Range Uncertainties in Proton Therapy





RADIATION ONCOLOGY

Harald Paganetti PhD

Professor of Radiation Oncology, Harvard Medical School Director of Physics Research, Massachusetts General Hospital, Department of Radiation Oncology

Proton Beam Range Medulloblastoma





Photons



Copyright© MGH/NPTC 2003





The difference compared to photon therapy: range uncertainties





In proton therapy, generic homogeneous PTV margin recipes are typically not sufficient !





Applied range uncertainty margins for non-moving targets





Range uncertainties sometimes limit our ability to exploit the end of range

Example: Prostate treatments





Protons and Prostate Treatments

Current technique: Lateral fields Use lateral penumbra (10 mm, 50-95%) to spare rectum (penumbra not better than 15 MV photon fields)

Why not AP fields?

Use much sharper distal penumbra (~ 4 mm, 50-95%)









Range uncertainty margins for non-moving targets

| Source of range uncertainty in the patient | Range uncertainty |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Independent of dose calculation: | |
| Measurement uncertainty in water for commissioning | $\pm 0.3 \text{ mm}$ |
| Compensator design | $\pm 0.2 \text{ mm}$ |
| Beam reproducibility | $\pm 0.2 \text{ mm}$ |
| Patient setup | $\pm 0.7 \text{ mm}$ |
| Dose calculation: | |
| Biology (always positive) | + 0.8 % |
| CT imaging and calibration | ± 0.5 % |
| CT conversion to tissue (excluding I-values) | ± 0.5 % |
| CT grid size | ± 0.3 % |
| Mean excitation energies (I-values) in tissue | \pm 1.5 % |
| Range degradation; complex inhomogeneities | - 0.7 % |
| Range degradation; local lateral inhomogeneities * | ± 2.5 % |
| Total (excluding *) | 2.7% + 1.2 mm |
| Total | 4.6% + 1.2 mm |







(Sawakuchi et al., 2008)









Range degradation Type II analytical Monte Carlo













RADIATION ONCOLOGY

Range uncertainty margins for non-moving targets



Range and Hetereogeneities



M. Bueno, H. Paganetti, M.A. Duch, J. Schuemann: An algorithm to assess the need for clinical Monte Carlo dose calculation for small proton therapy fields. Med Phys 2013





Range and Hetereogeneities

Avoiding density heterogeneities



| | Applied plan | | | 'Standard' plan | | |
|-------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|
| Field | Gantr y angle | Table angle | Density heterogene ity index | Gantr y angle | Table angle | Density heterogene ity index |
| 1 | -45 | -90 | 20.4 | -90 | -120 | 28.2 |
| 2 | -10 | 0 | 12.9 | -90 | -60 | 30.2 |
| 3 | -120 | -120 | 12.7 | 60 | 0 | 26.2 |



© T. Lomax (PSI)

MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL RADIATION ONCOLOGY

Range and Hetereogeneities

In addition(!): patient geometry changes Example: Intra-fractional geometry changes

Before RT

After RT



Parotid glands

Subm.glandsTumor

E. M. Vasques Osorio *et al.* IJROBP 70: 875-82





Range and Hetereogeneities In addition(!): patient geometry changes

- Patient weight gain / loss
- Filling up of sinuses
- (Sub-clinical) pneumonia
- Wet hair / gel / hairspray









MEDICAL SCHOOL

Lung

 Dose fall-off often in lung tissue (density ~0.25-0.3) -> range differences magnified by factor 3-4









Motion



Photons

Protons



© Engelsman, MGH







Motion



Photons

Protons



© Engelsman, MGH







Motion







| Source of range uncertainty in the patient | Range uncertainty | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Independent of dose calculation: | | | |
| Measurement uncertainty in water for commissioning | $\pm 0.3 \text{ mm}$ | | |
| Compensator design | $\pm 0.2 \text{ mm}$ | | |
| Beam reproducibility | ± 0.2 mm | | |
| \pm 0.7 mm | | dose | |
| Dose calculation: | | | |
| Biology (always positive) | +0.8 % | calculation | |
| CT imaging and calibration | ± 0.5 % | | |
| CT conversion to tissue (excluding I-values) | ± 0.5 % | → ± 0.2 % | |
| CT grid size | ± 0.3 % | | |
| Mean excitation energies (I-values) in tissue | ± 1.5 % | | |
| Range degradation; complex inhomogeneities | - 0.7 % | → ± 0.1 % | |
| Range degradation; local lateral inhomogeneities * | ± 2.5 % | → ± 0.1 % | |
| Total (excluding *) | excluding *) 2.7% + 1.2 mm | | |
| Total | 4.6% + 1.2 mm | 2.7 /0 T 1.2 IIIII | |

H. Paganetti: Range uncertainties in proton beam therapy and the impact of Monte Carlo simulations Phys. Med. Biol. 57: R99-R117 (2012)









ANALYSIS: Particle Physics Can Help Fight Cancer

Proton therapy works on similar principles. Wilson first suggested in 1946 that the energetic protons produced at the Harvard Cyclotron Laboratory might be an effective cancer treatment. The very first treatments were performed at particle accelerators originally built for physics research: Berkeley Radiation Laboratory in 1954, and Uppsala in Sweden in 1951.

So proton therapy has been around for about 50 years, generally reserved for the most complicated cancers, such as tumors in the head, eyes, or neck that have not vet spread to distant areas of the body -- locations where collateral damage to surrounding tissue could have serious consequences.

That's because proton therapy offers fewer side effects. In conventional x-ray therapy, the x-rays travel through the body and deliver radiation to all the tissues along the way to the actual tumor. To cut down on the damage to healthy tissue, doctors usually limit the dose delivered to the tumor.









Over the last few decades, particle physicists have developed all kinds of useful simulation tools to help them predict the behavior of subatomic particles interacting with matter, with valuable applications in medical









RADIATION ONCOLOGY

Addressing range uncertainties Head & Neck Patient



- 1 Balloon with detector array embedded on the surface
- 2 Deliver dose (< 1 cGy) for 500 ms using a few cm of extra beam range to cover dosimeters
- 3 Measure dose rate functions by a multi-channel electrometer
- 4 Match data (pattern matching) to determine WEPL at dosimeters and adjust beam range
 5 Commence treatment







MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL RADIATION ONCOLOGY





Mitigating range uncertainties using robust planning in IMPT



Mitigating range uncertainties using robust planning in IMPT



Conclusion

- Range uncertainties in proton therapy can be substantial (i.e. several mm)
- Advanced dose calculation only solves part of the problem
- Robust planning can mitigate the impact of range uncertainties
- Proton treatment planning needs to be done by experienced planners who understand the impact of range uncertainties
- For some sites (e.g. prostate) range uncertainties prevent us from exploiting the full potential of proton therapy
- In vivo range verification is highly desirable



