EJTAS
ISSN 2786-7447
EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF THEORETICAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES
OPEN ACCESS
PEER REVIEWED

Transformative Precision: Investigative Summary of PET/CT-Guided Radiation Therapy Simulation in Comprehensive Cancer Management

Nicholas A. Kerna[†]
Independent Global Medical Researchers Consortium
First InterHealth Group, Thailand

N.D. Victor Carsrud[†]
Lakeline Wellness Center, USA

Dabeluchi C. Ngwu
FMC Umuahia with King Abdullah Hospital, Bisha, Saudi Arabia
Earthwide Surgical Missions, Nigeria

Hilary M. Holets
Orange Partners Surgicenter, USA

John V. Flores
Orange Partners Surgicenter, USA

Kevin D. Pruitt
Kemet Medical Consultants, USA
PBJ Medical Associates, LLC, USA

Kyle Kadivi
Global Health Group, LLC, USA

[†] indicates co-first author

Suggested Citation
Kerna, N.A., Carsrud, N.D.V. Ngwu, D.C., Holets, H.N., Flores, J.V., Pruitt, K.D. & Kadivi, K. (2024). Transformative Precision: Investigative Summary of PET/CT-Guided Radiation Therapy Simulation in Comprehensive Cancer Management. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences, 2*(1), 623-633.
DOI: 10.59324/ejtas.2024.2(1).54

Abstract:

Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography (PET/CT)-guided radiation therapy simulation has transformed cancer treatment, ushering in enhanced precision and individualization. This discussion delves into clinical indications, applications, procedures, and limitations, providing a comprehensive overview across cancer types.

Clinical indications underscore PET/CT's role in accurate staging, target volume delineation, treatment response assessment, and post-treatment recurrence detection. Accurate staging is crucial for tailored treatment plans, while target volume delineation benefits from PET's identification of metabolic patterns. Ongoing treatment response assessment enables dynamic adjustments, and post-treatment, PET/CT aids in detecting recurrent disease.

Applications highlight PET/CT's treatment planning optimization by combining anatomical and functional information. Fusion of PET

and CT images customizes radiation plans, identifying active regions for targeted delivery while sparing healthy tissues. This fusion facilitates tailored strategies, minimizing radiation exposure and enabling dynamic adaptations.

Procedural aspects detail imaging acquisition, image fusion, target delineation, treatment planning, and ongoing monitoring. Starting with radiotracer administration, typically fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG), PET/CT captures functional and anatomical data. Image fusion aids in target delineation and optimizing plans. Ongoing monitoring allows real-time adjustments.

Specific clinical applications across cancers demonstrate PET/CT's versatility. In head and neck cancers, it ensures precise delineation while avoiding critical structures. In lung cancer, it improves tumor extent identification. Similar advantages apply to lymphomas, sarcomas, brain tumors, metastatic disease, and esophageal, gastrointestinal, breast, prostate, gynecological, and pediatric cancers.

Limitations include spatial resolution challenges, false positives, cumulative radiation exposure, lesion size, histology, and standardization issues. Ongoing research targets spatial resolution enhancement, radiomics and AI integration, novel tracers, hybrid imaging, patient-specific dosimetry, clinical trials, multimodal workflows, cost-effectiveness, accessibility, and education.

PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation is transformative. Ongoing advancements promise a more precise and individualized approach, enhancing patient outcomes in cancer management.

Keywords: *image fusion, minimizing radiation exposure, optimizing treatment planning, personalized treatment approaches, radiomics and AI, spatial resolution, target volume delineation.*

Introduction

The PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation journey represents a fascinating intersection of medical imaging, oncology, and technological innovation. From its discovery to the present, this transformative approach has reshaped the landscape of cancer treatment, enhancing precision and personalization.

Discovery of Positron Emission Tomography (PET)

The foundations of PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation trace back to the discovery of positron emission tomography (PET) in the mid-20th century. Physicist and Nobel laureate Ernest O. Lawrence and his colleagues developed the first cyclotron in 1930 at the University of California, Berkeley (Chu, 2005; Lawrence & Livingston, 1932). This innovation laid the groundwork for the production of positron-emitting isotopes.

Martin Kamen and Sam Ruben made the pivotal discovery of the positron in 1937, eventually leading to the synthesis of fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) by Michael Ter-Pogossian in the 1950s (Allison et al., n.d.; Petroni, Menichetti, & Poli, 2020; Wright, 2002). The introduction of FDG, a radiotracer that mimics glucose, enabled the visualization of metabolic activity in tissues.

Emergence of PET Imaging

The clinical application of PET imaging began to take shape in the 1970s. Physicist and biomedical engineer David E. Kuhl and his collaborator Michael E. Phelps were pivotal in advancing PET technology. They developed the first dedicated PET scanner at the University of Michigan in 1973 (Phelps, 2002; Wackers, 2018, 2019).

Around the same time, Michel Ter-Pogossian, Edward J. Hoffman, and Michael E. Phelps collaborated on developing the first commercial PET scanner, the ECAT (Emory-Carnegie-Athens) III, in the late 1970s (Hoffmann, Phelps, Mullani, Higgins, & Ter-Pogossian, 1976; Jones & Townsend, 2017; Phelps et al., 1975). This collaboration marked a significant milestone in the clinical implementation of PET imaging.

Integration of PET and CT

The fusion of PET and CT technologies marked the next evolutionary leap in medical imaging. In the early 1990s, researchers recognized the potential synergy between PET and CT, combining anatomical and functional information. One of the early pioneers in PET/CT integration was David W. Townsend, who, along with his team at the University of Pittsburgh, developed the first PET/CT scanner in 1998 (Jones & Townsend, 2017).

This integration offered a comprehensive imaging solution, providing high-resolution anatomical details from CT and functional metabolic information from PET. The synergistic combination proved invaluable in oncology, particularly in radiation therapy planning.

Notable Studies and Contributions

Landmark study by Wahl et al. (1993):

A pivotal study led by Richard L. Wahl and his team at Washington University School of Medicine demonstrated PET's potential in planning radiation therapy. The researchers used PET to define tumor volumes more accurately, paving the way for personalized treatment strategies (Wahl et al., 1993).

Advancements in fusion algorithms:

Throughout the late 1990s and early 2000s, research focused on refining the fusion algorithms that seamlessly integrated PET and CT images. This optimization aimed to enhance the accuracy of target volume delineation and treatment planning (Haribabu, Guruviah, & Yogarajah, 2023; Musafargani et al., 2018; Shan, Alessio, & Kinahan, 2010; Zaidi, Montandon, & Alavi, 2008).

Introduction of hybrid PET/CT systems:

The early 2000s saw the commercialization of hybrid PET/CT systems, combining PET and CT components in a single device. Notable contributions came from medical physicist and engineer Paul E. Kinahan, who worked on optimizing PET/CT image reconstruction algorithms (Beyer, Townsend, Czernin, & Freudenberg, 2011; Kinahan, Townsend, Beyer, & Sashin, 1998; Shan et al., 2010; Townsend, Beyer, & Blodgett, 2003).

Clinical Implementation and Validation

The adoption of PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation gained momentum in the early 2000s. Notable research institutions, including the Mayo Clinic, MD Anderson Cancer Center, and Johns Hopkins University, conducted clinical trials to validate the efficacy of PET/CT in radiation treatment planning across various cancer types (Acuff, Jackson, Subramaniam, & Osborne, 2018; Dhingra, Brandon, & Halkar, 2021; Unterrainer et al., 2020).

The landmark RTOG (Radiation Therapy Oncology Group) 0515 trial, led by Jeffrey Bradley and colleagues, investigated the impact of PET/CT on radiation treatment plans for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). The results demonstrated that PET/CT-guided treatment planning significantly reduced the target volume, highlighting the potential for more precise and personalized radiation therapy (Bradley et al., 2012).

Technological Advancements and Standardization

The years following the initial clinical implementations witnessed continuous technological advancements and efforts to standardize PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation. Standardized uptake values (SUVs) became a crucial metric for quantifying radiotracer uptake, aiding in comparing and interpreting PET/CT findings across institutions.

Research led by individuals such as Boellaard et al. (2014), Strauss et al. (2008), and Virostko et al. (2021) further refined the reliability and reproducibility of PET/CT measurements.

Current State of Research

PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation has become a standard of care in many oncology centers globally. The technology continues to evolve, with ongoing research focusing on improving spatial resolution, addressing artifacts, and integrating advanced imaging modalities, such as PET/MRI, into the treatment-planning process (Acuff et al., 2018; Beyer et al., 2011; Jones & Townsend, 2017).

Researchers like Habib Zaidi, an expert in medical imaging, are exploring artificial intelligence (AI) applications to enhance image analysis and interpretation in PET/CT (Arabi & Zaidi, 2021; Zaidi et al., 2008). AI-driven algorithms hold the potential to further streamline and automate the treatment planning workflow, contributing to increased efficiency and accuracy (Matsubara, Ibaraki, Nemoto, Watabe, & Kimura, 2022).

PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation represents a paradigm shift in cancer treatment, providing clinicians with a powerful tool to enhance precision and individualization.

Discussion

Clinical indications, applications, procedures, and limitations are fundamental in investigating, understanding, describing, and summarizing PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation.

Clinical Indications

Accurate Staging

One of the primary clinical indications for PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation is the accurate staging of various cancers. By integrating functional information from PET with anatomical details from CT, clinicians can precisely determine the extent of primary tumors, assess regional lymph node involvement, and identify distant metastases. Accurate staging is crucial for developing tailored treatment plans and optimizing therapeutic outcomes (Acuff et al., 2018).

Target Volume Delineation

PET/CT is pivotal in delineating target volumes for radiation therapy. The metabolic information PET provides helps identify regions of increased activity within tumors, allowing radiation oncologists to define treatment targets precisely. This metabolic information is crucial in cases where tumors exhibit heterogeneous metabolic patterns, enabling a more nuanced and individualized approach to radiation treatment planning (Lin et al., 2021).

Treatment Response Assessment

Ongoing assessment of treatment response is another critical clinical indication. PET/CT allows clinicians to monitor changes in metabolic activity within tumors during therapy. Early identification of treatment response or non-response enables dynamic adjustments to treatment plans, ensuring that patients receive the most effective and personalized care (Miceli et al., 2023).

Recurrence Detection

Post-treatment PET/CT serves as a valuable tool for detecting recurrent disease. The ability to identify residual or recurrent tumors early in the post-treatment phase influences subsequent interventions and alters the course of patient management (Zhang et al., 2022).

Applications

Optimizing Treatment Planning

PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation optimizes treatment planning by combining anatomical and functional information. The fusion of PET and CT images provides a comprehensive dataset that aids in customizing radiation treatment plans. Clinicians can identify metabolically active regions for targeted radiation delivery while sparing surrounding healthy tissues, thereby maximizing the therapeutic index (Unterrainer et al., 2020).

Personalized and Tailored Approaches

The ability to visualize the metabolic activity of tumors allows for personalized and tailored treatment approaches. This ability is particularly beneficial when tumors exhibit varying metabolic activity, guiding clinicians in adapting treatment strategies based on individual patient characteristics.

Minimizing Radiation Exposure to Healthy Tissues

A significant application of PET/CT in radiation therapy is minimizing radiation exposure to healthy tissues. By precisely delineating target volumes based on metabolic information, clinicians can optimize treatment plans to spare critical structures and reduce the risk of radiation-induced toxicities (Unterrainer et al., 2020).

Dynamic Adaptations During Treatment

PET/CT facilitates dynamic adaptations to treatment plans. Continuous monitoring of metabolic changes during therapy allows for real-time adjustments, ensuring that the treatment strategy remains responsive to the evolving characteristics of the tumor.

Applications of PET/CT-Guided Radiation Therapy Simulation in Specific Cancers

PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulations can be applied across a wide range of malignancies, contributing to optimizing treatment strategies and outcomes in cancer care (Table 1).

Table 1. Diverse Applications of PET/CT-Guided Radiation Therapy Simulation Across Cancer Types - Noting the Versatility of PET/CT-Guided Radiation Therapy Simulation in Optimizing Treatment Strategies

Cancer Type	Applications
Head and Neck Cancers	- Precise delineation of primary tumors and involved lymph nodes.
	- Avoid critical structures such as the spinal cord, salivary glands, and major blood vessels.
Lung Cancer	- Improved identification of tumor extent, especially in cases of multifocal disease.
	- Enhanced targeting of metabolically active regions for optimal radiation delivery.
Esophageal Cancer	- Accurate definition of the gross tumor volume and assessment of lymph node involvement.
	- Optimization of treatment plans to spare normal tissues, reducing the risk of radiation-induced toxicity.
Gastrointestinal Cancers	- Targeted radiation treatment planning for colorectal cancers, ensuring coverage of involved regions.
	- Evaluation of treatment response and adaptation in pancreatic cancer.
Breast Cancer	- Assessment of regional nodal involvement and identification of distant metastases.
	- Improved delineation of tumor bed for post-surgical radiation therapy.
Prostate Cancer	- Localization of primary tumors and assessment of lymph node involvement.
	- Tailored treatment planning to minimize radiation exposure to adjacent organs.
Gynecological Cancers	- Precise delineation of tumor volumes in cervical and endometrial cancers.
	- Adaptation of treatment plans based on metabolic response during therapy.
Lymphoma	- Accurate staging and identification of involved lymph nodes.
	- Assessment of treatment response and detection of residual disease.
Brain Tumors	- Localization and delineation of brain tumors with improved accuracy.
	- Planning radiation therapy to avoid critical structures in the brain.
Sarcomas	- Targeted radiation treatment planning for soft tissue and bone sarcomas.
	- Assessment of treatment response and detection of recurrence.
Metastatic Disease	- Identification of metastatic lesions for comprehensive treatment planning.
	- Monitoring response to systemic therapies and adapting radiation plans accordingly.
Pediatric Cancers	- Minimization of radiation exposure to developing organs in pediatric patients.
	- Improved localization and targeting of tumors in children.

Procedures

Imaging Acquisition

The procedure begins with administering radiotracers to the patient. The most widely used radiotracer is fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG)—also referred to as 18F-FDG, 18F, and [18F]FDG. FDG is a glucose analog that accumulates in metabolically active cells. Subsequently, the patient undergoes PET/CT imaging, capturing functional and anatomical information.

Image Fusion

Image fusion is a critical step in the process, where PET and CT images are integrated to create a fused dataset. This fusion provides a comprehensive understanding of both the metabolic activity within the tumor and the anatomical details of the surrounding tissues (Xiao et al., 2022).

Target Volume Delineation

Radiation oncologists use the fused images to delineate target volumes. The metabolic information from PET assists in precisely defining the areas of interest, guiding the radiation therapy planning process. Critical structures are also identified to minimize radiation exposure to healthy tissues (Lin et al., 2021).

Treatment Planning

PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation informs the development of personalized treatment plans. Optimization involves tailoring radiation delivery to maximize tumor control while minimizing the radiation dose to adjacent normal tissues. This step ensures that the therapeutic benefits are maximized while minimizing treatment-related side effects (Acuff et al., 2018).

Ongoing Monitoring

Continuous monitoring is a key procedural aspect of PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation. PET/CT allows for the dynamic assessment of treatment response throughout treatment. This ongoing evaluation enables clinicians to adapt treatment plans based on changes in metabolic activity within the tumor, ensuring a responsive and personalized approach (Herrmann, Krause, Bundschuh, Dechow, & Schwaiger, 2009).

PET/CT-Guided Radiation Therapy Simulation Limitations

Spatial Resolution

One of the primary limitations of PET/CT is its spatial resolution. PET imaging may encounter challenges in precisely delineating small structures or lesions. This limitation is particularly relevant when high spatial accuracy is crucial for treatment planning (Unterrainer et al., 2020).

False Positives

False positives can occur in PET imaging due to non-specific uptake of radiotracers. Inflammation, infection, or other benign conditions may increase metabolic activity, potentially resulting in false-positive findings. Differentiating between malignant and benign lesions can be challenging in certain cases (Roedl et al., 2008).

Radiation Exposure

Ionizing radiation in both PET and CT components contributes to cumulative radiation exposure. While the doses are generally considered safe, the potential for increased radiation risk should be carefully weighed, especially in cases requiring repeated imaging studies (Beyer et al., 2011).

Lesion Size and Histology

The accuracy of PET imaging can be influenced by lesion size and histology. Small lesions or lesions with low metabolic activity may present challenges in accurate detection and delineation. Additionally, specific histological subtypes may not exhibit significant metabolic changes, impacting PET's sensitivity in detecting certain tumor types (Unterrainer et al., 2020).

Standardization Challenges

Standardizing techniques and establishing universally accepted criteria, such as standardized uptake values (SUVs), can be challenging. Variability in SUV thresholds across different institutions may impact the consistency and comparability of PET/CT findings.

Current Research and Future Directions

The field of PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation is dynamic, with research focusing on overcoming limitations and expanding applications. Future developments are expected to enhance and integrate the technology's capabilities into routine clinical practice. The immediate research and prospective directions span a diverse spectrum of issues, noted as follows.

Advancements in Spatial Resolution

Improving spatial resolution is an imperative area of research to address challenges in accurately delineating small structures or lesions. Technological advancements, such as the development of high-resolution PET scanners and advanced reconstruction algorithms, aim to enhance spatial resolution and improve the precision of PET imaging.

Radiomics and Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Integrating radiomics and AI holds promise in refining PET/CT data interpretation. Radiomics involves extracting quantitative features from medical images, providing a more comprehensive characterization of tumors. AI algorithms can analyze large datasets, identify subtle patterns, and contribute to more accurate diagnosis, staging, and treatment planning (Hu et al., 2023).

Functional Imaging Beyond FDG

While FDG is the most commonly used radiotracer in PET imaging, research is exploring the potential of other tracers to address specific challenges. Tracers with affinities for certain molecular targets or specific biological processes can provide additional functional information. This approach aims to tailor the choice of radiotracer to the unique characteristics of different cancers (Ahmad, Majzoub, Hajeer, & Abbas, 2023; Moerlein, Schwarz, & Dehdashti, 2020).

Advanced Hybrid Imaging Technologies

The development of advanced hybrid imaging technologies beyond PET/CT is also under investigation. PET/MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) combines the strengths of both modalities, providing multi-parametric information for more accurate tumor characterization. This approach may be valuable in certain cancer types or situations where MRI offers specific advantages over CT (Aide et al., 2021; Beyer et al., 2011).

Patient-Specific Dosimetry

Advances in patient-specific dosimetry are contributing to personalized treatment planning. Dosimetry involves the measurement of radiation doses received by different tissues and organs. Implementing patient-specific dosimetry in PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation ensures a more accurate estimation of the absorbed radiation doses, optimizing the therapeutic balance between tumor control and minimizing normal tissue toxicity (Fahey, 2009; Quinn, Dauer, Pandit-Taskar, Schöder, & Dauer, 2016).

Clinical Trials and Evidence-Based Practice

Ongoing clinical trials are crucial for establishing evidence-based guidelines and validating the clinical efficacy of PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation across various cancer types. These trials contribute to the refinement of protocols, the identification of optimal imaging parameters, and the establishment of standardized criteria for interpretation (Ménard et al., 2022; Unterrainer et al., 2020).

Enhanced Integration into Multimodal Workflows

The seamless integration of PET/CT into multimodal workflows is a crucial direction for future developments. Combining PET/CT with other imaging modalities, such as ultrasound or functional MRI, may provide a more comprehensive understanding of tumor biology and enhance treatment planning accuracy. The synergy between different imaging modalities contributes to a holistic approach to cancer management (Kao & Yang, 2022; Liu et al., 2015).

Cost-Effectiveness and Accessibility

Addressing cost-effectiveness and improving accessibility are essential considerations. As the technology evolves, efforts are directed toward optimizing resource utilization, streamlining workflows, and making PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation more accessible to a broader patient population (Dhingra et al., 2021; Ménard et al., 2022).

Education and Standardization

Continued education and standardization efforts are crucial to ensure consistent and high-quality PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation implementation across diverse clinical settings. Establishing standardized protocols, training programs, and quality assurance measures contributes to the uniformity of practice and facilitates collaborative research initiatives

(Acuff et al., 2018; Buckler, Bresolin, Dunnick, & Sullivan, 2011).

Conclusion

PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation has established itself as a transformative approach in the comprehensive management of cancer. Its clinical indications, applications, procedures, and limitations highlight its significance in accurate staging, personalized treatment planning, and ongoing monitoring. Despite current limitations, ongoing research and technological advancements are driving the evolution of this technology, expanding its capabilities and refining its role in cancer care.

The future of PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation holds exciting prospects, with advancements in spatial resolution, the integration of radiomics and AI, the exploration of novel radiotracers, and the development of advanced hybrid imaging technologies. These developments are expected to contribute to a more precise and individualized approach to cancer treatment.

As the field progresses, collaboration among clinicians, researchers, and industry stakeholders will play a pivotal role in realizing the full potential of PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation. The ultimate goal is to enhance patient outcomes by tailoring treatments based on a comprehensive understanding of tumor biology and response to therapy.

PET/CT-guided radiation therapy simulation represents a beacon of progress in oncology, offering a dynamic and evolving tool that continues to shape the landscape of cancer diagnosis and treatment.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that this paper was written without any commercial or financial relationship that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

Acuff, S., Jackson, A., Subramaniam, R. M., & Osborne, D. (2018). Practical considerations for integrating PET/CT into radiation therapy planning. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine Technology*, *46*(4), 343–348. https://doi.org/10.2967/jnmt.118.209452

Ahmad, H. H., Majzoub, R. E., Hajeer, S., & Abbas, L. (2023). Arterial spin labeling (ASL-MRI) versus fluorodeoxyglucose-PET (FDG-PET) in diagnosing dementia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Neurology*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-023-03432-y

Aide, N., Lasnon, C., Kesner, A., Levin, C. S., Buvat, I., Iagaru, A., . . . McGowan, D. R. (2021). New PET technologies – embracing progress and pushing the limits. *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging*, *48*(9), 2711–2726. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-021-05390-4

Allison, W., Arnold, J., & Doolittle, R. F. (n.d.). Martin David Kamen. Retrieved from https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/inmemoriam/html/MartinDavidKamen.html

Arabi, H., & Zaidi, H. (2021). Deep learning–based metal artefact reduction in PET/CT imaging. *European Radiology*, *31*(8), 6384–6396. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-021-07709-z

Beyer, T., Townsend, D. W., Czernin, J., & Freudenberg, L. S. (2011). The future of hybrid imaging—part 2: PET/CT. *Insights Into Imaging*, *2*(3), 225–234. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13244-011-0069-4

Boellaard, R., Delgado-Bolton, R., Oyen, W. J., Giammarile, F., Tatsch, K., Eschner, W., . . . Krause, B. J. (2014). FDG PET/CT: EANM procedure guidelines for tumour imaging: Version 2.0. *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging*, *42*(2), 328–354. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-014-2961-x

Bradley, J. D., Bae, K., Choi, N. C., Forster, K., Siegel, B. A., Brunetti, J., . . . Choy, H. (2012). A phase II comparative study of gross tumor volume definition with or without PET/CT fusion in dosimetric planning for Non–Small-Cell lung cancer (NSCLC): Primary analysis of radiation therapy oncology group (RTOG) 0515.

International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics, *82*(1), 435-441.e1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2010.09.033

Buckler, A. J., Bresolin, L. B., Dunnick, N. R., & Sullivan, D. C. (2011). A collaborative enterprise for Multi-Stakeholder participation in the advancement of quantitative imaging. *Radiology*, *258*(3), 906–914. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.10100799

Chu, W. T. (2005). Ernest Orlando Lawrence (1901-1958), cyclotron and medicine. *Zeitschrift Für Medizinische Physik*, *16*(2).

Dhingra, J., Brandon, D., & Halkar, R. (2021). 4D PET/CT integration: Optimizing radiation and therapy. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, *62*(supplement 1), 1706.

Fahey, F. H. (2009). Dosimetry of pediatric PET/CT. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, *50*(9), 1483–1491. https://doi.org/10.2967/jnumed.108.054130

Haribabu, M., Guruviah, V., & Yogarajah, P. (2023). Recent advancements in multimodal medical image fusion techniques for better diagnosis: An overview. *Current Medical Imaging Reviews*, *19*(7), 673–694. https://doi.org/10.2174/1573405618666220606161137

Herrmann, K., Krause, B. J., Bundschuh, R. A., Dechow, T., & Schwaiger, M. (2009). Monitoring response to therapeutic interventions in patients with cancer. *Seminars in Nuclear Medicine*, *39*(3), 210–232. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2008.12.001

Hoffmann, E. J., Phelps, M., Mullani, N. A., Higgins, C. S., & Ter-Pogossian, M. M. (1976). Design and performance characteristics of a whole-body positron transaxial tomograph. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, *17*(6), 493–502.

Hu, Q., Li, K., Yang, C., Wang, Y., Huang, R. S., Gu, M., . . . Chen, L. (2023). The role of artificial intelligence based on PET/CT radiomics in NSCLC: Disease management, opportunities, and challenges. *Frontiers in Oncology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2023.1133164

Jones, T., & Townsend, D. W. (2017). History and future technical innovation in positron emission tomography. *Journal of Medical Imaging*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.1117/1.jmi.4.1.011013

Kao, Y., & Yang, J. (2022). Deep learning-based auto-segmentation of lung tumor PET/CT scans: A systematic review. *Clinical and Translational Imaging*, *10*(2), 217–223. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40336-022-00482-z

Kinahan, P. E., Townsend, D. W., Beyer, T., & Sashin, D. (1998). Attenuation correction for a combined 3D PET/CT scanner. *Medical Physics*, *25*(10), 2046–2053. https://doi.org/10.1118/1.598392

Lawrence, E. O., & Livingston, M. S. (1932). The production of high speed light ions without the use of high voltages. *The Physical Review*, *40*(1), 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrev.40.19

Lin, H., Xiao, H., Dong, L., Teo, K., Zou, W., Cai, J., & Li, T. (2021). Deep learning for automatic target volume segmentation in radiation therapy: A review. *Quantitative Imaging in Medicine and Surgery*, *11*(12), 4847–4858. https://doi.org/10.21037/qims-21-168

Liu, S., Cai, W., Zhang, F., Fulham, M., Feng, D., Pujol, S., & Kikinis, R. (2015). Multimodal neuroimaging computing: The workflows, methods, and platforms. *Brain Informatics*, *2*(3), 181–195. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40708-015-0020-4

Matsubara, K., Ibaraki, M., Nemoto, M., Watabe, H., & Kimura, Y. (2022). A review on AI in PET imaging. *Annals of Nuclear Medicine*, *36*(2), 133–143. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12149-021-01710-8

Ménard, C., Young, S., Zukotynski, K., Hamilton, R. J., Bénard, F., Yip, S., . . . Bauman, G. (2022). PSMA PET/CT guided intensification of therapy in patients at risk of advanced prostate cancer (PATRON): A pragmatic phase III randomized controlled trial. *BMC Cancer*, *22*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-022-09283-z

Miceli, A., Jonghi-Lavarini, L., Santo, G., Cassarino, G., Linguanti, F., Gazzilli, M., . . . Nappi, A. (2023). [18F]FDG PET/CT criteria for treatment response assessment: EORTC and beyond. *Clinical and Translational Imaging*, *11*(5), 421–437. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40336-023-00578-0

Moerlein, S. M., Schwarz, S. W., & Dehdashti, F. (2020). Beyond FDG: Novel radiotracers for PET imaging of melanoma and sarcoma. In A. H. Khandani (Ed.), *PET/CT and PET/MR in Melanoma and Sarcoma* (pp. 201–231). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60429-5_10

Musafargani, S., Ghosh, K., Mishra, S., Mahalakshmi, P., Parameswaran, P., & Gulyás, B. (2018). PET/MRI: A frontier in era of complementary hybrid imaging. *European Journal of Hybrid Imaging*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41824-018-0030-6

Petroni, D., Menichetti, L., & Poli, M. (2020). Historical and radiopharmaceutical relevance of [18F]FDG. *Journal of Radioanalytical and Nuclear Chemistry*, *323*(3), 1017–1031. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10967-020-07013-y

Phelps, M. E. (2002). History of PET. In D. Delbeke, W. H. Martin, J. A. Patton, & M. P. Sandler (Eds.), *Practical FDG imaging: A teaching file* (pp. 1–17). New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-22453-4_1

Phelps, M. E., Hoffman, E. J., Mullani, N. A., & Ter-Pogossian, M. M. (1975). Application of annihilation coincidence detection to transaxial reconstruction tomography. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, *16*(3), 210–224.

Quinn, B., Dauer, Z., Pandit-Taskar, N., Schöder, H., & Dauer, L. T. (2016). Radiation dosimetry of 18F-FDG PET/CT: Incorporating exam-specific parameters in dose estimates. *BMC Medical Imaging*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12880-016-0143-y

Roedl, J. B., Colen, R. R., King, K. R., Fischman, A. J., Müeller, P. R., & Blake, M. A. (2008). Visual PET/CT scoring for nonspecific 18F-FDG uptake in the differentiation of early malignant and benign esophageal lesions. *American Journal of Roentgenology*, *191*(2), 515–521. https://doi.org/10.2214/ajr.07.3320

Shan, T., Alessio, A. M., & Kinahan, P. E. (2010). Image reconstruction for PET/CT scanners: Past achievements and future challenges. *Imaging in Medicine*, *2*(5), 529–545. https://doi.org/10.2217/iim.10.49

Strauss, H. W., Miller, D. D., Wittry, M. D., Cerqueira, M. D., Garcia, E., Iskandrian, A. S., . . . Macháč, J. (2008). Procedure guideline for myocardial perfusion imaging 3.3. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine Technology*, *36*(3), 155–161. https://doi.org/10.2967/jnmt.108.056465

Townsend, D. W., Beyer, T., & Blodgett, T. M. (2003). PET/CT scanners: A hardware approach to image fusion. *Seminars in Nuclear Medicine*, *33*(3), 193–204. https://doi.org/10.1053/snuc.2003.127314

Unterrainer, M., Eze, C., Ilhan, H., Marschner, S., Roengvoraphoj, O., Schmidt-Hegemann, N., . . . Belka, C. (2020). Recent advances of PET imaging in clinical radiation oncology. *Radiation Oncology*, *15*(1), 88. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-020-01519-1

Virostko, J., Craddock, R. C., Williams, J. M., Triolo, T. M., Hilmes, M. A., Kang, H., . . . Powers, A. C. (2021). Development of a standardized MRI protocol for pancreas assessment in humans. *PLOS One*, *16*(8). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256029

Wackers, F. J. T. (2018). David E. Kuhl (1929–2017). *Journal of Nuclear Cardiology*, *26*(4), 1062–1063. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12350-018-1427-0

Wackers, F. J. T. (2019). Michael E. Phelps, PhD (born August 24, 1939). *Journal of Nuclear Cardiology*, *26*(1), 34–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12350-018-01492-z

Wahl, R. L., Quint, L. E., Cieslak, R. D., Aisen, A. M., Koeppe, R. A., & Meyer, C. R. (1993). "Anatometabolic" tumor imaging: Fusion of FDG PET with CT or MRI to localize foci of increased activity. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, *34*(7), 1190–1197.

Wright, P. (2002, September 9). Martin Kamen. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com

Xiao, N., Yang, W., Qiang, Y., Zhao, J., Hao, R., Lian, J., & Li, S. (2022). PET and CT image fusion of lung cancer with siamese pyramid fusion network. *Frontiers in Medicine*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2022.792390

Zaidi, H., Montandon, M., & Alavi, A. (2008). The clinical role of fusion imaging using PET, CT, and MR imaging. *Pet Clinics*, *3*(3), 275–291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpet.2009.03.002

Zhang, Q., Wang, K., Zhou, Z., Qin, G., Wang, L., Li, P., . . . Wang, J. (2022). Predicting local persistence/recurrence after radiation therapy for head and neck cancer from PET/CT using a multi-objective, multi-classifier radiomics model. *Frontiers in Oncology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2022.955712