



OPEN

# Author Correction: Quantitative biparametric analysis of hybrid $^{18}\text{F}$ -FET PET/MR-neuroimaging for differentiation between treatment response and recurrent glioma

Johannes Lohmeier , Georg Bohner, Eberhard Siebert, Winfried Brenner, Bernd Hamm & Marcus R. Makowski

Correction to: *Scientific Reports* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-50182-4>, published online 10 October 2019

This Article contains errors.

In the Discussion section,

“Thus, highest accuracy (90%) was achieved when both DWI- and  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FET-derived parameters were combined in a biparametric approach, which was superior to evaluating maximum target-to-background (TBRmax) ratio or mean apparent diffusion coefficient (ADCmean) alone.”

should read:

“Thus, highest accuracy (88%) was achieved when both DWI- and  $^{18}\text{F}$ -FET-derived parameters were combined in a biparametric approach, which was superior to evaluating maximum target-to-background (TBRmax) ratio or mean apparent diffusion coefficient (ADCmean) alone.”

In the legend of Figure 3,

“Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis. ROC curves for TBRmax (a), ADCmean (b) and biparametric analysis of DWI- and FET PET-derived parameters (c, ADCmean and TBRmax) were illustrated. Biparametric analysis (c) presented highest AUC (Area Under the Curve). Last panel (d) shows a comparison between ROC curves. p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.”

should read:

“Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis. ROC curves for TBRmax (a), ADCmean (b) and biparametric analysis of DWI- and FET PET-derived parameters (c, ADCmean and TBRmax) were illustrated. Biparametric analysis (c) using optimal criteria based on Youden index (TBRmax > 2.1196 and ADCmean > 1253.76) presented highest AUC (Area Under the Curve). Last panel (d) shows a comparison between ROC curves. p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.”

Additionally, in Table 1 the values in the column entitled ‘Positive/Negative predictive value’ are incorrect, and the column entitled ‘Positive/Negative Likelihood Ratio’ was omitted.

The correct Table 1 appears below.

Published online: 22 April 2020

	Sensitivity/ pecificity	Positive/Negative predictive value	Positive/Negative Likelihood Ratio	AUC
ADCmean + TBRmax	97%/60%	89%/86%	2.42/0.05	0.90
ADCmean > 1254	62%/100%	100%/45%	– /0.38	0.82
TBRmax > 2	81%/60%	87%/50%	2.03/0.31	0.81
Clinical rating	91%/44%	85%/57%	1.63/0.21	–

**Table 1.** Diagnostic measures of clinical assessment and quantitative PET/MRI analysis. Biparametric analysis using DWI- and FET PET-derived parameters presents improved diagnostic measures compared to clinical assessment.



**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2020