



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**Relative wash-in rate in dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging as a new prognostic biomarker for event-free survival in 82 patients with osteosarcoma: a multicenter study (vol 16, 1954, 2024)**

Kalisvaart, G.M.; Evenhuis, R.E.; Grootjans, W.; Berghe, T. van den; Callens, M.; Bovée, J.V.M.G.; ... ; Bloem, J.L.

**Citation**

Kalisvaart, G. M., Evenhuis, R. E., Grootjans, W., Berghe, T. van den, Callens, M., Bovée, J. V. M. G., ... Bloem, J. L. (2025). Relative wash-in rate in dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging as a new prognostic biomarker for event-free survival in 82 patients with osteosarcoma: a multicenter study (vol 16, 1954, 2024). *Cancers*, 17(16). doi:10.3390/cancers17162603

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4299702>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Correction

# Correction: Kalisvaart et al. Relative Wash-In Rate in Dynamic Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging as a New Prognostic Biomarker for Event-Free Survival in 82 Patients with Osteosarcoma: A Multicenter Study. *Cancers* 2024, 16, 1954

Gijsbert M. Kalisvaart <sup>1,†</sup> , Richard E. Evenhuis <sup>2,\*,†</sup> , Willem Grootjans <sup>1</sup>, Thomas Van Den Berghe <sup>3</sup> , Martijn Callens <sup>3</sup> , Judith V. M. G. Bovée <sup>4</sup> , David Creytens <sup>5</sup> , Hans Gelderblom <sup>6</sup> , Frank M. Speetjens <sup>6</sup> , Lore Lapeire <sup>7</sup> , Gwen Sys <sup>8</sup> , Marta Fiocco <sup>9,10,11</sup> , Koenraad L. Verstraete <sup>3</sup>, Michiel A. J. van de Sande <sup>2,10</sup>  and Johan L. Bloem <sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Department of Radiology, Leiden University Medical Center, 2333 Leiden, The Netherlands; g.m.kalisvaart@lumc.nl (G.M.K.); j.l.bloem@lumc.nl (J.L.B.)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Leiden University Medical Center, Albinusdreef 2, 2333 Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> Department of Radiology, Ghent University Hospital, 9000 Ghent, Belgium; thovdnbe.vandenbergh@ugent.be (T.V.D.B.)

<sup>4</sup> Department of Pathology, Leiden University Medical Center, 2333 Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>5</sup> Department of Pathology, Ghent University Hospital, 9000 Ghent, Belgium; david.creytens@uzgent.be

<sup>6</sup> Department of Medical Oncology, Leiden University Medical Center, 2333 Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>7</sup> Department of Medical Oncology, Ghent University Hospital, 9000 Ghent, Belgium; lore.lapeire@uzgent.be

<sup>8</sup> Department of Orthopedic Surgery and Traumatology, Ghent University Hospital, 9000 Ghent, Belgium; gwen.sys@uzgent.be

<sup>9</sup> Department of Biomedical Science, Section Medical Statistics, Leiden University Medical Center, 2333 Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>10</sup> Center for Pediatric Oncology, Princess Maxima Center, 3584 Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>11</sup> Mathematical Institute, Leiden University, 2300 Leiden, The Netherlands

\* Correspondence: r.e.evenhuis@lumc.nl

† These authors contributed equally to this work.



Received: 28 July 2025

Accepted: 30 July 2025


Published: 8 August 2025

**Citation:** Kalisvaart, G.M.; Evenhuis, R.E.; Grootjans, W.; Van Den Berghe, T.; Callens, M.; Bovée, J.V.M.G.; Creytens, D.; Gelderblom, H.; Speetjens, F.M.; Lapeire, L.; et al. Correction: Kalisvaart et al. Relative Wash-In Rate in Dynamic Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging as a New Prognostic Biomarker for Event-Free Survival in 82 Patients with Osteosarcoma: A Multicenter Study. *Cancers* 2024, 16, 1954. *Cancers* 2025, 17, 2603. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers17162603>

**Copyright:** © 2025 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## Error in Figure 2


In the original publication [1], there was a mistake in the legend of Figure 2 as published. In the original version the legend wrongly states the red line accounts for patients with ‘rWIR  $\geq 2.3$  (good response),’ whereas it actually accounts for patients with poor response. The corrected Figure 2 appears below.



**Figure 2.** Estimated event-free survival among good and poor responders based on the rWIR with a cut-off of 2.3.

**Error in Figure 3**

In the original publication, there was a mistake in the legend of Figure 3 as published. In the original version the legend wrongly states the red line accounts for patients with ‘rWIR ≥ 2.3 (good response),’ whereas it actually accounts for patients with poor response. The corrected Figure 3 appears below.



**Figure 3.** Estimated event-free survival among good and poor responders based on the rWIR with a cut-off of 2.3 in a subpopulation of 70 patients without metastases at presentation.

### Error in Table 2

In the original publication, there was a mistake in Table 2 as published. The fourth column of the original table wrongly defines good and poor radiological responders.  $rWIR < 2.3$  should define poor response and  $rWIR \geq 2.3$  should define good response. The corrected Table 2 appears below.

**Table 2.** Hazard ratios (HRs) along with the 95% confidence intervals using multivariate Cox regression models for EFS in a study population ( $n = 82$ ), with prognostic factors including histological response (left), rWIR as a binary variable (middle), and rWIR as a continuous variable (right) as the prognostic factors.

Factors	HR	95% CI	Factors	HR	95% CI	Factors	HR	95% CI
<b>Age Group</b>			<b>Age group</b>			<b>Age Group</b>		
Children	Ref		Children	Ref		Children	Ref	
AYA	1.36	0.61–3.03	AYA	1.43	0.64–3.22	AYA	1.32	0.59–2.98
Older adults	1.26	0.45–3.55	Older adults	1.55	0.55–4.41	Older adults	1.41	0.50–3.97
<b>Tumour size</b>			<b>Tumour size</b>			<b>Tumour size</b>		
Small $\leq 8$ cm	Ref		Small $\leq 8$ cm	Ref		Small $\leq 8$ cm	Ref	
Large $> 8$ cm	0.90	0.46–2.00	Large $> 8$ cm	0.97	0.47–2.00	Large $> 8$ cm	0.96	0.46–2.01
<b>Histological response to CTx</b>			<b>DCE-MRI response (binary) to CTx</b>			<b>DCE-MRI response (continuous) to CTx</b>		
Good response ( $<10\%$ viable tum. cells)	Ref		Good response ( $rWIR \geq 2.3$ )	Ref			0.78	0.60–1.01
Poor response ( $\geq 10\%$ viable tum. cells)	1.82	0.86–3.84	Poor response ( $rWIR < 2.3$ )	2.39	1.14–5.01			
<b>Metastases at presentation</b>			<b>Metastases at presentation</b>			<b>Metastases at presentation</b>		
No	Ref		No	Ref		No	Ref	
Yes	2.29	0.90–5.83	Yes	2.31	0.90–5.92	Yes	1.85	0.70–4.94

HR = hazard ratio; ref = reference category; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; CTx = chemotherapy; DCE-MRI = dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging; AYA = adolescents and young adults; and rWIR = relative wash-in rate.

### Error in Table 3

In the original publication, there was a mistake in Table 3 as published. The fourth column of the original table wrongly defines good and poor radiological responders.  $rWIR < 2.3$  should define poor response and  $rWIR \geq 2.3$  should define good response. The corrected Table 3 appears below.

**Table 3.** Hazard ratios (HRs) along with the 95% confidence intervals using multivariate Cox regression models for EFS with prognostic factors including histological response (left), rWIR as a binary variable (middle), and rWIR as a continuous variable (right) as the prognostic factors in a subpopulation of 70 patients without metastases at presentation.

Factors	HR	95% CI	Factors	HR	95% CI	Factors	HR	95% CI
<b>Age group</b>			<b>Age group</b>			<b>Age group</b>		
Children	Ref		Children	Ref		Children	Ref	
AYA	1.43	0.59–3.46	AYA	1.46	0.61–3.53	AYA	1.28	0.53–3.13
Older adults	2.11	0.66–6.79	Older adults	2.30	0.74–7.21	Older adults	2.02	0.63–6.50
<b>Tumour size</b>			<b>Tumour size</b>			<b>Tumour size</b>		
Small $\leq 8$ cm	Ref		Small $\leq 8$ cm	Ref		Small $\leq 8$ cm	Ref	
Large $> 8$ cm	1.26	0.55–2.92	Large $> 8$ cm	1.33	0.60–2.97	Large $> 8$ cm	1.23	0.54–2.80

Table 3. Cont.

Factors	HR	95% CI	Factors	HR	95% CI	Factors	HR	95% CI
<b>Histological response to CTx</b>			<b>DCE-MRI response (binary) to CTx</b>			<b>DCE-MRI response (continuous) to CTx</b>		
Good responder (<10% viable cells)	Ref		Good responder (rWIR $\geq$ 2.3)	Ref			0.69	0.50–0.94
Poor responder ( $\geq$ 10% viable cells)	1.98	0.84–4.67	Poor responder (rWIR < 2.3)	2.28	1.00–5.19			

HR = hazard ratio; ref = reference category; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; CTx = chemotherapy; DCE-MRI = dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging; AYA = adolescents and young adults; and rWIR = relative wash-in rate.

The authors state that the scientific conclusions are unaffected. This correction was approved by the Academic Editor. The original publication has also been updated.

## Reference

1. Kalisvaart, G.M.; Evenhuis, R.E.; Grootjans, W.; Van Den Berghe, T.; Callens, M.; Bovée, J.V.M.G.; Creytens, D.; Gelderblom, H.; Speetjens, F.M.; Lapeire, L.; et al. Relative Wash-In Rate in Dynamic Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging as a New Prognostic Biomarker for Event-Free Survival in 82 Patients with Osteosarcoma: A Multicenter Study. *Cancers* **2024**, *16*, 1954. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.