Discrimination of Different Brain Metastases and Primary CNS Lymphomas Using Morphologic Criteria and Diffusion Tensor Imaging

Zusammenfassung


Conclusion: There were morphologic differences among the main subtypes of brain metastases/CNS lymphomas. However, due to a high variability of common types of metastases and low specificity, prospective differentiation remained challenging. DTI including FA and ADC was not a reliable tool for differentiation between different histopathological subtypes of brain metastases except for CNS lymphomas.
For this retrospectively designed single center study, 200 consecutive patients with brain metastases and primary CNS lymphomas were included.

**Methods**

**Patient population**

For this retrospectively designed single center study, 200 consecutive patients with brain metastases and primary CNS lymphomas were included.

**Histopathologic Subtypes**

- Histopathologic subtypes of brain metastases/CNS lymphomas were assessed with morphologic criteria.
- Primary CNS lymphomas revealed significantly reduced ADC values.
- DTI is not a reliable tool for differentiation between brain metastases and primary CNS lymphomas.

**Image analysis**

Image analysis was conducted by a neuroradiologist (S.B.; 6 years of experience). Using regions of interest (ROIs), FA and ADC were measured in each anatomical plane.

**Image interpretation**

Image interpretation is crucial for accurate diagnosis. Using diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) can help to differentiate between brain tumors and metastases.

**Key Points**

- Histopathologic subtypes of brain metastases/CNS lymphomas show different morphologic features on MRI.
- Primary CNS lymphomas show significantly reduced ADC values.
- DTI is not a reliable tool for differentiation between brain metastases and primary CNS lymphomas.

**Citation Format**

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of this explorative study including descriptive data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 23.0 (SPSS Inc., IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Non-normally distributed data are shown as median and interquartile range. Metric values (FA/ADC values) were compared using the Kruskal-Wallis test for all histopathological groups. Furthermore, these values were compared between each entity and the remaining samples (e.g. melanoma vs. no melanoma; lung cancer vs. no lung cancer) using the Mann Whitney U Test. The Youden's index was calculated in receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis to determine the best cut-off point for further calculation of sensitivity and specificity.

Comparison of morphologic criteria between two groups was performed using the chi-squared test. Comparison of all morphological parameters was further done by decision trees, using Chi-square automatic interaction detectors (CHAID). Only morphological parameters were included for decision tree analysis due to missing FA/ADC values in some patients. To detect intrinsic correlations between imaging features and histology, we performed unsupervised hierarchical clustering analysis of complete cases. Because the dataset contained both numerical and categorical variables, we used the function "daisy" and Gower’s distance for calculation of dissimilarity matrices from the R cluster package. Furthermore, we performed a principal component analysis (PCA) on ADC and FA values in complete cases [14].

Results

Histopathological analysis revealed 62 lung cancers (58 non-small cell lung cancers, 4 small-cell lung cancers), 29 melanomas, 26 breast cancers, 21 gastrointestinal cancers (including colon, rectum, sigma, esophagus), 6 sarcomas, 12 primary CNS b-cell lymphomas, 18 urothelial carcinomas (including renal and bladder tumors), 12 germ-cell carcinomas (including ovarian carcinoma and seminoma), 4 endometrial carcinomas and 10 other cancers (Table 2).

The morphologic criteria were analyzed in the different histopathological subgroups (Fig. 1, Table 3). There were 108 singular lesions and 92 multiple (≥2) intracranial lesions. Cystic components were detected in 66 brain metastases, and 43 brain lesions showed hemorrhage. Contact to the dura was observed in 106 metastases. 3 patients showed no relevant contrast enhancement due to hemorrhage. Most of the brain metastases showed solid contrast enhancement (n = 144) (Table 4). The highest percentage of hemorrhage was shown by metastases of melanoma (58.6 %), urothelial carcinoma (27.8 %), and lung cancer (19.4 %). Comparing melanoma to all other brain metastases, this difference was significant (P<0.001). Using this morphologic parameter a sensitivity/specificity of 58.6%/84.8 % for the diagnosis of melanoma was achieved.
with a positive/negative predictive value of 39.5%/92.4%, respectively. Metastases of urothelial carcinoma (P = 0.497) and lung cancer (P = 0.386) did not show a significantly higher rate of hemorrhage. The highest fraction of a solid component was observed in metastases of breast cancer (100.0%), lymphoma (100.0%) and sarcoma (100.0%). Comparing breast cancer metastases to all other metastases, this difference remained significant (P = 0.049), resulting in a sensitivity/specificity of 100.0%/83.3% and a positive/negative predictive value of 39.5%/92.4%, respectively. Contact to the dura was shown mostly by metastases of sarcoma (83.3%) and gastrointestinal tumors (61.9%). However, differences compared to other tumor types were not significant (sarcoma: P = 0.131; GI cancer: P = 0.387).

Regarding the median values of measured ratios of fractional anisotropy and apparent diffusion coefficient, the only significant differences between different histopathological subtypes were observed for ADCcontrast using the Kruskal-Wallis Test (P = 0.010) (Fig. 2). No significant differences were observed for FAcontrast (P = 0.467), FAnekrosis (P = 0.519), FAnekrotische (P = 0.176), ADCnekrosis (P = 0.648) and ADCnekrotische (P = 0.910). Table 2 shows median values of FA and ADC among different histopathological subtypes. Comparing lymphomas to other metastases showed significant differences for ADCcontrast (0.92 [0.83 – 1.07] vs. 1.35 [1.10 – 1.64] P = 0.001) (Fig. 3, 4). The optimal cut-off value for the diagnosis of lymphoma was ADCcontrast 1.08. Using this cut-off, a specificity of 98.5% and a sensitivity of 18.4% were achieved with a positive/negative predictive value of 18.4%/98.5%, respectively.

Metastases of urothelial carcinoma showed significantly higher median values in ADCcontrast compared to all other metastases (1.65 [1.24 – 1.85] vs. 1.30 [1.04 – 1.59], P = 0.025). Germ cell cancer metastases compared to all other brain metastases showed significantly lower values of FAnekrotische (0.16 [0.12 – 0.22] vs. 0.22 [0.17 – 0.29], P = 0.038) (Fig. 4).

No significant differences were found in FA and ADC values of adenocarcinoma, small cell carcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma of the lung. Slight differences were found regarding subtypes of breast cancer: Breast cancer metastases with identification of Her2neu and estrogen/progesterone hormone receptor showed lower ADC values in the contrast-enhancing tumor part compared to breast cancer metastases without identification of Her2neu and hormone receptor (1.08 vs. 1.33; P = 0.032). Differences were also observed when comparing metastases of the upper GI to metastases of the lower GI (ADCnekrotische 4.64 vs. 1.68; P = 0.012). However, only a small number of patients were analyzed in these subgroups.

In the comparison of metastases of adenocarcinoma to metastases of squamous cell carcinoma independently of the origin, no significant differences were observed for ADC and FA values.

Decision tree analysis using morphological criteria only showed that the correct diagnosis was achieved in 34.0% of cases (Fig. 5). The main criteria for differentiation between histopathological subtypes using this automatic classification model were hemorrhage and the pattern of contrast enhancement.

We further performed unsupervised hierarchical clustering (using a dissimilarity matrix as input for the distance function), where some trends could be observed, but no clear clustering based on histology. Similarly, principal component analysis (PCA) of complete cases with ADC and FA values showed no separation of a set of tumors (Fig. 6).

**Discussion**

Significant differences in morphological criteria between histopathological subtypes of brain metastases and primary CNS lymphomas were observed, but due to a high variability and low specificity of these parameters, use in the clinical routine is limited. Except for lower ADC values in primary CNS lymphomas, no significant differences regarding FA/ADC values between different types of brain metastases were disclosed. Therefore, DTI is not a reliable tool for the differentiation between brain metastases. Histopathological assessment is still essential for diagnosis.

Brain metastases occur more often than gliomas and are sometimes the first manifestation of cancer [2]. MRI was shown to be superior to CT imaging for the detection of brain metastases. Pre- and post-contrast T1w sequences are mandatory for diagnosis [15, 16]. MRI is performed for staging in patients with known malignancies or in patients with neurological symptoms [1]. Imaging provides information about the location and extent of brain metastases and morphologic criteria such as hemorrhage, contact to dura, singularity and pattern of contrast enhancement. MRI is important for further therapy decisions such as surgery or radiotherapy [2]. Knowledge of the primary tumor of the metastatic brain lesion is important for therapy planning. Especially in patients with unknown malignancies, diagnosis of histopathological subtypes using MRI could help targeted staging and might eliminate the need for biopsy.

Histopathological subtypes of brain metastases display different morphologic criteria which can help in differentiation. Brain metastases of melanoma, renal cancer and lung cancer are prone to
show hemorrhage as confirmed by the data of this study [1, 17]. Different histopathological subtypes of brain metastases show various patterns of contrast enhancement. In this study, most lesions had solid enhancement, while nodular enhancement was not observed in brain metastases. Solid contrast enhancement is most frequently observed in breast cancer and GI cancer metastases. Another important morphologic criterion may be contact to the dura. Especially brain metastases of GI cancer and of sarcoma showed contact to the dura in this study. However, due to the low specificity of these morphological parameters, differentiation between histopathological subtypes remains challenging. Using automatic classification by decision trees of morphological criteria, a prediction of the correct diagnosis could only be performed in 34.0%, suggesting limited applicability in the clinical routine.

Advanced imaging techniques are increasingly important in the imaging of brain metastases especially for the differentiation from gliomas. Perfusion-weighted imaging and MR spectroscopy were shown to help in the differentiation between brain metastases and glioblastomas [18–20]. The limitation of these imaging methods is the low spatial resolution. FET-PET imaging was shown to be important in the diagnosis of brain metastases [21]. However, it also has low spatial resolution. To date, these advanced imaging
methods have not been shown to differentiate between different histopathological subtypes of brain metastases. Diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) are important in the preoperative MR imaging of brain lesions [10]. ADC is the most common quantitative analysis of DWI and provides information on cell density [22, 23]. Fractional anisotropy is a quantitative parameter of DTI and provides information about the directionality of diffusion processes [24]. It was shown that diffusion-weighted imaging can give additional information regarding tissue composition and can therefore help in the differentiation of intracranial tumors and tumor-like conditions [25]. Many studies have tried to assess diffusion tensor imaging and diffusion-weighted imaging for the differentiation between brain metastases and gliomas [11, 26–28]. Higher FA values were shown in the contrast-enhancing tumor part of glioblastomas compared to brain metastases, whereas no differences were observed in the NEPTR [11]. Malignant brain tumors showed reduced FA values in the non-enhancing peritumoral region. Significant differences were observed between meningiomas, metastases and high-grade gliomas [29]. This suggests that different biology of brain lesions has an effect on fractional anisotropy values. In this explorative study germ cell cancer metastases compared to all other brain metastases showed lower FA values in the non-enhancing peritumoral region, suggesting a higher invasiveness of this type of metastasis. Due to the low patient number (n = 12), the validity of these results is lim-

### Table 3 Morphologic criteria of different histopathological subtypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>primary tumor</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>solitary tumor</th>
<th>cystic component</th>
<th>hemorrhage</th>
<th>solid component</th>
<th>contact to dura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lung cancer</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38/62 (61.3%)</td>
<td>21/62 (33.9%)</td>
<td>11/62 (17.7%)</td>
<td>48/62 (77.4%)</td>
<td>33/62 (53.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melanoma</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13/29 (44.8%)</td>
<td>9/29 (31.0%)</td>
<td>17/29 (58.6%)</td>
<td>26/29 (89.7%)</td>
<td>19/29 (65.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breast cancer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13/26 (50.0%)</td>
<td>6/26 (23.1%)</td>
<td>2/26 (7.7%)</td>
<td>26/26 (100.0%)</td>
<td>13/26 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI cancer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10/21 (47.6%)</td>
<td>7/21 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1/21 (4.8%)</td>
<td>19/21 (90.5%)</td>
<td>13/21 (61.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarcoma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/6 (83.3%)</td>
<td>3/6 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1/6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6/6 (100.0%)</td>
<td>5/6 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lymphoma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3/12 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3%)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3%)</td>
<td>12/12 (100.0%)</td>
<td>3/12 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urothelial carcinoma</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11/18 (61.1%)</td>
<td>8/18 (44.4%)</td>
<td>5/18 (27.8%)</td>
<td>14/18 (77.8%)</td>
<td>8/18 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>germ cell carcinoma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8/12 (66.7%)</td>
<td>6/12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3/12 (25.0%)</td>
<td>12/12 (100.0%)</td>
<td>6/12 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endometrial carcinoma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3/4 (75.0%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4/4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5/10 (50.0%)</td>
<td>2/10 (20.0%)</td>
<td>2/10 (20.0%)</td>
<td>10/10 (100.0%)</td>
<td>5/10 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GI: gastrointestinal cancer. GI: gastrointestinal.

### Table 4 Patterns of contrast enhancement of different histopathological subtypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>primary tumor</th>
<th>circular</th>
<th>nodular</th>
<th>solid</th>
<th>garland-like</th>
<th>circular+solid</th>
<th>garland-like+solid</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lung cancer</td>
<td>11/62 (17.7%)</td>
<td>0/62 (0.0%)</td>
<td>16/62 (25.8%)</td>
<td>12/62 (19.4%)</td>
<td>17/62 (27.4%)</td>
<td>5/62 (8.1%)</td>
<td>1/62 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melanoma</td>
<td>7/29 (24.1%)</td>
<td>0/29 (0.0%)</td>
<td>12/29 (41.4%)</td>
<td>0/29 (0.0%)</td>
<td>6/29 (20.7%)</td>
<td>3/29 (10.3%)</td>
<td>1/29 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breast cancer</td>
<td>0/26 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0/26 (0.0%)</td>
<td>16/26 (61.5%)</td>
<td>2/26 (7.7%)</td>
<td>5/26 (19.2%)</td>
<td>3/26 (11.5%)</td>
<td>0/26 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI cancer</td>
<td>4/21 (19.0%)</td>
<td>0/21 (0.0%)</td>
<td>7/21 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2/21 (9.5%)</td>
<td>4/21 (19.0%)</td>
<td>4/21 (19.0%)</td>
<td>0/21 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarcoma</td>
<td>0/6 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0/6 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3/6 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0/6 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2/6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0/6 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1/6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lymphoma</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
<td>11/12 (91.7%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urothelial carcinoma</td>
<td>6/18 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0/18 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4/18 (22.2%)</td>
<td>2/18 (11.1%)</td>
<td>4/18 (22.2%)</td>
<td>2/18 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0/18 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>germ cell carcinoma</td>
<td>4/12 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2/12 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6/12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endometrial carcinoma</td>
<td>0/4 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25.0%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25.0%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1/10 (10.0%)</td>
<td>0/10 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5/10 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0/10 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1/10 (10.0%)</td>
<td>3/10 (30.0%)</td>
<td>0/10 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GI: gastrointestinal cancer. GI: gastrointestinal.

**Fig. 2** ADCcontrast in the different histopathological subtypes of brain metastases. * P<0.05.

**Abb. 2** Werte für ADCcontrast in den unterschiedlichen histopathologischen Subtypen von Hirnmetastasen. * P<0.05.
limited, and further studies have to be performed. There were no other significant differences in FA values in the contrast-enhancing tumor part, the necrosis and the NEPTR of the analyzed lesions, suggesting that FA is not a reliable tool for the differentiation between brain metastases.

ADC values for the differentiation between histopathological subtypes of brain metastases were assessed in a recent study but did not show significant differences [9]. Another study showed that ADC values in the contrast-enhancing tumor part correlate with the cellularity of brain metastases [30]. Primary CNS lymphomas are known to show lower ADC values in diffusion-weighted ima-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>primary tumor</th>
<th>FA\textsubscript{contrast}</th>
<th>FA\textsubscript{necrosis}</th>
<th>FA\textsubscript{NEPTR}</th>
<th>ADC\textsubscript{contrast}</th>
<th>ADC\textsubscript{necrosis}</th>
<th>ADC\textsubscript{NEPTR}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lung cancer</td>
<td>0.22 [0.20–0.28]</td>
<td>0.17 [0.12–0.21]</td>
<td>0.23 [0.18–0.28]</td>
<td>1.43 [1.14–1.63]</td>
<td>2.64 [1.48–3.48]</td>
<td>2.15 [1.87–2.40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melanoma</td>
<td>0.25 [0.19–0.28]</td>
<td>0.20 [0.14–0.31]</td>
<td>0.21 [0.15–0.25]</td>
<td>1.15 [0.92–1.76]</td>
<td>2.41 [1.19–3.78]</td>
<td>2.28 [2.02–2.47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breast cancer</td>
<td>0.21 [0.16–0.26]</td>
<td>0.18 [0.14–0.24]</td>
<td>0.22 [0.18–0.32]</td>
<td>1.25 [1.14–1.38]</td>
<td>2.56 [2.05–3.59]</td>
<td>2.23 [1.88–2.44]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI cancer</td>
<td>0.23 [0.18–0.27]</td>
<td>0.22 [0.14–0.31]</td>
<td>0.23 [0.13–0.31]</td>
<td>1.40 [1.20–1.83]</td>
<td>1.93 [1.33–3.39]</td>
<td>2.19 [2.03–2.40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarcoma</td>
<td>0.25 [0.10–0.31]</td>
<td>0.16 [0.11–0.27]</td>
<td>0.21 [0.20–0.35]</td>
<td>1.38 [0.93–1.53]</td>
<td>2.48 [1.67–3.71]</td>
<td>2.53 [1.78–2.87]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lymphoma</td>
<td>0.22 [0.17–0.25]</td>
<td>0.22 [0.13–0.41]</td>
<td>0.23 [0.16–0.27]</td>
<td>0.92 [0.83–1.07]</td>
<td>2.96 [1.74–4.00]</td>
<td>2.12 [1.83–2.50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urothelial carcinoma</td>
<td>0.21 [0.16–0.26]</td>
<td>0.14 [0.11–0.21]</td>
<td>0.19 [0.17–0.28]</td>
<td>1.65 [1.24–1.85]</td>
<td>2.44 [1.31–3.12]</td>
<td>2.22 [2.07–2.46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>germ cell carcinoma</td>
<td>0.24 [0.19–0.30]</td>
<td>0.15 [0.09–0.20]</td>
<td>0.16 [0.12–0.22]</td>
<td>1.32 [1.04–1.75]</td>
<td>3.59 [2.43–3.69]</td>
<td>2.19 [2.13–2.54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endometrial carcinoma</td>
<td>0.15 [0.11–0.19]</td>
<td>0.12 [0.10–0.14]</td>
<td>0.33 [0.29–0.37]</td>
<td>1.31 [1.15–1.57]</td>
<td>3.19 [2.09–4.05]</td>
<td>2.15 [2.03–2.42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0.18 [0.17–0.23]</td>
<td>0.19 [0.16–0.27]</td>
<td>0.30 [0.18–0.40]</td>
<td>1.08 [0.90–1.65]</td>
<td>1.70 [1.32–2.66]</td>
<td>2.29 [1.70–2.66]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GI: gastrointestinal; non-normally distributed data is shown as median [interquartile range]. GI: gastrointestinal; nicht normalverteilte Daten sind dargestellt als Median [Interquartilenabstand].

1 \( P < 0.005 \).
2 \( P < 0.05 \).
ging [31, 32]. This is supported by our findings that lymphomas show significantly lower ADC values in the contrast-enhancing tumor part.

Despite previous information that ADC values correlate with brain metastasis cellularity, no significant differences in ADC values were found between different histopathological subtypes of brain metastases. In addition to the minimal differences for FA-NEPTR in germ cell cancer metastases, minimal differences were also observed in ADC values in the contrast-enhancing tumor part for urothelial carcinomas. Due to the comparison of multiple groups of brain metastases, Bonferroni correction would have to be performed to adjust the significance level which was not considered due to the explorative character of this study. However, accounting for this, differences in FA values in germ cell cancer metastases and in ADC values in urothelial carcinoma metastases would no longer reach statistical significance.

One could assume that brain metastases with similar histopathological patterns (e.g. adenocarcinoma, squamous cell carcinoma) show differences in structure and therefore also in FA and ADC values. In this study only slight differences between subgroups of brain metastases (e.g. upper/lower GI), but no significant differences between histopathological groups independently of the origin were observed. There is high variability of brain metastases between different organs, different histopathological patterns and also between the different histopathological patterns of different organs which makes classification very difficult. Furthermore, the small number of patients in the subgroups is a main limitation for statistical analysis.

In summary, MRI including morphologic criteria, diffusion-weighted imaging and diffusion tensor imaging was not able to differentiate between histopathological subtypes of brain metastases/primary CNS lymphomas in the clinical routine. Also hierarchical clustering showed limited use of FA and ADC values for discrimina-
tion between histopathological subtypes due to high variability. This analysis focused on imaging findings and thus excluded knowledge of clinical history that would improve the correct histopathological diagnosis and may be addressed in further studies. One possible limitation of this study is the use of manually placed ROIs without fully segmenting the complete tumor regions. It is known that especially FA values show a wide heterogeneity even between white matter tracks [33, 34]. Thus, the most representative regions were manually determined by an experienced neuroradiologist in this study. It remains to be determined if this selective approach or complete segmentation of the lesion shows better results. Further data from different MR scanners with different DTI images were analyzed for this study which might introduce an unavoidable bias. To account for this in each patient the FA/ADC values of the internal capsule were measured as previously described [13]. Another limitation is the small number of patients in some histopathological tumor types (sarcoma, germ cell, endometrial, lymphoma). However, this reflects the daily routine, as these tumor entities are rare, while the most common types of brain metastases are lung and breast cancer and melanoma.

Abbreviations

- **FA**: fractional anisotropy
- **ADC**: apparent diffusion coefficient
- **MRI**: magnetic resonance imaging
- **FLAIR**: fluid attenuated inversion recovery
- **MPRage**: magnetization prepared rapid gradient echo
- **ROI**: region of interest
- **DTI**: diffusion tensor imaging
- **DWI**: diffusion-weighted imaging
- **CHAID**: chi-square automatic interaction detectors
- **NEPTR**: non-enhancing peritumoral region
- **ROC**: receiver operating characteristics
- **PCA**: principal component analysis

**Clinical relevance of the study**

> Significant differences in morphologic criteria were observed between histopathological subtypes of brain metastases and primary CNS lymphomas.

> However, as the most common types of metastases/CNS lymphomas showed a high variability in appearance, the positive and negative predictive values of imaging findings were low and thus the use of these parameters is limited in the clinical routine.

> DTI was not a reliable tool for differentiation between histopathological subtypes of brain metastases, except in primary CNS lymphoma showing significantly lower ADC values.

> Therefore, biopsy and surgery are still essential for diagnosis.
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