



Correction to: Why harmonization is needed when using FDG PET/CT as a prognosticator: demonstration with EARL-compliant SUV as an independent prognostic factor in lung cancer

Benjamin Houdu¹ · Charline Lasnon^{2,3} · Idir Licaj⁴ · Guy Thomas⁵ · Pascal Do⁶ · Anne-Valerie Guizard⁷ · Cédric Desmots¹ · Nicolas Aide^{1,3} 

Published online: 7 December 2018

© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2018

Correction to: European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-018-4151-8>

An error occurred in the labelling of Fig. 3, where math symbols for SUV thresholds were inverted in panel b when the EARL threshold was applied to the PSF dataset and vice versa. This figure should read as follows:

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-018-4151-8>

✉ Nicolas Aide
aide-n@chu-Caen.fr

¹ Nuclear Medicine Department, University Hospital, Caen, France

² Nuclear Medicine Department, François Baclesse Cancer Centre, Caen, France

³ INSERM ANTICIPE, Normandie University, Caen, France

⁴ Clinical Research Department, François Baclesse Cancer Centre, Caen, France

⁵ Medical Informatics Department, François Baclesse Cancer Centre, Caen, France

⁶ Lung Cancer Unit, François Baclesse Cancer Centre, Caen, France

⁷ Regional Cancer Registry, François Baclesse Cancer Centre, Caen, France




Fig. 3 Prognostic value of tumour SUVmax. Overall survival Kaplan Meyer curves according to different scenarios. **a** Use of the optimal PSF and EARL SUVmax cutoff values on their respective datasets. **b**

Use of the PSF and EARL SUVmax cutoff values switched across datasets. **c** Use of the PSF and EARL SUVmax cutoff values on a simulated multicentre dataset