81-87. doi:10.1016/j.lungcan.2016.01.024
  18. Im H-J, Pak K, Cheon GJ, et al. Prognostic value of volumetric parameters of 18F-FDG PET in non-small-cell lung cancer: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2015;42(2):241-251. doi:10.1007/s00259-014-2903-7
  19. Humbert O, Cadour N, Paquet M, et al. 18FDG PET/CT in the early assessment of non-small cell lung cancer response to immunotherapy: frequency and clinical significance of atypical evolutive patterns. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. Published online November 23, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00259-019-04573-4
  20. Kanoun S, Tal I, Berriolo-Riedinger A, et al. Influence of Software Tool and Methodological Aspects of Total Metabolic Tumor Volume Calculation on Baseline [18F]FDG PET to Predict Survival in Hodgkin Lymphoma. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10(10):e0140830. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0140830
  21. Tal I, Kanoun S. *PET/CT Viewer*. Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Division of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging Accessed January 28, 2020. <http://petctviewer.org/>
  22. Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, et al. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nat Methods*. 2012;9(7):676-682. doi:10.1038/nmeth.2019
  23. Boellaard R, O'Doherty MJ, Weber WA, et al. FDG PET and PET/CT: EANM procedure guidelines for tumour PET imaging: version 1.0. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2009;37(1):181. doi:10.1007/s00259-009-1297-4
  24. Ito K, Schöder H, Teng R, et al. Prognostic value of baseline metabolic tumor volume measured on 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computed tomography in melanoma patients treated with ipilimumab therapy. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2019;46(4):930-939. doi:10.1007/s00259-018-4211-0
  25. Evangelista L, Cuppari L, Menis J, et al. 18F-FDG PET/CT in non-small-cell lung cancer patients: a potential predictive biomarker of response to immunotherapy. *Nuclear Medicine Communications*. 2019;40(8):802. doi:10.1097/MNM.0000000000001025

26. Joseph RW, Elassaiss-Schaap J, Kefford R, et al. Baseline Tumor Size Is an Independent Prognostic Factor for Overall Survival in Patients with Melanoma Treated with Pembrolizumab. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2018;24(20):4960-4967. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-17-2386
27. Katsurada M, Nagano T, Tachihara M, et al. Baseline Tumor Size as a Predictive and Prognostic Factor of Immune Checkpoint Inhibitor Therapy for Non-small Cell Lung Cancer. *Anticancer Res.* 2019;39(2):815-825. doi:10.21873/anticancer.13180
28. Huang AC, Postow MA, Orlowski RJ, et al. T-cell invigoration to tumour burden ratio associated with anti-PD-1 response. *Nature.* 2017;545(7652):60-65. doi:10.1038/nature22079
29. Banna GL, Passiglia F, Colonese F, et al. Immune-checkpoint inhibitors in non-small cell lung cancer: A tool to improve patients' selection. *Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology.* 2018;129:27-39. doi:10.1016/j.critrevonc.2018.06.016
30. Hashimoto K, Kaira K, Yamaguchi O, et al. Potential of FDG-PET as Prognostic Significance after anti-PD-1 Antibody against Patients with Previously Treated Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. *Journal of Clinical Medicine.* 2020;9(3):725. doi:10.3390/jcm9030725
31. Castello A, Rossi S, Mazziotti E, Toschi L, Lopci E. Hyperprogressive Disease in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Treated with Checkpoint Inhibitors: The Role of 18F-FDG PET/CT. *J Nucl Med.* 2020;61(6):821-826. doi:10.2967/jnumed.119.237768
32. Boellaard R. Standards for PET image acquisition and quantitative data analysis. *J Nucl Med.* 2009;50 Suppl 1:11S-20S. doi:10.2967/jnumed.108.057182
33. Wolchok JD, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gonzalez R, et al. Overall Survival with Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab in Advanced Melanoma. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;377(14):1345-1356. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1709684
34. Tanvetyanon T, Gray JE, Antonia SJ. PD-1 checkpoint blockade alone or combined PD-1 and CTLA-4 blockade as immunotherapy for lung cancer? *Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy.* 2017;17(3):305-312. doi:10.1080/14712598.2017.1280454
35. Paz-Ares L, Luft A, Vicente D, et al. Pembrolizumab plus Chemotherapy for Squamous Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2018;379(21):2040-2051. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1810865
36. Socinski MA, Jotte RM, Cappuzzo F, et al. Atezolizumab for First-Line Treatment of Metastatic Nonsquamous NSCLC. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2018;378(24):2288-2301. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1716948



## FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Examples of  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG PET/CT tumor segmentations for MTV measurement. Included voxels are represented in blue on Maximum Intensity Projection (MIP) images. **A.** Example of a small MTV (10.9ml), **B.** Example of a large MTV (142ml).

Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier curves for overall survival in relation to **A.**  $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$ , **B.**  $\text{SUV}_{\text{peak}}$ , **C.** MTV (metabolic tumor volume), and **D.** TLG (total lesion glycolysis) (p-values for log-rank test).

Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier curves for overall survival in relation to **A.** age, **B.** gender, **C.** presence of brain metastases **D.** PDL1 expression (when known), **E.** prior chemotherapy and **F.** prior local treatment (p-values are given for log-rank test).

Figure 4. Receiver operating characteristic curves representing the value of **A.** MTV (metabolic tumor volume), **B.** TLG (total lesion glycolysis), **C.**  $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$  and **D.**  $\text{SUV}_{\text{peak}}$  to predict early treatment discontinuation after immunotherapy.




Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 3.




Figure 4.

## SERMENT D'HIPPOCRATE

« Au moment d'être admis à exercer la Médecine , je promets et je jure d'être fidèle aux lois de l'honneur et de la probité .

Mon premier souci sera de rétablir , de préserver ou de promouvoir la santé dans tous ses éléments, physiques et mentaux , individuels et sociaux .

Je respecterai toutes les personnes , leur autonomie et leur volonté , sans aucune discrimination selon leur état ou leurs convictions . J'interviendrai pour les protéger si elles sont affaiblies , vulnérables ou menacées dans leur intégrité ou leur dignité . Même sous la contrainte , je ne ferai usage de mes connaissances contre les lois de l'humanité .

J'informerai les patients des décisions envisagées , de leurs raisons et de leurs conséquences . Je ne tromperai jamais leur confiance et n'exploiterai pas le pouvoir hérité des circonstances pour forcer les consciences .

Je donnerai mes soins à l'indigent et à quiconque me le demandera . Je ne me laisserai pas influencer par la soif du gain ou la recherche de la gloire .

Admis dans l'intimité des personnes , je tairai les secrets qui me seront confiés . Reçu à l'intérieur des maisons , je respecterai les secrets des foyers et ma conduite ne servira pas à corrompre les mœurs .

Je ferai tout pour soulager les souffrances . Je ne prolongerai pas abusivement les agonies . Je ne provoquerai jamais la mort délibérément .

Je préserverai l'indépendance nécessaire à l'accomplissement de ma mission . Je n'entreprendrai rien qui dépasse mes compétences . Je les entretiendrai et les perfectionnerai pour assurer au mieux les services qui me seront demandés .

J'apporterai mon aide à mes confrères ainsi qu'à leurs familles dans l'adversité .

Que les hommes et mes confrères m'accordent leur estime si je suis fidèle à mes promesses , que je sois déshonoré et méprisé si j'y manque.»