Electronic Supplementary Material Assessing Response to Therapy Using Simultaneous PET/MRI in Preclinical Model of Pancreatic Cancer

Journal: Molecular Imaging and Biology

Joshua M. Goldenberg,^{1,2} Julio Cárdenas-Rodríguez,^{3,4} Mark D. Pagel²

1. Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, 85721, USA

2. Department of Cancer Systems Imaging, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer

Center, Houston, TX, 77054, USA

3. Department of Medical Imaging, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

4. University of Arizona Cancer Center, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, 85719, USA

Corresponding Author:

Mark D. Pagel

MD Anderson Cancer Center

3SCR4.3642, Unit 1907

Houston, TX 77054-1901

Tel: (713)-205-8515

Email.: mdpagel@mdanderson.org



Supplemental Figure 1. *In vivo* **CEST spectra one day before treatment.** Each post-injection spectrum showed lower % water signal than the pre-injection spectrum at 4.2 and 5.6 ppm. The difference between pre-injection and post-injection CEST spectra (blue circles) were fit with the Bloch-McConnell equations modified for chemical exchange (black line). a,c,e,g,i,k,m: Spectra are shown for vehicle-treated mice. b,d,f,h,j,l,n: Spectra are shown for metformin-treated mice.



Supplemental Figure 2. *In vivo* **CEST spectra one day after treatment.** Each post-injection spectrum showed lower % water signal than the pre-injection spectrum at 4.2 and 5.6 ppm. The difference between pre-injection and post-injection CEST spectra (blue circles) were fit with the Bloch-McConnell equations modified for chemical exchange (black line). a,c,e,g: Spectra are shown for vehicle-treated mice. b,d,f,h,i,j: Spectra are shown for metformin-treated mice.



Supplemental Figure 3. *In vivo* **CEST spectra seven days after treatment.** Each post-injection spectrum showed lower % water signal than the pre-injection spectrum at 4.2 and 5.6 ppm. The difference between pre-injection and post-injection CEST spectra (blue circles) were fit with the Bloch-McConnell equations modified for chemical exchange (black line). a,c,e,g: Spectra are shown for vehicle-treated mice. b,d,f,h,i,j: Spectra are shown for metformin-treated mice.



Supplemental Figure 4. Images of SUV_{max} representing [¹⁸F]DG uptake, concentration representing iopamidol uptake, and pHe representing acidosis for mice imaged on Day -1. a,c,e,g,i,k,m: Images are shown for vehicle-treated mice. b,d,f,h,j,l,n: Images are shown for metformin-treated mice.



SUV_{max} 0.28

1. a,c,e,g: Images are shown for vehicletreated mice. b,d,f,h,I,j: Images are shown for metformin-treated mice.

0 25 50 75 100 Concentration (mM) рНе

75 100 5.5 6.0 6.5 7.0 7.5 8.0



Concentration (mM) рНе

Supplemental Table 1. p-Scores for vehicle-treated (untreated) and metformin-treated (treated) mice using both a One Sample Student's t-test, and a Two-Sample Hotelling's T² Distribution test.

Day -1 vs Day 1	Untreated	Treated	Treated vs Untreated
Change in pHe	-0.12	0.09	0.23
t-test p-value	0.059	0.35	0.07
Change in mean Suv _{max}	0.10	-0.24	-0.25
t-test p-value	0.45	0.07	0.17
Change in mean pHe/Suv _{max}	(-0.12, 0.10)	(0.09, -0.24)	(0.23, -0.26)
Hotelling's T ² t-test p-value	0.15	0.16	0.03
Day -1 vs Day 7	Untreated	Treated	Treated vs Untreated
Change in pHe	-0.33	-0.53	-0.18
t-test p-value	0.10	0.05	0.48
Change in mean Suv _{max}	-0.14	-0.35	-0.12
t-test p-value	0.02	0.02	0.39
-			
Change in mean pHe/Suv _{max}	(-0.33, -0.14)	(-0.53, -0.35)	(-0.184, -0.12)
Hotelling's T^2 t-test n-value	0.03	0.01	0.007