



# European Commission Initiative on Breast Cancer (ECIBC): European guidelines on breast cancer screening and diagnosis Evidence profile

<b>Healthcare question</b>	Should 18F-FDG PET-CT staging exams vs. no PET staging exams be used for patients with clinical stage I breast cancer without symptoms suggestive of metastases?
<b>Date</b>	March 2017
<b>Authors</b>	ECIBC Guidelines Development Group (GDG): Mariangela Autelitano, Bettina Borisch, Mireille Broeders, Xavier Castells, Edoardo Colzani, Jan Daneš, Stephen Duffy, Patricia Fitzpatrick, Markus Follmann, Livia Giordano, Paolo Giorgi Rossi, Axel Gräwingholt, Solveig Hofvind, Lydia Ioannidou-Mouzaka, Susan Knox, Miranda Langendam, Annette Lebeau, Helen McGarrigle, Lennarth Nyström, Elsa Pérez Gómez, Cecily Quinn, Peter Rabe, Holger Schünemann, Alberto Torresin, Ruben Van Engen, Cary Van Landsveld-Verhoeven, Sue Warman, Kenneth Young. Systematic Review team: Carlos Canelo-Aybar, David Rigau, Margarita Posso, Ivan Solá, Pablo Alonso Coello. JRC Healthcare Quality team: Asli Uluturk
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>CI:</b> Confidence interval

Certainty assessment							Nº of patients		Effect		Certainty	Importance
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	18F-FDG PET-CT staging exams	no PET staging exams	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Detection rate												
6 1,2,3,4,5,6	randomised trials	serious <sup>ab</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c,d</sup>	none	Pooled detection rate: 16 per 1000 examinations (95% CI: 0 - 59); n/N = 3/80				⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
False positive												
3 <sup>1,3,5</sup>	randomised trials	serious <sup>ab</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>c,d</sup>	none	Pooled detection rate: 0.0 per 1000 examinations (95% CI: 0 - 36); n/N = 0/51				⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL

## Explanations

- a. Different reference standards were used across studies some included another imaging test without histological confirmation, which is likely to incorrectly classify the condition. Additional follow up were not implemented in all cases.
- b. Some studies collected its data from medical registries on retrospective designs, which preclude them from implementing standard procedures and quality of data.
- c. Judgement of imprecision depends on the panel decision about the detection rate threshold, which leads to change decision.
- d. Overall, included studies had small sample sizes, therefore confidence interval are widen.

## References

1. Ulaner, G. A., Castillo, R., Goldman, D. A., Wills, J., Riedl, C. C., Pinker-Domenig, K., Jochelson, M. S., Gonen, M.. (18)F-FDG-PET/CT for systemic staging of newly diagnosed triple-negative breast cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging; Oct 2016.
2. Sen F, Akpınar AT, Ogur U, Duman G, Tamgac F, Alper E.. The impact of PET/CT imaging performed in the early postoperative period on the management of breast cancer patients. Nucl Med Commun; 2013.
3. Riedl CC, Slobod E, Jochelson M, Morrow M, Goldman DA, Gonen M, Weber WA, Ulaner GA.. Retrospective analysis of 18F-FDG PET/CT for staging asymptomatic breast cancer patients younger than 40 years. J Nucl Med; 2014.
4. Lebon, V., Alberini, J. L., Pierga, J. Y., Dieras, V., Jehanno, N., Wartski, M. Rate of Distant Metastases on 18F-FDG PET/CT at Initial Staging of Breast Cancer: Comparison of Women Younger and Older Than 40 Years. J Nucl Med; Feb 2017.
5. Hogan MP, Goldman DA, Dashevsky B, Riedl CC, Gonen M, Osborne JR, Jochelson M, Hudis C, Morrow M, Ulaner GA.. Comparison of 18F-FDG PET/CT for Systemic Staging of Newly Diagnosed Invasive Lobular Carcinoma Versus Invasive Ductal Carcinoma. J Nucl Med; 2015.
6. Ulaner, G. A., Castillo, R., Goldman, D. A. 18F-FDG-PET/CT for systemic staging of patients with newly diagnosed ER-positive and HER2-positive breast cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol; 2017.