# New response evaluation criteria in solid tumours: Revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1)

E.A. Eisenhauer[a,*], P. Therasse[b], J. Bogaerts[c], L.H. Schwartz[d], D. Sargent[e], R. Ford[f], J. Dancey[g], S. Arbuck[h], S. Gwyther[i], M. Mooney[g], L. Rubinstein[g], L. Shankar[g], L. Dodd[g], R. Kaplan[j], D. Lacombe[c], J. Verweij[k]

[a]National Cancer Institute of Canada – Clinical Trials Group, 10 Stuart Street, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada
[b]GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals, Rixensart, Belgium
[c]European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer, Data Centre, Brussels, Belgium
[d]Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA
[e]Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA
[f]RadPharm, Princeton, NJ, USA
[g]Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD, USA
[h]Schering-Plough, Kenilworth, NJ, USA
[i]East Surrey Hospital, Redhill, Surrey, UK
[j]National Cancer Research Network, Leeds, UK
[k]Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

## ARTICLE INFO

## ABSTRACT

Background: Assessment of the change in tumour burden is an important feature of the clinical evaluation of cancer therapeutics: both tumour shrinkage (objective response) and disease progression are useful endpoints in clinical trials. Since RECIST was published in 2000, many investigators, cooperative groups, industry and government authorities have adopted these criteria in the assessment of treatment outcomes. However, a number of questions and issues have arisen which have led to the development of a revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1). Evidence for changes, summarised in separate papers in this special issue, has come from assessment of a large data warehouse (>6500 patients), simulation studies and literature reviews.

Highlights of revised RECIST 1.1: Major changes include: Number of lesions to be assessed: based on evidence from numerous trial databases merged into a data warehouse for analysis purposes, the number of lesions required to assess tumour burden for response determination has been reduced from a maximum of 10 to a maximum of five total (and from five to two per organ, maximum). Assessment of pathological lymph nodes is now incorporated: nodes with a short axis of ⩾15 mm are considered measurable and assessable as target lesions. The short axis measurement should be included in the sum of lesions in calculation of tumour response. Nodes that shrink to <10 mm short axis are considered normal. Confirmation of response is required for trials with response primary endpoint but is no longer required in randomised studies since the control arm serves as appropriate means of interpretation of data. Disease progression is clarified in several aspects: in addition to the previous definition of progression in target disease of 20% increase in sum, a 5 mm absolute increase is now required as well to guard against over calling PD when the total sum is very

* Corresponding author: Tel.: +1 613 533 6430; fax: +1 613 533 2411.
  E-mail address: eeisenhauer@ctg.queensu.ca (E.A. Eisenhauer).

small. Furthermore, there is guidance offered on what constitutes 'unequivocal progression' of non-measurable/non-target disease, a source of confusion in the original RECIST guideline. Finally, a section on detection of new lesions, including the interpretation of FDG-PET scan assessment is included. *Imaging guidance*: the revised RECIST includes a new imaging appendix with updated recommendations on the optimal anatomical assessment of lesions.

*Future work:* A key question considered by the RECIST Working Group in developing RECIST 1.1 was whether it was appropriate to move from anatomic unidimensional assessment of tumour burden to either volumetric anatomical assessment or to functional assessment with PET or MRI. It was concluded that, at present, there is not sufficient standardisation or evidence to abandon anatomical assessment of tumour burden. The only exception to this is in the use of FDG-PET imaging as an adjunct to determination of progression. As is detailed in the final paper in this special issue, the use of these promising newer approaches requires appropriate clinical validation studies.

## 1. Background

### 1.1. History of RECIST criteria

Assessment of the change in tumour burden is an important feature of the clinical evaluation of cancer therapeutics. Both tumour shrinkage (objective response) and time to the development of disease progression are important endpoints in cancer clinical trials. The use of tumour regression as the endpoint for phase II trials screening new agents for evidence of anti-tumour effect is supported by years of evidence suggesting that, for many solid tumours, agents which produce tumour shrinkage in a proportion of patients have a reasonable (albeit imperfect) chance of subsequently demonstrating an improvement in overall survival or other time to event measures in randomised phase III studies (reviewed in [1–4]). At the current time objective response carries with it a body of evidence greater than for any other biomarker supporting its utility as a measure of promising treatment effect in phase II screening trials. Furthermore, at both the phase II and phase III stage of drug development, clinical trials in advanced disease settings are increasingly utilising time to progression (or progression-free survival) as an endpoint upon which efficacy conclusions are drawn, which is also based on anatomical measurement of tumour size.

However, both of these tumour endpoints, objective response and time to disease progression, are useful only if based on widely accepted and readily applied standard criteria based on anatomical tumour burden. In 1981 the World Health Organisation (WHO) first published tumour response criteria, mainly for use in trials where tumour response was the primary endpoint. The WHO criteria introduced the concept of an overall assessment of tumour burden by summing the products of bidimensional lesion measurements and determined response to therapy by evaluation of change from baseline while on treatment.[5] However, in the decades that followed their publication, cooperative groups and pharmaceutical companies that used the WHO criteria often 'modified' them to accommodate new technologies or to address areas that were unclear in the original document. This led to confusion in interpretation of trial results[6] and in fact, the application of varying response criteria was shown to lead to very different conclusions about the efficacy of the same regimen.[7] In response to these problems, an International Working Party was formed in the mid 1990s to standardise and simplify response criteria. New criteria, known as RECIST (Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumours), were published in 2000.[8] Key features of the original RECIST include definitions of minimum size of measurable lesions, instructions on how many lesions to follow (up to 10; a maximum five per organ site), and the use of unidimensional, rather than bidimensional, measures for overall evaluation of tumour burden. These criteria have subsequently been widely adopted by academic institutions, cooperative groups, and industry for trials where the primary endpoints are objective response or progression. In addition, regulatory authorities accept RECIST as an appropriate guideline for these assessments.

### 1.2. Why update RECIST?

Since RECIST was published in 2000, many investigators have confirmed in prospective analyses the validity of substituting unidimensional for bidimensional (and even three-dimensional)-based criteria (reviewed in [9]). With rare exceptions (e.g. mesothelioma), the use of unidimensional criteria seems to perform well in solid tumour phase II studies.

However, a number of questions and issues have arisen which merit answers and further clarity. Amongst these are whether fewer than 10 lesions can be assessed without affecting the overall assigned response for patients (or the conclusion about activity in trials); how to apply RECIST in randomised phase III trials where progression, not response, is the primary endpoint particularly if not all patients have measurable disease; whether or how to utilise newer imaging technologies such as FDG-PET and MRI; how to handle assessment of lymph nodes; whether response confirmation is truly needed; and, not least, the applicability of RECIST in trials of targeted non-cytotoxic drugs. This revision of the RECIST guidelines includes updates that touch on all these points.

## 1.3.    Process of RECIST 1.1 development

The RECIST Working Group, consisting of clinicians with expertise in early drug development from academic research organisations, government and industry, together with imaging specialists and statisticians, has met regularly to set the agenda for an update to RECIST, determine the evidence needed to justify the various changes made, and to review emerging evidence. A critical aspect of the revision process was to create a database of prospectively documented solid tumour measurement data obtained from industry and academic group trials. This database, assembled at the EORTC Data Centre under the leadership of Jan Bogaerts and Patrick Therasse (co-authors of this guideline), consists of >6500 patients with >18,000 target lesions and was utilised to investigate the impact of a variety of questions (e.g. number of target lesions required, the need for response confirmation, and lymph node measurement rules) on response and progression-free survival outcomes. The results of this work, which after evaluation by the RECIST Working Group led to most of the changes in this revised guideline, are reported in detail in a separate paper in this special issue.[10] Larry Schwartz and Robert Ford (also co-authors of this guideline) also provided key databases from which inferences have been made that inform these revisions.[11]

The publication of this revised guideline is believed to be timely since it incorporates changes to simplify, optimise and standardise the assessment of tumour burden in clinical trials. A summary of key changes is found in Appendix I. Because the fundamental approach to assessment remains grounded in the anatomical, rather than functional, assessment of disease, we have elected to name this version RECIST 1.1, rather than 2.0.

## 1.4.    What about volumetric or functional assessment?

This raises the question, frequently posed, about whether it is 'time' to move from anatomic unidimensional assessment of tumour burden to either volumetric anatomical assessment *or* to functional assessment (e.g. dynamic contrast enhanced MRI or CT or (18)F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomographic (FDG-PET) techniques assessing tumour metabolism). As can be seen, the Working Group and particularly those involved in imaging research, did not believe that there is at present sufficient standardisation and widespread availability to recommend adoption of these alternative assessment methods. The only exception to this is in the use of FDG-PET imaging as an adjunct to determination of progression, as described later in this guideline. As detailed in paper in this special issue[12], we believe that the use of these promising newer approaches (which could either *add to* or *substitute for* anatomical assessment as described in RECIST) requires appropriate and rigorous clinical validation studies. This paper by Sargent et al. illustrates the type of data that will be needed to be able to define 'endpoints' for these modalities and how to determine where and when such criteria/modalities can be used to improve the reliability with which truly active new agents are identified and truly inactive new agents are discarded in comparison to RECIST criteria in phase II screening trials. The RECIST Working Group looks forward to such data emerging in the next few years to allow the appropriate changes to the next iteration of the RECIST criteria.

## 2.    Purpose of this guideline

This guideline describes a standard approach to solid tumour measurement and definitions for objective assessment of change in tumour size for use in adult and paediatric cancer clinical trials. It is expected these criteria will be useful in all trials where objective response is the primary study endpoint, as well as in trials where assessment of stable disease, tumour progression or time to progression analyses are undertaken, since all of these outcome measures are based on an assessment of anatomical tumour burden and its change on study. There are no assumptions in this paper about the proportion of patients meeting the criteria for any of these endpoints which will signal that an agent or treatment regimen is active: those definitions are dependent on type of cancer in which a trial is being undertaken and the specific agent(s) under study. Protocols must include appropriate statistical sections which define the efficacy parameters upon which the trial sample size and decision criteria are based. In addition to providing definitions and criteria for assessment of tumour response, this guideline also makes recommendations regarding standard reporting of the results of trials that utilise tumour response as an endpoint.

While these guidelines may be applied in malignant brain tumour studies, there are also separate criteria published for response assessment in that setting.[13] This guideline is *not* intended for use for studies of malignant lymphoma since international guidelines for response assessment in lymphoma are published separately.[14]

Finally, many oncologists in their daily clinical practice follow their patients' malignant disease by means of repeated imaging studies and make decisions about continued therapy on the basis of both objective and symptomatic criteria. It is not intended that these RECIST guidelines play a role in that decision making, except if determined appropriate by the treating oncologist.

## 3.    Measurability of tumour at baseline

### 3.1.    Definitions

At baseline, tumour lesions/lymph nodes will be categorised measurable or non-measurable as follows:

#### 3.1.1.    Measurable
*Tumour lesions*: Must be accurately measured in at least one dimension (*longest* diameter in the plane of measurement is to be recorded) with a *minimum* size of:

- 10 mm by CT scan (CT scan slice thickness no greater than 5 mm; see Appendix II on imaging guidance).
- 10 mm caliper measurement by clinical exam (lesions which cannot be accurately measured with calipers should be recorded as non-measurable).
- 20 mm by chest X-ray.

*Malignant lymph nodes*: To be considered pathologically enlarged *and* measurable, a lymph node must be ≥15 mm in *short* axis when assessed by CT scan (CT scan slice thickness recommended to be no greater than 5 mm). At baseline and in follow-up, only the *short* axis will be measured and followed (see Schwartz et al. in this Special Issue[15]). See also notes below on 'Baseline documentation of target and non-target lesions' for information on lymph node measurement.

### 3.1.2. Non-measurable

All other lesions, including small lesions (longest diameter <10 mm or pathological lymph nodes with ≥10 to <15 mm short axis) as well as truly non-measurable lesions. Lesions considered truly non-measurable include: leptomeningeal disease, ascites, pleural or pericardial effusion, inflammatory breast disease, lymphangitic involvement of skin or lung, abdominal masses/abdominal organomegaly identified by physical exam that is not measurable by reproducible imaging techniques.

可测量病变的特殊事项说明

### 3.1.3. Special considerations regarding lesion measurability

Bone lesions, cystic lesions, and lesions previously treated with local therapy require particular comment:

**Bone lesions:.**

- Bone scan, PET scan or plain films are not considered adequate imaging techniques to measure bone lesions. However, these techniques can be used to confirm the presence or disappearance of bone lesions.
- Lytic bone lesions or mixed lytic-blastic lesions, with *identifiable soft tissue components*, that can be evaluated by cross sectional imaging techniques such as CT or MRI can be considered as measurable lesions if the *soft tissue component* meets the definition of measurability described above.
- Blastic bone lesions are non-measurable.

**Cystic lesions:.**

- Lesions that meet the criteria for radiographically defined simple cysts should not be considered as malignant lesions (neither measurable nor non-measurable) since they are, by definition, simple cysts.
- 'Cystic lesions' thought to represent cystic metastases can be considered as measurable lesions, if they meet the definition of measurability described above. However, if non-cystic lesions are present in the same patient, these are preferred for selection as target lesions.

**Lesions with prior local treatment:**

- Tumour lesions situated in a previously irradiated area, or in an area subjected to other loco-regional therapy, are usually not considered measurable unless there has been demonstrated progression in the lesion. Study protocols should detail the conditions under which such lesions would be considered measurable.

## 3.2. Specifications by methods of measurements

### 3.2.1. Measurement of lesions

All measurements should be recorded in metric notation, using calipers if clinically assessed. All baseline evaluations should be performed as close as possible to the treatment start and never more than 4 weeks before the beginning of the treatment.

### 3.2.2. Method of assessment

The same method of assessment and the same technique should be used to characterise each identified and reported lesion at baseline and during follow-up. Imaging based evaluation should always be done rather than clinical examination unless the lesion(s) being followed cannot be imaged but are assessable by clinical exam.

*Clinical lesions*: Clinical lesions will only be considered measurable when they are superficial and ≥10 mm diameter as assessed using calipers (e.g. skin nodules). For the case of skin lesions, documentation by colour photography including a ruler to estimate the size of the lesion is suggested. As noted above, when lesions can be evaluated by both clinical exam and imaging, imaging evaluation should be undertaken since it is more objective and may also be reviewed at the end of the study.

*Chest X-ray*: Chest CT is preferred over chest X-ray, particularly when progression is an important endpoint, since CT is more sensitive than X-ray, particularly in identifying new lesions. However, lesions on chest X-ray may be considered measurable if they are clearly defined and surrounded by aerated lung. See Appendix II for more details.

*CT, MRI*: CT is the best currently available and reproducible method to measure lesions selected for response assessment. This guideline has defined measurability of lesions on CT scan based on the assumption that CT slice thickness is 5 mm or less. As is described in Appendix II, when CT scans have slice thickness greater than 5 mm, the minimum size for a measurable lesion should be twice the slice thickness. MRI is also acceptable in certain situations (e.g. for body scans). More details concerning the use of both CT and MRI for assessment of objective tumour response evaluation are provided in Appendix II.

*Ultrasound*: Ultrasound is not useful in assessment of lesion size and should not be used as a method of measurement. Ultrasound examinations cannot be reproduced in their entirety for independent review at a later date and, because they are operator dependent, it cannot be guaranteed that the same technique and measurements will be taken from one assessment to the next (described in greater detail in Appendix II). If new lesions are identified by ultrasound in the course of the study, confirmation by CT or MRI is advised. If there is concern about radiation exposure at CT, MRI may be used instead of CT in selected instances.

*Endoscopy, laparoscopy*: The utilisation of these techniques for objective tumour evaluation is not advised. However, they can be useful to confirm complete pathological response when biopsies are obtained or to determine relapse in trials where recurrence following complete response or surgical resection is an endpoint.

*Tumour markers*: Tumour markers *alone* cannot be used to assess *objective* tumour response. If markers are initially above

the upper normal limit, however, they must normalise for a patient to be considered in complete response. Because tumour markers are disease specific, instructions for their measurement should be incorporated into protocols on a disease specific basis. Specific guidelines for both CA-125 response (in recurrent ovarian cancer) and PSA response (in recurrent prostate cancer), have been published.[16–18] In addition, the Gynecologic Cancer Intergroup has developed CA125 progression criteria which are to be integrated with objective tumour assessment for use in first-line trials in ovarian cancer.[19]

*Cytology, histology:* These techniques can be used to differentiate between PR and CR in rare cases if required by protocol (for example, residual lesions in tumour types such as germ cell tumours, where known residual benign tumours can remain). When effusions are known to be a potential adverse effect of treatment (e.g. with certain taxane compounds or angiogenesis inhibitors), the cytological confirmation of the neoplastic origin of any effusion that appears or worsens during treatment can be considered if the measurable tumour has met criteria for response or stable disease in order to differentiate between response (or stable disease) and progressive disease.

## 4. Tumour response evaluation

### 4.1. Assessment of overall tumour burden and measurable disease

To assess objective response or future progression, it is necessary to estimate the *overall tumour burden at baseline* and use this as a comparator for subsequent measurements. Only patients with measurable disease at baseline should be included in protocols where objective tumour response is the primary endpoint. Measurable disease is defined by the presence of at least one measurable lesion (as detailed above in Section 3). In studies where the primary endpoint is tumour progression (either time to progression or proportion with progression at a fixed date), the protocol must specify if entry is restricted to those with measurable disease or whether patients having non-measurable disease only are also eligible.

### 4.2. Baseline documentation of 'target' and 'non-target' lesions

When more than one measurable lesion is present at baseline all lesions up to a maximum of five lesions total (and a maximum of two lesions per organ) representative of all involved organs should be identified as *target lesions* and will be recorded and measured at baseline (this means in instances where patients have only one or two organ sites involved a *maximum* of two and four lesions respectively will be recorded). For evidence to support the selection of only five target lesions, see analyses on a large prospective database in the article by Bogaerts et al.[10]

Target lesions should be selected on the basis of their size (lesions with the longest diameter), be representative of all involved organs, but in addition should be those that lend themselves to *reproducible repeated measurements.* It may be the case that, on occasion, the largest lesion does not lend itself to reproducible measurement in which circumstance the next largest lesion which can be measured reproducibly should be selected. To illustrate this point see the example in Fig. 3 of Appendix II.

*Lymph nodes* merit special mention since they are normal anatomical structures which may be visible by imaging even if not involved by tumour. As noted in Section 3, pathological nodes which are defined as measurable and may be identified as target lesions must meet the criterion of a short axis of ⩾15 mm by CT scan. Only the *short* axis of these nodes will contribute to the baseline sum. The short axis of the node is the diameter normally used by radiologists to judge if a node is involved by solid tumour. Nodal size is normally reported as two dimensions in the plane in which the image is obtained (for CT scan this is almost always the axial plane; for MRI the plane of acquisition may be axial, saggital or coronal). The smaller of these measures is the short axis. For example, an abdominal node which is reported as being 20 mm × 30 mm has a short axis of 20 mm and qualifies as a malignant, measurable node. In this example, 20 mm should be recorded as the node measurement (See also the example in Fig. 4 in Appendix II). All other pathological nodes (those with short axis ⩾10 mm but <15 mm) should be considered non-target lesions. Nodes that have a short axis <10 mm are considered non-pathological and should not be recorded or followed.

A *sum of the diameters* (longest for non-nodal lesions, short axis for nodal lesions) for all target lesions will be calculated and reported as the *baseline sum diameters.* If lymph nodes are to be included in the sum, then as noted above, only the *short* axis is added into the sum. The baseline sum diameters will be used as reference to further characterise any objective tumour regression in the measurable dimension of the disease.

All other lesions (or sites of disease) including pathological lymph nodes should be identified as *non-target lesions* and should also be recorded at baseline. Measurements are not required and these lesions should be followed as 'present', 'absent', or in rare cases 'unequivocal progression' (more details to follow). In addition, it is possible to record multiple non-target lesions involving the same organ as a single item on the case record form (e.g. 'multiple enlarged pelvic lymph nodes' or 'multiple liver metastases').

### 4.3. Response criteria

This section provides the definitions of the criteria used to determine objective tumour response for target lesions.

#### 4.3.1. Evaluation of target lesions

Complete Response (CR):  Disappearance of all target lesions. Any pathological lymph nodes (whether target or non-target) must have reduction in short axis to <10 mm.

Partial Response (PR):  At least a 30% decrease in the sum of diameters of target lesions, taking as reference the baseline sum diameters.

Progressive Disease (PD): At least a 20% increase in the sum of diameters of target lesions, taking as reference the *smallest sum on study* (this includes the baseline sum if that is the smallest on study). In addition to the relative increase of 20%, the sum must also demonstrate an absolute increase of at least 5 mm. (*Note:* the appearance of one or more new lesions is also considered progression).

Stable Disease (SD): Neither sufficient shrinkage to qualify for PR nor sufficient increase to qualify for PD, taking as reference the smallest sum diameters while on study.

### 4.3.2. *Special notes on the assessment of target lesions*

*Lymph nodes.* Lymph nodes identified as target lesions should always have the actual short axis measurement recorded (measured in the same anatomical plane as the baseline examination), even if the nodes regress to below 10 mm on study. This means that when lymph nodes are included as target lesions, the 'sum' of lesions may not be zero even if complete response criteria are met, since a normal lymph node is defined as having a short axis of <10 mm. Case report forms or other data collection methods may therefore be designed to have target nodal lesions recorded in a separate section where, in order to qualify for CR, each node must achieve a short axis <10 mm. For PR, SD and PD, the actual short axis measurement of the nodes is to be included in the sum of target lesions.

*Target lesions that become 'too small to measure'.* While on study, all lesions (nodal and non-nodal) recorded at baseline should have their actual measurements recorded at each subsequent evaluation, even when very small (e.g. 2 mm). However, sometimes lesions or lymph nodes which are recorded as target lesions at baseline become so faint on CT scan that the radiologist may not feel comfortable assigning an exact measure and may report them as being 'too small to measure'. When this occurs it is important that a value be recorded on the case report form. If it is the opinion of the radiologist that the lesion has likely disappeared, the measurement should be recorded as 0 mm. If the lesion is believed to be present and is faintly seen but too small to measure, a default value of 5 mm should be assigned (*Note:* It is less likely that this rule will be used for lymph nodes since they usually have a definable size when normal and are frequently surrounded by fat such as in the retroperitoneum; however, if a lymph node is believed to be present and is faintly seen but too small to measure, a default value of 5 mm should be assigned in this circumstance as well). This default value is derived from the 5 mm CT slice thickness (but should not be changed with varying CT slice thickness). The measurement of these lesions is potentially non-reproducible, therefore providing this default value will prevent false responses or progressions based upon measurement error. To reiterate, however, if the radiologist is able to provide an actual measure, that should be recorded, even if it is below 5 mm.

*Lesions that split or coalesce on treatment.* As noted in Appendix II, when non-nodal lesions 'fragment', the longest diameters of the fragmented portions should be added together to calculate the target lesion sum. Similarly, as lesions coalesce, a plane between them may be maintained that would aid in obtaining maximal diameter measurements of each individual lesion. If the lesions have truly coalesced such that they are no longer separable, the vector of the longest diameter in this instance should be the maximal longest diameter for the 'coalesced lesion'.

### 4.3.3. *Evaluation of non-target lesions*

This section provides the definitions of the criteria used to determine the tumour response for the group of non-target lesions. While some non-target lesions may actually be measurable, they need not be measured and instead should be assessed only *qualitatively* at the time points specified in the protocol.

Complete Response (CR): Disappearance of all non-target lesions and normalisation of tumour marker level. All lymph nodes must be non-pathological in size (<10 mm short axis).

Non-CR/Non-PD: Persistence of one or more non-target lesion(s) and/or maintenance of tumour marker level above the normal limits.

Progressive Disease (PD): *Unequivocal progression* (see comments below) of existing non-target lesions. (*Note:* the appearance of one or more new lesions is also considered progression).

### 4.3.4. *Special notes on assessment of progression of non-target disease*

The concept of progression of non-target disease requires additional explanation as follows:

*When the patient also has measurable disease.* In this setting, to achieve 'unequivocal progression' on the basis of the non-target disease, there must be an overall level of substantial worsening in non-target disease such that, even in presence of SD or PR in target disease, the overall tumour burden has increased sufficiently to merit discontinuation of therapy (see examples in Appendix II and further details below). A modest 'increase' in the size of one or more non-target lesions is usually not sufficient to quality for unequivocal progression status. The designation of overall progression *solely* on the basis of change in non-target disease in the face of SD or PR of target disease will therefore be extremely rare.

*When the patient has only non-measurable disease.* This circumstance arises in some phase III trials when it is not a criterion of study entry to have measurable disease. The same general concepts apply here as noted above, however, in this instance there is no measurable disease assessment to factor into the interpretation of an increase in non-measurable disease burden. Because worsening in non-target disease cannot be easily quantified (by definition: if all lesions are truly non-measurable) a useful test that can be applied when assessing patients for unequivocal progression is to consider if the increase in overall disease burden based on the change in non-measurable disease is comparable in magnitude to the increase that would be required to declare PD for measurable disease: i.e. an increase in tumour burden representing an additional 73% increase in 'volume' (which is equivalent to a 20% increase diameter in a measurable lesion). Examples include an increase in a pleural effusion from 'trace' to 'large', an increase in lymphangitic

disease from localised to widespread, or may be described in protocols as 'sufficient to require a change in therapy'. Some illustrative examples are shown in Figs. 5 and 6 in Appendix II. If 'unequivocal progression' is seen, the patient should be considered to have had overall PD at that point. While it would be ideal to have objective criteria to apply to non-measurable disease, the very nature of that disease makes it impossible to do so, therefore the increase must be substantial.

### 4.3.5.   New lesions

The appearance of new malignant lesions denotes disease progression; therefore, some comments on detection of new lesions are important. There are no specific criteria for the identification of new radiographic lesions; however, the finding of a new lesion should be unequivocal: i.e. not attributable to differences in scanning technique, change in imaging modality or findings thought to represent something other than tumour (for example, some 'new' bone lesions may be simply healing or flare of pre-existing lesions). This is particularly important when the patient's baseline lesions show partial or complete response. For example, necrosis of a liver lesion may be reported on a CT scan report as a 'new' cystic lesion, which it is not.

A lesion identified on a follow-up study in an anatomical location that was *not* scanned at baseline is considered a new lesion and will indicate disease progression. An example of this is the patient who has visceral disease at baseline and while on study has a CT or MRI brain ordered which reveals metastases. The patient's brain metastases are considered to be evidence of PD even if he/she did not have brain imaging at baseline.

If a new lesion is equivocal, for example because of its small size, continued therapy and follow-up evaluation will clarify if it represents truly new disease. If repeat scans confirm there is definitely a new lesion, then progression should be declared using the date of the initial scan.

While FDG-PET response assessments need additional study, it is sometimes reasonable to incorporate the use of FDG-PET scanning to complement CT scanning in assessment of progression (particularly possible 'new' disease). New lesions on the basis of FDG-PET imaging can be identified according to the following algorithm:

a. Negative FDG-PET at baseline, with a positive[1] FDG-PET at follow-up is a sign of PD based on a new lesion.
b. No FDG-PET at baseline and a positive FDG-PET at follow-up:
If the positive FDG-PET at follow-up corresponds to a new site of disease confirmed by CT, this is PD.
If the positive FDG-PET at follow-up is not confirmed as a new site of disease on CT, additional follow-up CT scans are needed to determine if there is truly progression occurring at that site (if so, the date of PD will be the date of the initial abnormal FDG-PET scan).
If the positive FDG-PET at follow-up corresponds to a pre-existing site of disease on CT that is not progressing on the basis of the anatomic images, this is not PD.

---

[1] A 'positive' FDG-PET scan lesion means one which is FDG avid with an uptake greater than twice that of the surrounding tissue on the attenuation corrected image.

### 4.4.   Evaluation of best overall response

The best overall response is the best response recorded from the start of the study treatment until the end of treatment taking into account any requirement for confirmation. On occasion a response may not be documented until after the end of therapy so protocols should be clear if post-treatment assessments are to be considered in determination of best overall response. Protocols must specify how any new therapy introduced before progression will affect best response designation. The patient's best overall response assignment will depend on the findings of both target and non-target disease and will also take into consideration the appearance of new lesions. Furthermore, depending on the nature of the study and the protocol requirements, it may also require confirmatory measurement (see Section 4.6). Specifically, in non-randomised trials where response is the primary endpoint, confirmation of PR or CR is needed to deem either one the 'best overall response'. This is described further below.

### 4.4.1.   Time point response

It is assumed that at each protocol specified time point, a response assessment occurs. Table 1 on the next page provides a summary of the overall response status calculation at each time point for patients who have measurable disease at baseline.

When patients have non-measurable (therefore non-target) disease only, Table 2 is to be used.

### 4.4.2.   Missing assessments and inevaluable designation

When no imaging/measurement is done at all at a particular time point, the patient is not evaluable (NE) at that time point. If only a subset of lesion measurements are made at an assessment, usually the case is also considered NE at that time point, unless a convincing argument can be made that the contribution of the individual missing lesion(s) would not change the assigned time point response. This would be most likely to happen in the case of PD. For example, if a patient had a baseline sum of 50 mm with three measured lesions and at follow-up only two lesions were assessed, but those gave a sum of 80 mm, the patient will have achieved PD status, regardless of the contribution of the missing lesion.

### 4.4.3.   Best overall response: all time points

The *best overall response* is determined once all the data for the patient is known.

*Best response determination in trials where confirmation of complete or partial response IS NOT required*: Best response in these trials is defined as the best response across all time points (for example, a patient who has SD at first assessment, PR at second assessment, and PD on last assessment has a best overall response of PR). When SD is believed to be best response, it must also meet the protocol specified minimum time from baseline. If the minimum time is not met when SD is otherwise the best time point response, the patient's best response depends on the subsequent assessments. For example, a patient who has SD at first assessment, PD at second and does not meet minimum duration for SD, will have a best response of PD. The same patient lost to follow-up after the first SD assessment would be considered inevaluable.

### Table 1 – Time point response: patients with target (+/– non-target) disease.

| Target lesions | Non-target lesions | New lesions | Overall response |
|---|---|---|---|
| CR | CR | No | CR |
| CR | Non-CR/non-PD | No | PR |
| CR | Not evaluated | No | PR |
| PR | Non-PD or not all evaluated | No | PR |
| SD | Non-PD or not all evaluated | No | SD |
| Not all evaluated | Non-PD | No | NE |
| PD | Any | Yes or No | PD |
| Any | PD | Yes or No | PD |
| Any | Any | Yes | PD |

CR = complete response, PR = partial response, SD = stable disease, PD = progressive disease, and NE = inevaluable.

### Table 2 – Time point response: patients with non-target disease only.

| Non-target lesions | New lesions | Overall response |
|---|---|---|
| CR | No | CR |
| Non-CR/non-PD | No | Non-CR/non-PD[a] |
| Not all evaluated | No | NE |
| Unequivocal PD | Yes or No | PD |
| Any | Yes | PD |

CR = complete response, PD = progressive disease, and NE = inevaluable.

a 'Non-CR/non-PD' is preferred over 'stable disease' for non-target disease since SD is increasingly used as endpoint for assessment of efficacy in some trials so to assign this category when no lesions can be measured is not advised.

*Best response determination in trials where confirmation of complete or partial response IS required*: Complete or partial responses may be claimed only if the criteria for each are met

at a subsequent time point as specified in the protocol (generally 4 weeks later). In this circumstance, the best overall response can be interpreted as in Table 3.

#### 4.4.4. Special notes on response assessment

When nodal disease is included in the sum of target lesions and the nodes decrease to 'normal' size (<10 mm), they may still have a measurement reported on scans. This measurement should be recorded even though the nodes are normal in order not to overstate progression should it be based on increase in size of the nodes. As noted earlier, this means that patients with CR may not have a total sum of 'zero' on the case report form (CRF).

In trials where confirmation of response is required, repeated 'NE' time point assessments may complicate best response determination. The analysis plan for the trial must address how missing data/assessments will be addressed in determination of response and progression. For example, in most trials it is reasonable to consider a patient with time point responses of PR-NE-PR as a confirmed response.

Patients with a global deterioration of health status requiring discontinuation of treatment without objective evidence of disease progression at that time should be reported as 'symptomatic deterioration'. Every effort should be made to document objective progression even after discontinuation of treatment. Symptomatic deterioration is *not* a descriptor of an objective response: it is a reason for stopping study therapy. The objective response status of such patients is to be determined by evaluation of target and non-target disease as shown in Tables 1–3.

Conditions that define 'early progression, early death and inevaluability' are study specific and should be clearly described in each protocol (depending on treatment duration, treatment periodicity).

In some circumstances it may be difficult to distinguish residual disease from normal tissue. When the evaluation of complete response depends upon this determination, it is recommended that the residual lesion be investigated (fine

### Table 3 – Best overall response when confirmation of CR and PR required.

| Overall response First time point | Overall response Subsequent time point | BEST overall response |
|---|---|---|
| CR | CR | CR |
| CR | PR | SD, PD or PR[a] |
| CR | SD | SD provided minimum criteria for SD duration met, otherwise, PD |
| CR | PD | SD provided minimum criteria for SD duration met, otherwise, PD |
| CR | NE | SD provided minimum criteria for SD duration met, otherwise NE |
| PR | CR | PR |
| PR | PR | PR |
| PR | SD | SD |
| PR | PD | SD provided minimum criteria for SD duration met, otherwise, PD |
| PR | NE | SD provided minimum criteria for SD duration met, otherwise NE |
| NE | NE | NE |

CR = complete response, PR = partial response, SD = stable disease, PD = progressive disease, and NE = inevaluable.

a If a CR is *truly* met at first time point, then any disease seen at a subsequent time point, even disease meeting PR criteria relative to baseline, makes the disease PD at that point (since disease must have reappeared after CR). Best response would depend on whether minimum duration for SD was met. However, sometimes 'CR' may be claimed when subsequent scans suggest small lesions were likely still present and in fact the patient had PR, not CR at the first time point. Under these circumstances, the original CR should be changed to PR and the best response is PR.

needle aspirate/biopsy) before assigning a status of complete response. FDG-PET may be used to upgrade a response to a CR in a manner similar to a biopsy in cases where a residual radiographic abnormality is thought to represent fibrosis or scarring. The use of FDG-PET in this circumstance should be prospectively described in the protocol and supported by disease specific medical literature for the indication. However, it must be acknowledged that both approaches may lead to false positive CR due to limitations of FDG-PET and biopsy resolution/sensitivity.

For equivocal findings of progression (e.g. very small and uncertain new lesions; cystic changes or necrosis in existing lesions), treatment may continue until the next scheduled assessment. If at the next scheduled assessment, progression is confirmed, the date of progression should be the earlier date when progression was suspected.

### 4.5. Frequency of tumour re-evaluation

Frequency of tumour re-evaluation while on treatment should be protocol specific and adapted to the type and schedule of treatment. However, in the context of phase II studies where the beneficial effect of therapy is not known, follow-up every 6–8 weeks (timed to coincide with the end of a cycle) is reasonable. Smaller or greater time intervals than these could be justified in specific regimens or circumstances. The protocol should specify which organ sites are to be evaluated at baseline (usually those most likely to be involved with metastatic disease for the tumour type under study) and how often evaluations are repeated. Normally, all target and non-target sites are evaluated at each assessment. In selected circumstances certain non-target organs may be evaluated less frequently. For example, bone scans may need to be repeated only when complete response is identified in target disease or when progression in bone is suspected.

After the end of the treatment, the need for repetitive tumour evaluations depends on whether the trial has as a goal the response rate or the time to an event (progression/death). If 'time to an event' (e.g. time to progression, disease-free survival, progression-free survival) is the main endpoint of the study, then routine scheduled re-evaluation of protocol specified sites of disease is warranted. In randomised comparative trials in particular, the scheduled assessments should be performed as identified on a calendar schedule (for example: every 6–8 weeks on treatment or every 3–4 months after treatment) and should not be affected by delays in therapy, drug holidays or any other events that might lead to imbalance in a treatment arm in the timing of disease assessment.

### 4.6. Confirmatory measurement/duration of response

#### 4.6.1. Confirmation
In non-randomised trials where response is the primary endpoint, confirmation of PR and CR is required to ensure responses identified are not the result of measurement error. This will also permit appropriate interpretation of results in the context of historical data where response has traditionally required confirmation in such trials (see the paper by Bogaerts et al. in this Special Issue[10]). However, in all other circumstances, i.e. in randomised trials (phase II or III) or studies where stable disease or progression are the primary endpoints, confirmation of response is not required since it will not add value to the interpretation of trial results. However, elimination of the requirement for response confirmation may increase the importance of central review to protect against bias, in particular in studies which are not blinded.

In the case of SD, measurements must have met the SD criteria at least once after study entry at a minimum interval (in general not less than 6–8 weeks) that is defined in the study protocol.

#### 4.6.2. Duration of overall response
The duration of overall response is measured from the time measurement criteria are first met for CR/PR (whichever is first recorded) until the first date that recurrent or progressive disease is objectively documented (taking as reference for progressive disease the smallest measurements recorded on study).

The duration of overall complete response is measured from the time measurement criteria are first met for CR until the first date that recurrent disease is objectively documented.

#### 4.6.3. Duration of stable disease
Stable disease is measured from the start of the treatment (in randomised trials, from date of randomisation) until the criteria for progression are met, taking as reference the *smallest sum on study* (if the baseline sum is the smallest, this is the reference for calculation of PD).

The clinical relevance of the duration of stable disease varies in different studies and diseases. If the proportion of patients achieving stable disease for a minimum period of time is an endpoint of importance in a particular trial, the protocol should specify the minimal time interval required between two measurements for determination of stable disease.

*Note*: The duration of response and stable disease as well as the progression-free survival are influenced by the frequency of follow-up after baseline evaluation. It is not in the scope of this guideline to define a standard follow-up frequency. The frequency should take into account many parameters including disease types and stages, treatment periodicity and standard practice. However, these limitations of the precision of the measured endpoint should be taken into account if comparisons between trials are to be made.

### 4.7. Progression-free survival/proportion progression-free

#### 4.7.1. Phase II trials
This guideline is focused primarily on the use of objective response endpoints for phase II trials. In some circumstances, 'response rate' may not be the optimal method to assess the potential anticancer activity of new agents/regimens. In such cases 'progression-free survival' (PFS) or the 'proportion progression-free' at landmark time points, might be considered appropriate alternatives to provide an initial signal of biologic effect of new agents. It is clear, however, that in an uncontrolled trial, these measures are subject to criticism since an apparently promising observation may be related to biological factors such as patient selection and not the impact of the intervention. Thus, phase II screening trials utilising these endpoints are best designed with a randomised control. Exceptions may exist

where the behaviour patterns of certain cancers are so consistent (and usually consistently poor), that a non-randomised trial is justifiable (see for example van Glabbeke et al.[20]). However, in these cases it will be essential to document with care the basis for estimating the expected PFS or proportion progression-free in the absence of a treatment effect.

### 4.7.2. Phase III trials

Phase III trials in advanced cancers are increasingly designed to evaluate progression-free survival or time to progression as the primary outcome of interest. Assessment of progression is relatively straightforward if the protocol requires all patients to have measurable disease. However, restricting entry to this subset of patients is subject to criticism: it may result in a trial where the results are less likely to be generalisable if, in the disease under study, a substantial proportion of patients would be excluded. Moreover, the restriction to entry will slow recruitment to the study. Increasingly, therefore, trials allow entry of both patients with measurable disease as well as those with non-measurable disease only. In this circumstance, care must be taken to explicitly describe the findings which would qualify for progressive disease for those patients *without* measurable lesions. Furthermore, in this setting, protocols must indicate if the maximum number of recorded target lesions for those patients with measurable disease may be relaxed from five to three (based on the data found in Bogaerts et al.[10] and Moskowitz et al.[11]). As found in the 'special notes on assessment of progression', these guidelines offer recommendations for assessment of progression in this setting. Furthermore, if available, validated tumour marker measures of progression (as has been proposed for ovarian cancer) may be useful to integrate into the definition of progression. Centralised blinded review of imaging studies or of source imaging reports to verify 'unequivocal progression' may be needed if important drug development or drug approval decisions are to be based on the study outcome. Finally, as noted earlier, because the date of progression is subject to ascertainment bias, timing of investigations in study arms should be the same. The article by Dancey et al. in this special issue[21] provides a more detailed discussion of the assessment of progression in randomised trials.

### 4.8. Independent review of response and progression

For trials where *objective response* (CR + PR) is the primary endpoint, and in particular where key drug development decisions are based on the observation of a minimum number of responders, it is recommended that all claimed responses be reviewed by an expert(s) independent of the study. If the study is a randomised trial, ideally reviewers should be blinded to treatment assignment. Simultaneous review of the patients' files and radiological images is the best approach.

Independent review of progression presents some more complex issues: for example, there are statistical problems with the use of central-review-based progression time in place of investigator-based progression time due to the potential introduction of informative censoring when the former precedes the latter. An overview of these factors and other lessons learned from independent review is provided in an article by Ford et al. in this special issue.[22]

### 4.9. Reporting best response results

#### 4.9.1. Phase II trials

When response is the primary endpoint, and thus all patients must have measurable disease to enter the trial, all patients included in the study must be accounted for in the report of the results, even if there are major protocol treatment deviations or if they are not evaluable. Each patient will be assigned one of the following categories:

1. Complete response
2. Partial response
3. Stable disease
4. Progression
5. Inevaluable for response: specify reasons (for example: early death, malignant disease; early death, toxicity; tumour assessments not repeated/incomplete; other (specify)).

Normally, all *eligible* patients should be included in the denominator for the calculation of the response rate for phase II trials (in some protocols it will be appropriate to include all treated patients). It is generally preferred that 95% two-sided confidence limits are given for the calculated response rate. Trial conclusions should be based on the response rate for all eligible (or all treated) patients and should *not* be based on a selected 'evaluable' subset.

#### 4.9.2. Phase III trials

Response evaluation in phase III trials may be an indicator of the relative anti-tumour activity of the treatments evaluated and is almost always a secondary endpoint. Observed differences in response rate may not predict the clinically relevant therapeutic benefit for the population studied. If objective response is selected as a primary endpoint for a phase III study (only in circumstances where a direct relationship between objective tumour response and a clinically relevant therapeutic benefit can be unambiguously demonstrated for the population studied), the same criteria as those applying to phase II trials should be used and all patients entered should have at least one measurable lesion.

In those many cases where response is a secondary endpoint and not all trial patients have measurable disease, the method for reporting overall best response rates must be pre-specified in the protocol. In practice, response rate may be reported using either an 'intent to treat' analysis (all randomised patients in the denominator) or an analysis where only the subset of patients with measurable disease at baseline are included. The protocol should clearly specify how response results will be reported, including any subset analyses that are planned.

The original version of RECIST suggested that in phase III trials one could write protocols using a 'relaxed' interpretation of the RECIST guidelines (for example, reducing the number of lesions measured) but this should no longer be done since these revised guidelines have been amended in such a way that it is clear how these criteria should be applied for all trials in which anatomical assessment of tumour response or progression are endpoints.

## Appendix I. Summary of major changes RECIST 1.0 to RECIST 1.1

| | RECIST 1.0 | RECIST 1.1 | Rationale | Reference in special issue (if applicable) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minimum size measurable lesions | CT: 10 mm spiral<br>20 mm non-spiral<br><br>Clinical: 20 mm<br><br>Lymph node: not mentioned | CT 10 mm; delete reference to spiral scan<br><br>Clinical: 10 mm (must be measurable with calipers)<br><br>CT:<br> ⩾15 mm short axis for target<br> ⩾10–<15 mm for non-target<br> <10 mm is non-pathological | Most scans used have 5 mm or less slice thickness Clearer to give instruction based on slice interval if it is greater than 5 mm<br>Caliper measurement will make this reliable<br><br>Since nodes are normal structure need to define pathological enlargement. Short axis is most sensitive | Schwartz et al.[15] |
| Special considerations on lesion measurability | – | Notes included on bone lesions, cystic lesions | Clarify frequently asked questions | |
| Overall tumour burden | 10 lesions (5 per organ) | 5 lesions (2 per organ) | Data warehouse analysis shows no loss of information if lesion number reduced from 10 to 5. A maximum of 2 lesions per organ yields sufficient representation per disease site | Bogaerts et al.[10] |
| Response criteria target disease | CR lymph node not mentioned<br><br>PD 20% increase over smallest sum on study or new lesions | CR lymph nodes must be <10 mm short axis<br><br>PD 20% increase over smallest sum on study (including baseline if that is smallest) and at least 5 mm increase or new lesions | In keeping with normal size of nodes<br><br>Clarification that if baseline measurement is smaller than any on study measurement, it is reference against which PD is assessed<br>5 mm absolute increase to guard against over calling PD when total sum is very small and 20% increase is within measurement error | Schwartz et al.[15] |
| Response criteria non-target disease | 'unequivocal progression' considered as PD | More detailed description of 'unequivocal progression' to indicate that it should not normally trump target disease status. It must be representative of overall disease status change, not a single lesion increase | Confusion with RECIST 1.0 where some were considering PD if 'increase' in any non-target lesion, even when target disease is stable or responding | |
| New lesions | – | New section on New lesions | To provide guidance on when a lesion is considered new (and thus PD) | |
| Overall response | Table integrated target and non-target lesions | Two tables: one integrating target and non-target and the other of non-target only | To account for the fact that RECIST criteria are now being used in trials where PFS is the endpoint and not all patients have measurable (target) disease at baseline | Dancey et al.[21] |

| | | Special notes:<br> How to assess and measure lymph nodes<br> CR in face of residual tissue<br> Discussion of 'equivocal' progression | Frequently asked questions on these topics | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Confirmatory measure | For CR and PR: criteria must be met again 4 weeks after initial documentation | Retain this requirement ONLY for non-randomised trials with primary endpoint of response | Data warehouse shows that response rates rise when confirmation is eliminated, but the only circumstance where this is important is in trials where there is no concurrent comparative control and where this measure is the primary endpoint | Bogaerts et al.[10] |
| Progression-free survival | General comments only | More specific comments on use of PFS (or proportion progression-free) as phase II endpoint<br>Greater detail on PFS assessment in phase III trials | Increasing use of PFS in phase III trials requires guidance on assessment of PD in patients with non-measurable disease | Dancey et al.[21] |
| Reporting of response results | 9 categories suggested for reporting phase II results | Divided into phase II and phase III<br>9 categories collapsed into 5<br>In phase III, guidance given about reporting response | Simplifies reporting and clarifies how to report phase II and III data consistently | |
| Response in phase III trials | More relaxed guidelines possible if protocol specified | This section removed and referenced in section above: no need to have different criteria for phase II and III | Simplification of response assessment by reducing number of lesions and eliminating need for confirmation in randomised studies where response is not the primary endpoint makes separate 'rules' unnecessary | |
| Imaging appendix | Appendix I | Appendix II: updated with detailed guidance on use of MRI, PET/CT<br>Other practical guidance included | Evolving use of newer modalities addressed. Enhanced guidance in response to frequent questions and from radiology review experience | |
| New appendices | | Appendix I: comparison of RECIST 1.0 and 1.1<br>Appendix III: frequently asked questions | | |

## Conflict of interest statement

## Acknowledgements

## Appendix II.  Specifications for standard anatomical radiological imaging

These protocols for image acquisition of computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are recommendations intended for patients on clinical trials where RECIST assessment will be performed. Standardisation of imaging requirements and image acquisition parameters is ideal to allow for optimal comparability of subjects within a study and results between studies. These recommendations are designed to balance optimised image acquisition protocols with techniques that should be feasible to perform globally at imaging facilities in all types of radiology practices. These guidelines are not applicable to functional imaging techniques or volumetric assessment of tumour size.

Scanner quality control is highly recommended and should follow standard manufacturer and facility maintenance schedules using commercial phantoms. It is likely that for RECIST unidimensional measurements this will be adequate to produce reproducible measurements. Imaging quality control for CT includes an analysis of image noise and uniformity and CT number as well as spatial resolution. The frequency of quality control analysis is also variable and should focus on clinically relevant scanning parameters. Dose analysis is always important and the use of imaging should follow the ALARA principle, 'As Low As Reasonably Achievable', which refers to making every reasonable effort to maintain radiation exposures as far below the dose limits as possible.

### Specific notes

*Chest X-ray* measurement of lesions surrounded by pulmonary parenchyma is feasible, but not preferable as the measurement represents a summation of densities. Furthermore, there is poor identification of new lesions within the chest on X-ray as compared with CT. Therefore, measurements of pulmonary parenchymal lesions as well as mediastinal disease are optimally performed with CT of the chest. MRI of the chest should only be performed in extenuating circumstances. Even if IV contrast cannot be administered (for example, in the situation of allergy to contrast), a non-contrast CT of the chest is still preferred over MRI or chest X-ray.

*CT scans:* CT scans of the chest, abdomen, and pelvis should be contiguous throughout all the anatomic region of interest. As a general rule, the minimum size of a measurable lesion at baseline should be no less than double the slice thickness and also have a minimum size of 10 mm (see below for minimum size when scanners have a slice thickness more than 5 mm). While the precise physics of lesion size and partial volume averaging is complex, lesions smaller than 10 mm may be difficult to accurately and reproducibly measure. While this rule is applicable to baseline scans, as lesions potentially decrease in size at follow-up CT studies, they should still be measured. Lesions which are reported as 'too small to measure' should be assigned a default measurement of 5 mm if they are still visible.

The most critical CT image acquisition parameters for optimal tumour evaluation using RECIST are *anatomic coverage, contrast administration, slice thickness, and reconstruction interval.*

  a. *Anatomic coverage*: Optimal anatomic coverage for most solid tumours is the chest, abdomen and pelvis. Coverage should encompass all areas of known predilection for metastases in the disease under evaluation and

should additionally investigate areas that may be involved based on signs and symptoms of individual patients. Because a lesion later identified in a body part not scanned at baseline would be considered as a new lesion representing disease progression, careful consideration should be given to the extent of imaging coverage at baseline and at subsequent follow-up time points. This will enable better consistency not only of tumour measurements but also identification of new disease.

b. *IV contrast administration*: Optimal visualisation and measurement of metastases in solid tumours requires consistent administration (dose and rate) of IV contrast as well as timing of scanning. Typically, most abdominal imaging is performed during the portal venous phase and (optimally) about the same time frame after injection on each examination (see Fig. 1 for impact of different phase of IV contrast on lesion measurement). Most solid tumours may be scanned with a single phase after administration of contrast. While triphasic CT scans are sometimes performed on other types of vascular tumours to improve lesion conspicuity, for consistency and uniformity, we would recommend triphasic CT for hepatocellular and neuroendocrine tumours for which this scanning protocol is generally standard of care, and the improved temporal resolution of the triphasic scan will enhance the radiologists' ability to consistently and reproducibly measure these lesions. The precise dose and rate of IV contrast is dependent upon the CT scanning equipment, CT acquisition protocol, the type of contrast used, the available venous access and the medical condition of the patient. Therefore, the method of administration of intravenous contrast agents is variable. Rather than try to institute rigid rules regarding methods for administering contrast agents and the volume injected, it is appropriate to suggest that an adequate volume of a suitable contrast agent should be given so that the metastases are demonstrated to best effect and a *consistent method* is used on subsequent examinations for any given patient (ideally, this would be specified in the protocol or for an institution). It is very important that the same technique be used at baseline and on follow-up examinations for a given patient. This will greatly enhance the reproducibility of the tumour measurements. If prior to enrolment it is known a patient is not able to undergo CT scans with IV contrast due to allergy or renal insufficiency, the decision as to whether a non-contrast CT or MRI (with or without IV contrast) should be used to evaluate the subject at baseline and follow-up should be guided by the tumour type under investigation and the anatomic location of the disease. For patients who develop contraindications to contrast after baseline contrast CT is done, the decision as to whether non-contrast CT or MRI (enhanced or non-enhanced) should be performed should also be based on the tumour type, anatomic location of the disease and should be optimised to allow for comparison to the prior studies if possible. Each case should be discussed with the radiologist to determine if substitution of these other approaches is possible and, if not, the patient should be considered not evaluable from that point forward. Care must be taken in measurement of target lesions on a different modality and interpretation of non-target disease or new lesions, since the same lesion may appear to have a different size using a new modality (see Fig. 2 for a comparison of CT and MRI of the same lesion). Oral contrast is recommended to help visualise and differentiate structures in the abdomen.

c. *Slice thickness and reconstruction interval*: RECIST measurements may be performed at most clinically obtained slice thicknesses. It is recommended that CT scans be performed at 5 mm contiguous slice thickness or less and indeed this guideline presumes a minimum 5 mm thickness in recommendations for measurable lesion definition. Indeed, variations in slice thickness can have an impact on lesion measurement and on detection of new lesions. However, consideration should also be given for minimising radiation exposure. With these parameters, a minimum 10 mm lesion is considered measurable at baseline. Occasionally, institutions may perform medically acceptable scans at slice thicknesses *greater than* 5 mm. If this occurs, the minimum size of measurable lesions at baseline should be *twice the slice*



Fig. 1 – Difference in measurement/visualisation with different phases of IV contrast administration. Hypervascular metastases imaged in the arterial phase (left) and the portal venous phase (right). Note that the number of lesions visible differs greatly between the two phases of contrast administration as does any potential lesion measurement. Consistent CT scan acquisition, including phase of contrast administration, is important for optimal and reproducible tumour

**Fig. 2 – CT versus MRI of same lesions showing apparent 'progression' due only to differing method of measurement.**

*thickness* of the baseline scans. Most contemporary CT scanners are multidetector which have many imaging options for these acquisition parameters.[23] The equipment vendor and scanning manual should be reviewed if there are any specific system questions.

d. *Alternative contrast agents*: There are a number of other, new contrast agents, some organ specific.[24] They may be used as part of patient care for instance, in liver lesion assessment, or lymph node characterisation[25], but *should not as yet be used in clinical trials*.

*FDG-PET* has gained acceptance as a valuable tool for detecting, staging and restaging several malignancies. Criteria for incorporating (or substituting) FDG-PET into anatomical assessment of tumour response in phase II trials are not yet available, though much research is ongoing. Nevertheless, FDG-PET is being used in many drug development trials both as a tool to assess therapeutic efficacy and also in assessment of progression. If FDG-PET scans are included in a protocol, by consensus, an FDG uptake period of 60 min prior to imaging has been decided as the most appropriate for imaging of patients with malignancy.[26] Whole-body acquisition is important since this allows for sampling of all areas of interest and can assess if new lesions have appeared thus determining the possibility of interval progression of disease. Images from the base of the skull to the level of the mid-thigh should be obtained 60 min post injection. PET camera specifications are variable and manufacturer specific, so every attempt should be made to use the same scanner, or the same model scanner, for serial scans on the same patient. Whole-body acquisitions can be performed in either 2- or 3-dimensional mode with attenuation correction, but the method chosen should be consistent across all patients and serial scans in the clinical trial.

*PET/CT scans*: Combined modality scanning such as with PET–CT is increasingly used in clinical care, and is a modality/technology that is in rapid evolution; therefore, the recommendations in this paper may change rather quickly with time. At present, low dose or attenuation correction CT portions of a combined PET–CT are of limited use in anatomically based efficacy assessments and it is therefore suggested that they should not be substituted for dedicated diagnostic contrast enhanced CT scans for anatomically based RECIST measurements. However, if a site can document that the CT performed as part of a PET–CT is of identical diagnostic quality to a diagnostic CT (with IV and oral contrast) then the CT portion of the PET–CT can be used for RECIST measurements. Note, however, that the PET portion of the CT introduces additional data which may bias an investigator if it is not routinely or serially performed.

*Ultrasound examinations* should not be used in clinical trials to measure tumour regression or progression of lesions because the examination is necessarily subjective and operator dependent. The reasons for this are several: Entire examinations cannot be reproduced for independent review at a later date, and it must be assumed, whether or not it is the case, that the hard-copy films available represent a true and accurate reflection of events. Furthermore, if, for example, the only measurable lesion is in the para-aortic region of the abdomen and if gas in the bowel overlies the lesion, the lesion will not be detected because the ultrasound beam cannot penetrate the gas. Accordingly, the disease staging (or restaging for treatment evaluation) for this patient will not be accurate.

While evaluation of lesions by *physical examination* is also of limited reproducibility, it is permitted when lesions are superficial, at least 10 mm size, and can be assessed using calipers. In general, it is preferred if patients on clinical trials have at least one lesion that is measurable by CT. Other skin or palpable lesions may be measured on physical examination and be considered target lesions.

Use of *MRI* remains a complex issue. MRI has excellent contrast, spatial and temporal resolution; however, there are many image acquisition variables involved in MRI, which greatly impact image quality, lesion conspicuity and measurement. Furthermore, the availability of MRI is variable globally. As with CT, if an MRI is performed, the technical specifications of the scanning sequences used should be optimised for the evaluation of the type and site of disease. Furthermore, as with CT, the modality used at follow-up should be the same as was used at baseline and the lesions should be measured/assessed on the same pulse sequence. Generally, axial imaging of the abdomen and pelvis with T1 and T2 weighted imaging along with gadolinium enhanced imaging should be performed. The field of view, matrix, number of excitations, phase encode steps, use of fat suppression and fast sequences should be optimised for the spe-

cific body part being imaged as well as the scanner utilised. It is beyond the scope of this document or appendix to prescribe specific MRI pulse sequence parameters for all scanners, body parts and diseases. Ideally, the same type of scanner should be used and the image acquisition protocol should be followed as closely as possible to prior scans. Body scans should be performed with breath-hold scanning techniques if possible.

*Selection of target lesions*: In general, the *largest* lesions representative of involved organs (up to a maximum of two per organ and five total) are selected to follow as target lesions. However, in some cases, the largest lesions may not be easily measured and are not suitable for follow-up because of their configuration. In these cases, identification of the largest *most reproducible* lesions is advised. Fig. 3 provides an illustrative example where the largest lesion is not the most reproducible and another lesion is better to select and follow:

### Measurement of lesions

The longest diameter of selected lesions should be measured in the plane in which the images were acquired. For body CT, this is the axial plane. In the event isotropic reconstructions are performed, measurements can be made on these reconstructed images; however, it should be cautioned that not all radiology sites are capable of producing isotropic reconstructions. This could lead to the undesirable situation of measurements in the axial plane at one assessment point and in a different plane at a subsequent assessment. There are some tumours, for instance paraspinal lesions, which are better measured in the coronal or sagittal plane. It would be acceptable to measure these lesions in these planes if the

reconstructions in those planes were isotropic or the images were acquired with MRI in those planes. Using the same plane of evaluation, the maximal diameter of each target lesion should always be measured at subsequent follow-up time points even if this results in measuring the lesion at a different slice level or in a different orientation or vector compared with the baseline study. Software tools that calculate the maximal diameter for a perimeter of a tumour may be employed and may even reduce variability.

The only exception to the longest diameter rule is lymph node measurement. Because malignant nodes are identified by the length of their short axis, this is the guide used to determine not only whether they are pathological but is also the dimension measured for adding into the sum of target lesions. Fig. 4 illustrates this point: the large arrow identifies a malignant node: the shorter perpendicular axis is ⩾15 mm and will be recorded. Close by (small arrow) there is a normal node: note here the long axis is greater than 10 mm but the short axis is well below 10 mm. This node should be considered non-pathological.

If a lesion disappears and reappears at a subsequent time point it should continue to be measured. However, the patient's response at the point in time when the lesion reappears will depend upon the status of his/her other lesions. For example, if the patient's tumour had reached a CR status and the lesion reappeared, then the patient would be considered PD at the time of reappearance. In contrast, if the tumour status was a PR or SD and one lesion which had disappeared then reappears, its maximal diameter should be added to the sum of the remaining lesions for a calculated response: in other words, the reappearance of an apparently 'disappeared' single lesion amongst many which remain is not in itself en-



Fig. 3 – Largest lesion may not be most reproducible: most reproducible should be selected as target. In this example, the primary gastric lesion (circled at baseline and at follow-up in the top two images) may be able to be measured with thin section volumetric CT with the same degree of gastric distention at baseline and follow-up. However, this is potentially challenging to reproduce in a multicentre trial and if attempted should be done with careful imaging input and analysis. The most reproducible lesion is a lymph node (circled at baseline and at follow-up in the bottom two images).

Fig. 4 – Lymph node assessment: large arrow illustrates a pathological node with the short axis shown as a solid line which should be measured and followed. Small arrow illustrates a non-pathological node which has a short axis <10 mm.

ded in an organ with a similar contrast such as the liver, pancreas, kidney, adrenal or spleen. Additionally, peritumoural oedema may surround a lesion and may be difficult to distinguish on certain modalities between this oedema and actual tumour. In fact, pathologically, the presence of tumour cells within the oedema region is variable. Therefore, it is most critical that the measurements be obtained in a reproducible manner from baseline and all subsequent follow-up time-points. This is also a strong reason to consistently utilise the same imaging modality.

When lesions 'fragment', the individual lesion diameters should be added together to calculate the target lesion sum. Similarly, as lesions coalesce, a plane between them may be maintained that would aid in obtaining maximal diameter measurements of each individual lesion. If the lesions have truly coalesced such that they are no longer separable, the vector of the longest diameter in this instance should be the maximal longest diameter for the 'merged lesion'.

ough to qualify for PD: that requires the sum of all lesions to meet the PD criteria. The rationale for such a categorisation is based upon the realisation that most lesions do not actually 'disappear' but are not visualised because they are beyond the resolving power of the imaging modality employed.

The identification of the precise boundary definition of a lesion may be difficult especially when the lesion is embed-

*Progression of non-target lesions*

To achieve 'unequivocal progression' there must be an *overall* level of substantial worsening in non-target disease that is of a magnitude that, even in the presence of SD or PR in target disease, the treating physician would feel it important to change therapy. Examples of unequivocal progression are shown in Figs. 5 and 6.



Fig. 5 – Example of unequivocal progression in non-target lesions in liver.



Fig. 6 – Example of unequivocal progression in non-target lesion (nodes).

## Appendix III. Frequently asked questions

| Question | Answer |
|---|---|
| What should be done if several unique lesions at baseline become confluent at a follow-up evaluation? | Measure the longest diameter of the confluent mass and record to add into the sum of the longest diameters |
| How large does a new lesion have to be to count as progression? Does any small subcentimetre lesion qualify, or should the lesion be at least measurable? | New lesions do not need to meet 'measurability criteria' to be considered valid. If it is clear on previous images (with the same technique) that a lesion was absent then its definitive appearance implies progression. If there is any doubt (because of the techniques or conditions) then it is suggested that treatment continue until next scheduled assessment when, generally, all should be clear. Either it gets bigger and the date of progression is the date of the first suspicion, or it disappears and one may then consider it an artefact with the support of the radiologists |
| How should one lesion be measured if on subsequent exams it is split into two? | Measure the longest diameter of each lesion and add this into the sum |
| Does the definition of progression depend on the status of all target lesions or only one? | As per the RECIST 1.1 guideline, progression requires a 20% increase in the sum of diameters of all target lesions AND a minimum absolute increase of 5 mm in the sum |
| Are RECIST criteria accepted by regulatory agencies? | Many cooperative groups and members of pharma were involved in preparing RECIST 1.0 and have adopted them. The FDA was consulted in their development and supports their use, though they don't require it. The European and Canadian regulatory authorities also participated and the RECIST criteria are now integrated in the European note for guidance for the development of anticancer agents. Many pharmaceutical companies are also using them. RECIST 1.1 was similarly widely distributed before publication |
| What is the criterion for a measurable lesion if the CT slice thickness is >5 mm? | RECIST 1.1 recommends that CT scans have a maximum slice thickness of 5 mm and the minimum size for a measurable lesion is twice that: 10 mm (even if slice thickness is <5 mm). If scanners with slice thickness >5 mm are used, the minimum lesion size must have a longest diameter twice the actual slice thickness |
| What should we record when target lesions become so small they are below the 10 mm 'measurable' size? | Target lesion measurability is defined at baseline. Thereafter, actual measurements, even if <10 mm, should be recorded. If lesions become very small, some radiologists indicate they are 'too small to measure'. This guideline advises that when this occurs, if the lesion is actually still present, a default measurement of 5 mm should be applied. If in fact the radiologist believes the lesion has gone, a default measurement of 0 mm should be recorded |
| If a patient has several lesions which have decreased in size to meet PR criteria and one has actually disappeared, does that patient have PD if the 'disappeared' lesion reappears? | Unless the sum meets the PD criteria, the reappearance of a lesion in the setting of PR (or SD) is not PD. The lesion should simply be added into the sum.<br>If the patients had had a CR, clearly reappearance of an absent lesion would qualify for PD |
| When measuring the longest diameter of target lesions in response to treatment, is the same axis that was used initially used subsequently, even if there is a shape change to the lesion that may have produced a new longest diameter? | The longest diameter of the lesion should always be measured even if the actual axis is different from the one used to measure the lesion initially (or at different time point during follow-up)<br>The only exception to this is lymph nodes: as per RECIST 1.1 the short axis should always be followed and as in the case of target lesions, the vector of the short axis may change on follow-up |
| Target lesions have been selected at baseline and followed but then one of these target lesions then becomes non-evaluable (i.e. different technique used)<br>What is the effect this has on the other target lesions and the overall response? | What may be done in such cases is one of the following:<br>(a) If the patient is still being treated, call the centre to be sure that future evaluations are done with the baseline technique so at least SOME courses are fully evaluable<br>(b) If that is not possible, check if there IS a baseline exam by the same technique which was used to follow patients…in which case if you retrieve the baseline measures from that technique you retrieve the lesion evaluability<br>(c) If neither (a) nor (b) is possible then it is a judgement call about whether you delete the lesion from all forms or consider the impact of the lesion overall is so important that its being non-evaluable makes the overall response interpretation inevaluable without it. Such a decision should be discussed in a review panel<br>It is NOT recommended that the lesion be included in baseline sums and then excluded from follow-up sums since this biases in favour of a response |

**Appendix III** – *continued*

| Question | Answer |
|---|---|
| What if a single non-target lesion cannot be reviewed, for whatever reason; does this negate the overall assessment? | Sometimes the major contribution of a single non-target lesion may be in the setting of CR having otherwise been achieved: failure to examine one non-target in that setting will leave you unable to claim CR. It is also possible that the non-target lesion has undergone such substantial progression that it would override the target disease and render patient PD. However, this is very unlikely, especially if the rest of the measurable disease is stable or responding |
| A patient has a 32% decrease in sum cycle 2, a 28% decrease cycle 4 and a 33% decrease cycle 6. Does confirmation of PR have to take place in sequential scans or is a case like this confirmed PR? | It is not infrequent that tumour shrinkage hovers around the 30% mark. In this case, most would consider PR to have been confirmed looking at this overall case. Had there been two or three non-PR observations between the two time point PR responses, the most conservative approach would be to consider this case SD |
| In the setting of a breast cancer neoadjuvant study, would mammography not be used to assess lesions? Is CT preferred in this setting? | Neither CT nor mammography are optimal in this setting. MRI is the preferred modality to follow breast lesions in a neoadjuvant setting |
| A patient has a lesion measurable by clinical exam and by CT scan. Which should be followed? | CT scan. Always follow by imaging if that option exists since it can be reviewed and verified |
| A lesion which was solid at baseline has become necrotic in the centre. How should this be measured? | The longest diameter of the entire lesion should be followed. Eventually, necrotic lesions which are responding to treatment decrease in size. In reporting the results of trials, you may wish to report on this phenomenon if it is seen frequently since some agents (e.g. angiogenesis inhibitors) may produce this effect |
| If I am going to use MRI to follow disease, what is minimum size for measurability? | MRI may be substituted for contrast enhanced CT for some sites, but not lung. The minimum size for measurability is the same as for CT (10 mm) as long as the scans are performed with slice thickness of 5 mm and no gap. In the event the MRI is performed with thicker slices, the size of a measurable lesion at baseline should be two times the slice thickness. In the event there are inter-slice gaps, this also needs to be considered in determining the size of measurable lesions at baseline |
| Can PET–CT be used with RECIST? | At present, the low dose or attenuation correction CT portion of a combined PET–CT is not always of optimal diagnostic CT quality for use with RECIST measurements. However, if your site has documented that the CT performed as part of a PET–CT is of the same diagnostic quality as a diagnostic CT (with IV and oral contrast) then the PET–CT can be used for RECIST measurements. Note, however, that the PET portion of the CT introduces additional data which may bias an investigator if it is not routinely or serially performed |

REFERENCES

1. Paesmans M, Sculier JP, Libert P, et al. Response to chemotherapy has predictive value for further survival of patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer: 10 years experience of the European Lung Cancer Working Party. *Eur J Cancer* 1997;**33**:2326–32.
2. Buyse M, Thirion P, Carlson RW, et al. Relation between tumor response to first-line chemotherapy and survival in advanced colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. Meta-analysis group in Cancer. *Lancet* 2000;**356**:373–8.
3. Goffin J, Baral S, Tu D, et al. Objective responses in patients with malignant melanoma or renal cell cancer in early clinical studies do not predict regulatory approval. *Clin Cancer Res* 2005;**15**:5928–34.
4. El-Maraghi RH, Eisenhauer EA. Review of phase II trial designs used in studies of molecular targeted agents: outcomes and predictors of success in phase III. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;**10**:1346–54.
5. Miller AB, Hoogstraten B, Staquet M, Winkler A. Reporting results of cancer treatment. *Cancer* 1981;**47**:207–14.
6. Tonkin K, Tritchler D, Tannock I. Criteria of tumor response used in clinical trials of chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol* 1985;**3**:870–5.
7. Baar J, Tannock I. Analyzing the same data in two ways: a demonstration model to illustrate the reporting and misreporting of clinical trials. *J Clin Oncol* 1989;**7**:969–78.
8. Therasse P, Arbuck SG, Eisenhauer EA, et al. New guidelines to evaluate the response to treatment in solid tumors (RECIST Guidelines). *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2000;**92**:205–16.
9. Therasse P, Eisenhauer EA, Verweij J. RECIST revisited: a review of validation studies on tumour assessment. *Eur J Cancer* 2006;**42**:1031–9.
10. Bogaerts J, Ford R, Sargent D, et al. Individual patient data analysis to assess modifications to the RECIST criteria. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;**45**:248–60.
11. Moskowitz CS, Jia X, Schwartz LH, Gönen M. A simulation study to evaluate the impact of the number of lesions measured on response assessment. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;**45**:300–10.
12. Sargent D, Rubinstein L, Schwartz L, et al. Validation of novel imaging methodologies for use as cancer clinical trials end-points. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;**45**:290–9.

13. Macdonald DR, Cascino TL, Schold Jr SC, Cairncross JG. Response criteria for phase II studies of supratentorial malignant glioma. *J Clin Oncol* 1990;**8**:1277–80.

14. Cheson BD, Pfistner B, Juweid ME, et al. Revised response criteria for malignant lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;**10**:579–86.

15. Schwartz LH, Bogaerts J, Ford R, et al. Evaluation of lymph nodes with RECIST 1.1. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;**45**:261–7.

16. Rustin GJ, Quinn M, Thigpen T, et al. Re: New guidelines to evaluate the response to treatment in solid tumors (ovarian cancer). *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2004;**96**:487–8.

17. Bubley GJ, Carducci M, Dahut W, et al. Eligibility and response guidelines for phase II clinical trials in androgen-independent prostate cancer: recommendations from the Prostate-Specific Antigen Working Group. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;**17**:3461–7.

18. Scher H, Halabi S, Tannock I, et al. Design and end points of clinical trials for patients with progressive prostate cancer and castrate levels of testosterone: recommendations of the Prostate Cancer Clinical Trials Working Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;**26**:1148–59.

19. Vergote I, Rustin GJ, Eisenhauer EA, et al. Re: new guidelines to evaluate the response to treatment in solid tumors [ovarian cancer]. Gynecologic Cancer Intergroup. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2000;**92**:1534–5.

20. Van Glabbeke M, Verweij J, Judson I, Nielsen OS. EORTC Soft Tissue and Bone Sarcoma Group: Progression-free rate as the principal end-point for phase II trials in soft-tissue sarcomas. *Eur J Cancer* 2002;**38**:543–9.

21. Dancey JE, Dodd LE, Ford R, et al. Recommendations for the assessment of progression in randomised cancer treatment trials. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;**45**:281–9.

22. Ford R, Schwartz L, Dancey J, et al. Lessons learned from independent central review. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;**45**: 268–74.

23. Catalano C, Francone M, Ascarelli A, Mangia M, Iacucci I, Passariello R. Optimizing radiation dose and image quality. *Eur Radiol* 2007;**17**(Suppl 6):F26–32.

24. Low RN. Abdominal MRI advances in the detection of liver tumours and characterization. *Lancet Oncol* 2007;**8**(6):525–35.

25. Barrett T, Choyke PL, Kobayashi H. Imaging of the lymphatic system: new horizons. *Contrast Media Mol Imaging* 2006;**1**(6):230–45.

26. Shankar LK, Hoffman JM, Bacharach S, et al. National Cancer Institute. Consensus recommendations for the use of 18F-FDG PET as an indicator of therapeutic response in patients in National Cancer Institute Trials. *J Nucl Med* 2006;**47**(6):1059–66.