

**Sources of error with cardiovascular PET/CT and PET/MRI and questions to be answered to achieve clinical usefulness**

Høilund-Carlsen, Poul F.; Gerke, Oke

*Published in:*  
Journal of Nuclear Cardiology

*DOI:*  
10.1007/s12350-021-02750-3

*Publication date:*  
2021

*Document version:*  
Accepted manuscript

*Citation for pulished version (APA):*  
Høilund-Carlsen, P. F., & Gerke, O. (2021). Sources of error with cardiovascular PET/CT and PET/MRI and questions to be answered to achieve clinical usefulness. *Journal of Nuclear Cardiology*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12350-021-02750-3>

Go to publication entry in University of Southern Denmark's Research Portal

**Terms of use**

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark.  
Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving.  
If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim.  
Please direct all enquiries to [puresupport@bib.sdu.dk](mailto:puresupport@bib.sdu.dk)

**LETTER TO THE EDITOR**

---

**Sources of error with cardiovascular PET/CT and PET/MRI and questions to be answered to achieve clinical usefulness****To the Editor,**

Recent articles in Journal of Nuclear Cardiology make a commendable attempt to shed light on some of the variation associated with  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FDG PET/MRI and  $^{18}\text{F}$ -sodium fluoride PET/CT to elucidate inflammation in the aorta and carotid arteries and coronary microcalcification activity, respectively.<sup>1,2</sup> They leave the impression that variations are small and measurements possess a good certainty. However, this is not necessarily the case.

We agree that Bland-Altman analysis and inherent repeatability coefficients assess agreement in absolute terms, but Limits of Agreement (LoAs) are (as is the bias) only estimates, and respective 95% confidence intervals reflect upon these estimates' uncertainty. Conservatively speaking, it is the lower confidence limit of the lower LoA and the upper confidence limit of the upper LoA (i.e., the outer confidence limits) that deserve interpretation, not only the LoAs as such. Repeated measurements analysis was earlier provided by Olofsen and colleagues,<sup>3</sup> including a respective online tool ([https://sec.lumc.nl/method\\_agreement\\_analysis](https://sec.lumc.nl/method_agreement_analysis)). Intraclass correlation coefficients provide very limited information as these will by definition always be large as long as there is substantial inter-patient variation. Finally, variance component analysis, based on mixed effects

1  
2  
3  
4 modelling, offers an opportunity to assess repeatability coefficients for the reassessment of (a) the  
5 same scan by the same rater, (b) the same scan by a different rater, and (c) a rescan by any rater.<sup>4</sup>  
6  
7

8  
9 We acknowledge reporting limitations of single-center, single PET/MRI or PET/CT system  
10 studies.<sup>1,2</sup> However, additional sources of discrepancy include type and make of scanner, tracer  
11 dose, time from tracer administration to acquisition, motion correction procedures, among others.<sup>5</sup>  
12 All sources must be considered to estimate the certainty of single and repeated measurement in the  
13 individual patient. While studies focusing on a few sources of error are highly appreciated, they  
14 may create a false impression of measurement certainty that is actually lower than the data seem to  
15 suggest.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 **Disclosure** Poul F. Høilund-Carlsen and Oke Gerke have nothing to disclose.  
31

32 Poul F. Høilund-Carlsen, MD, DMSc, Prof. (Hon.) and Oke Gerke, MSc, PhD, Prof., Department of  
33 Nuclear Medicine, Odense University Hospital and Department of Clinical Research, University of  
34 Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark.  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 [pfhc@rsyd.dk](mailto:pfhc@rsyd.dk); [oke.gerke@rsyd.dk](mailto:oke.gerke@rsyd.dk)  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **References**

- 48  
49 1. Robson PM, Kaufman A, Pruzan A, et al. Scan-rescan measurement repeatability of (18)F-FDG  
50 PET/MR imaging of vascular inflammation. J Nucl Cardiol. 2021 May 27.  
51  
52 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12350-021-02627-5>  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 2. Tzolos E, Kwiecinski J, Lassen ML, et al. Observer repeatability and interscan reproducibility of  
5  
6 18F-sodium fluoride coronary microcalcification activity. *J Nucl Cardiol*. 2020 Jun  
7  
8 11:10.1007/s12350-020-02221-1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12350-020-02221-1>  
9  
10
- 11 3. Olofsen E, Dahan A, Borsboom G, Drummond G. Improvements in the application and reporting  
12  
13 of advanced Bland-Altman methods of comparison. *J Clin Monit Comput*. 2015;29(1):127-39.  
14  
15 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10877-014-9577-3>.  
16  
17
- 18 4. Gerke O, Vilstrup MH, Segtnan EA, Halekoh U, Høilund-Carlsen PF. How to assess intra- and  
19  
20 inter-observer agreement with quantitative PET using variance component analysis: a proposal  
21  
22 for standardisation. *BMC Med Imaging*. 2016;16(1):54. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12880-016-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12880-016-0159-3)  
23  
24 0159-3.  
25  
26
- 27 5. Boellaard R, Delgado-Bolton R, Oyen WJ, et al. European Association of Nuclear Medicine  
28  
29 (EANM). FDG PET/CT: EANM procedure guidelines for tumour imaging: version 2.0. *Eur J*  
30  
31 *Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2015;42(2):328-54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-014-2961-x>.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60