

Small Field Dosimetry: Overview of AAPM TG-155 and the IAEA-AAPM Code of Practice (Therapy)

Indra J. Das, PhD, FAAPM, FACR, FASTRO
Department of Radiation Oncology
Indiana University School of Medicine
Indianapolis, Indiana, USA

Small Field Dosimetry Problem



Institutional variability in 6 MV Radionics SRS dosimetry

Das et al, J Radiosurgery, 3, 177-186, 2000

Dosimetric Variation with Detectors



Das et al, J Radiosurgery, 3, 177-186, 2000

What is a Small Field?

- Lack of charged particle
  - Dependent on the range of secondary electrons
  - Photon energy
- Collimator setting that obstructs the source size
- Detector is comparable to the field size

Definition of Small Fields





Das et al, Med. Phys. 35, 206-215, 2008

Energy Fluence Penumbra/Output



Nyholm *et al* Radiother Oncol 78, 347, 2006 and Phys Med Biol 51,6245, 2006

Source Size



90%, 70%, 50%, 30%, 10% iso-intensity line

Jaffray et al, Med Phys 20, 1417-1427 (1993)

Source Size, Modern Machines

Varian TrueBeam



	Dimensions x, y (mm)
6 MV	0.9, 0.7
6 MV FFF	0.8, 0.7
10 MV	0.9, 0.9
10 MV FFF	0.9, 0.8

Sawkey et al, Med Phys, 40, 332, 2013

IAEA/AAPM Proposed Pathway



Alfonso, et al. Med Phys ***35****, 5179-5186 (2008)*

Why So Much of Fuss?

- Reference (ref) conditions cannot be achieved for most SRS devices (cyberknife, gammaknife, tomotherapy etc)
- Machine Specific reference (msr) needs to be linked to ref
- Ratio of reading (PDD, TMR, Output etc) is not the same as ratio of dose

$$\frac{D_1}{D_2} \neq \frac{M_1}{M_2}$$

$$\frac{D_1}{D_2} = \frac{M_1}{M_2} \bullet \left[k_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin},f_{msr}} \right]$$

Relative Dosimetry

$$D_{w,Q_{msr}}^{f_{msr}} = M_{Q_{msr}}^{f_{msr}} N_{DW,Qo} k_{Q,Qo} k_{Q_{msr},Q}^{f_{msr},f_{ref}}$$

$$\Omega_{Q_{clin}Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin}f_{msr}} = \frac{M_{Q_{clin}}^{f_{clin}}}{M_{Q_{msr}}^{f_{msr}}} \left[\frac{\left(D_{w,Q_{clin}}^{f_{clin}}\right) / \left(M_{Q_{clin}}^{f_{clin}}\right)}{\left(D_{w,Q_{msr}}^{f_{msr}}\right) / \left(M_{Q_{msr}}^{f_{msr}}\right)} \right] = \frac{M_{Q_{clin}}^{f_{clin}}}{M_{Q_{msr}}^{f_{msr}}} k_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}$$

$$k_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin},f_{msr}} = \frac{\left(D_{w,Q_{clin}}^{f_{msr}}\right) / \left(M_{w,Q_{clin}}^{f_{clin}}\right)}{\left(D_{w,Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin}}\right) / \left(M_{w,Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin}}\right)} = \frac{(Output)_{rel}}{(Reading)_{rel}}$$

$$k_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin},f_{msr}} = \frac{\left(S_{w,air}\right)_{fclin} \cdot P_{fclin}}{\left(S_{w,air}\right)_{fmsr} \cdot P_{msr}}$$

Meaning of k in Micro-Chambers

$$k_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin},f_{msr}} = \frac{\left[\left(\frac{\overline{L}}{\rho} \right)_{air}^{w} \cdot P_{fl} \cdot P_{grad} \cdot P_{stem} \cdot P_{cell} \cdot P_{wall} \right]_{f_{clin}}}{\left[\left(\frac{\overline{L}}{\rho} \right)_{air}^{w} \cdot P_{fl} \cdot P_{grad} \cdot P_{stem} \cdot P_{cell} \cdot P_{wall} \right]_{f_{msr}}}$$

Stopping Power Ratio

INSTITUTE OF PHYSICS PUBLISHING — PHYSICS IN MEDICINE AND BIOLOGY
Phys. Med. Biol. 48 (2003) 2081–2099 — PII: S0031-9155(03)61152-8

Ionization chamber dosimetry of small photon fields: a Monte Carlo study on stopping-power ratios for radiosurgery and IMRT beams

F Sánchez-Doblado[1,2], P Andreo[3], R Capote[1,2], A Leal[1,2], M Perucha[2], R Arráns[1], L Núñez[4], E Mainegra[5], J I Lagares[1,2] and E Carrasco[1,2]





Radiological Parameters

6 MV beams	Beam quality ($TPR_{20,10}$)	$s_{w,air}$ Andreo (1994)[a]	$s_{w,air}$ This work	$s_{w,air}$ Ratio this work/ Andreo	$s_{PMMA,air}$ Andreo (1994)[a]	$s_{PMMA,air}$ This work	$s_{PMMA,air}$ Ratio this work/ Andreo	Configuration
Elekta SL-18 radiosurgery								
10 × 10 cm^2	0.690	1.1187	1.1188	1.000	1.0853	1.0856	1.000	figure 1(a)
1.0 cm diameter			1.1155	0.997		1.0819	0.997	figure 1(b)
0.3 cm diameter			1.1153	0.997		1.0817	0.997	figure 1(c)
Siemens Primus MLC								
10 × 10 cm^2	0.677	1.1213	1.1221	1.001	1.0880	1.0892	1.001	figure 1(d)
2 × 2 cm^2 irregular on-axis			1.1203	0.999		1.0870	0.999	figure 1(e)
2 × 2 cm^2 irregular 8 cm off-axis			1.1250	1.003		1.0922	1.004	figure 1(f)
MLC transmission			1.1300	1.008				figure 1(i)
IMRT beam (10 × 10 cm^2 approx)			1.1201	0.999				figure 12

[a] These are the values in the IAEA TRS-398 code of practice (Andreo *et al* 2000).

Sanchez-Deblado et al, Phy. Med. Biol., 48, 2081, 2003

Cyber Knife Dosimetry







Machine type	%dd(10)$_x$	$(\bar{\mu}_{en}/\rho)^{w}_{wall}$
		Wall=C-552
Linac	66.3	1.1091
Cyberknife	60.8	1.1088
		Wall=Carbon
Linac	66.3	1.1144
Cyberknife	60.8	1.1144
		Wall=PMMA

Machine type	%dd(10)$_x$	$(\bar{L}/\rho)^{w}_{air}$ Water	PMMA	Carbon	C-552
Linac	66.3[a]	1.1208	1.0878	0.9876	0.9836
Cyberknife	60.8[b]	1.1194	1.0859	0.9854	0.9817

[a] For a 10×10 cm^2 field at 100 cm SSD from a Varian 6 MV-linear accelerator.
[b] For a 60 mm circular collimator at 80 cm SSD from a Cyberknife system.

F. Araki, Med. Phys. 33, 2955-2963 (2006).

Correction Factors

Correction Factor depends on:
- Field size
- Source size (FWHM)
- Detector type

TABLE VII. F_{cor} of the four detectors for the 5, 7.5, and 10 mm collimators, as a function of the FWHM.

A16 FWHM (mm)	F_{cor} 5 mm coll	7.5 mm coll	10 mm coll
1.4	1.067	1.021	1.008
1.8	1.087	1.017	1.007
2.2	1.102	1.020	1.012
2.6	1.112	1.027	1.010
Pin Point FWHM (mm)	F_{cor} 5 mm coll	7.5 mm coll	10 mm coll
1.4	1.082	1.025	1.017
1.8	1.099	1.024	1.013
2.2	1.110	1.025	1.013
2.6	1.124	1.037	1.016
Diode FWHM (mm)	F_{cor} 5 mm coll	7.5 mm coll	10 mm coll
1.4	0.953	0.966	0.978
1.8	0.955	0.966	0.978
2.2	0.957	0.967	0.978
2.6	0.940	0.967	0.978
Diamond FWHM (mm)	F_{cor} 5 mm coll	7.5 mm coll	10 mm coll
1.4	1.066	1.001	1.001
1.8	1.093	1.007	1.000
2.2	1.107	1.010	0.999
2.6	1.123	1.012	1.001

Francescon, et al Med Phys 35, 504, 2008

Published data on $k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$



Francescon et al Med Phys,38, 6513, 2011

$k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$ of Linear Accelerators (Varian)

Implementing a newly proposed Monte Carlo based small field dosimetry formalism for a comprehensive set of diode detectors

G. Cranmer-Sargison[a)]
Department of Medical Physics, Saskatchewan Cancer Agency, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 4H4, Canada and Division of Medical Physics, Leeds Institute of Genetics, Health and Therapeutics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

S. Weston
Department of Medical Physics and Engineering, St James's University Hospital, Leeds LS9 7TF, United Kingdom

J. A. Evans
Division of Medical Physics, Leeds Institute of Genetics, Health and Therapeutics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

N. P. Sidhu
Saskatoon Cancer Centre, Saskatchewan Cancer Agency, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 4H4, Canada and Department of Physics and Engineering, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5E2, Canada

D. I. Thwaites
Institute of Medical Physics, School of Physics, University of Sydney, Sydney NSW 2006, Australia and Division of Medical Physics, Leeds Institute of Genetics, Health and Therapeutics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

(Received 21 April 2011; revised 11 October 2011; accepted for publication 14 October 2011; published 23 November 2011)

Med. Phys. 38 (12), 6992, 2011

$k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$ of Linear Accelerators

Calculation of $k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$ for several small detectors and for two linear accelerators using Monte Carlo simulations

P. Francescon,[a] S. Cora, and N. Satariano
Department of Medical Physics, ULSS 6 – 36100 Vicenza, Italy

Med. Phys. 38 (12), 6513-6527, 2011

Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect
Radiotherapy and Oncology
journal homepage: www.thegreenjournal.com
ELSEVIER

Experimental small field 6 MV output ratio analysis for various diode detector and accelerator combinations

Gavin Cranmer-Sargison[a,b,*], Steve Weston[b,c], Narinder P. Sidhu[a,d], David I. Thwaites[b,e]

Radiotherapy and Oncology 100 (2011) 429–435

$k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$ Cyber Knife

Detector	5 mm		7.5 mm		10 mm	
	$M^{f_{clin}}_{Q_{clin}}/M^{f_{msr}}_{Q_{msr}}$	$k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$	$M^{f_{clin}}_{Q_{clin}}/M^{f_{msr}}_{Q_{msr}}$	$k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$	$M^{f_{clin}}_{Q_{clin}}/M^{f_{msr}}_{Q_{msr}}$	$k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$
A16	0.626 (15)	1.089 (3)	0.811 (10)	1.018 (3)	0.866 (6)	1.010 (3)
PinPoint	0.620 (17)	1.101 (3)	0.801 (7)	1.024 (3)	0.862 (5)	1.015 (3)
Diode 60008	0.726 (1)	0.943 (3)	0.873 (1)	0.949 (3)	0.912 (1)	0.964 (3)
Diode 60012	0.705 (1)	0.956 (3)	0.847 (2)	0.966 (3)	0.891 (1)	0.978 (3)
EDGE	0.726 (1)	0.948 (3)	0.864 (1)	0.955 (3)	0.906 (1)	0.966 (3)
Alanine	0.544 (8)	1.249 (8)	0.785 (12)	1.059 (4)	0.855 (13)	1.019 (3)
TLD	0.668 (4)	⋯	0.809 (6)	⋯	0.880 (8)	⋯
EBT films	0.659 (17)	⋯	0.811 (16)	⋯	0.853 (18)	⋯
Polymer gels[a]	0.702 (21)	⋯	0.872 (27)	⋯	0.929 (29)	⋯

Pantelis et al, Med Phy. 37, 2369-2379, 2010

CyberKnife data



Moignier et al, Med Phys 41(7), 071702, 2014

IOP PUBLISHING METROLOGIA
Metrologia 49 (2012) S215–S218

The influence of linac spot size on scatter factors

D Czarnecki[1], J Wulff[1] and K Zink[1,2]



Output correction factors for nine small field detectors in 6 MV radiation therapy photon beams: A PENELOPE Monte Carlo study

Med Phys, 41(4), 041711, 2014

Hamza Benmakhlouf[a)]
Department of Medical Physics, Karolinska University Hospital, SE-171 76 Stockholm, Sweden, and Department of Physics, Medical Radiation Physics, Stockholm University and Karolinska Institute, SE-171 76 Stockholm, Sweden

Josep Sempau
Institut de Tècniques Energètiques, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Diagonal 647, E-08028, Barcelona, Spain

Pedro Andreo
Department of Physics, Medical Radiation Physics, Stockholm University and Karolinska Institute, SE-171 76 Stockholm, Sweden



Newer Data on $k^{f_{clin},f_{msr}}_{Q_{clin},Q_{msr}}$





Benmakhlouf et al, Med Phys, 41(4), 041711, 2014

Detector to detector corrections: A comprehensive experimental study of detector specific correction factors for beam output measurements for small radiotherapy beams

Godfrey Azangwe[a)] and Paulina Grochowska
International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna International Centre, PO Box 100, 1400 Vienna, Austria

Dietmar Georg
Department of Radiation Oncology, Medical University Vienna/AKH Vienna, Währinger Gürtel 18-20, A-1090 Vienna, Austria and Christian Doppler Laboratory for Medical Radiation Research for Radiation Oncology, Medical University Vienna, Vienna, Währinger Gürtel 18-20, A-1090 Vienna, Austria

Joanna Izewska
International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna International Centre, PO Box 100, 1400 Vienna, Austria

Johannes Hopfgartner and Wolfgang Lechner
Department of Radiation Oncology, Medical University Vienna/AKH Vienna, Währinger Gürtel 18-20, A-1090 Vienna, Austria and Christian Doppler Laboratory for Medical Radiation Research for Radiation Oncology, Medical University Vienna, Vienna, Währinger Gürtel 18-20, A-1090 Vienna, Austria

Claus E. Andersen, Anders R. Beierholm, and Jakob Helt-Hansen
Center for Nuclear Technologies, Technical University of Denmark, Risø Campus, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark

Hideyuki Mizuno and Akifumi Fukumura
National Institute of Radiological Sciences, 4-9-1, Anagawa, Inage-ku, Chiba-shi 263-8555, Japan

Kaori Yajima
Association for Nuclear Technology in Medicine, 7-16, Nihonbashikodenmacho, chuou-ku, Tokyo 103-0001, Japan

Clare Gouldstone and Peter Sharpe
National Physical Laboratory, Acoustics and Ionising Radiation Division, Teddington TW11 0LW, United Kingdom

Ahmed Meghzifene
International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna International Centre, PO Box 100, 1400 Vienna, Austria

Hugo Palmans
National Physical Laboratory, Acoustics and Ionising Radiation Division, Teddington TW11 0LW, United Kingdom and EBG MedAustron GmbH, Medical Physics Department, A-2700 Wiener Neustadt, Austria

072103-1 Med. Phys. 41 (7), July 2014



072103-11 Azangwe *et al.*: Detector specific correction factors for small radiotherapy beams 072103-11

TABLE V. Detector correction factors $(p_{fl})^{Q_{clin}}_{Q_{int}}(p_{spec})^{Q_{clin}}_{Q_{int}}$. Factors shown are ratios of detector ratios relative to the dose ratios determined from alanine measurement for each field size $\left(\frac{D^{f_{clin}}_{w,Q_{clin}}}{D^{f_{int}}_{w,Q_{int}}}\right)/\left(\frac{M^{f_{clin}}_{Q_{clin}}}{M^{f_{int}}_{Q_{int}}}\times(p_{vol})^{Q_{clin}}_{Q_{int}}\right)$.

FS [cm]	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.8	2.4	3.0	4.2	10.0
TLD chips	1.000	…	1.003	1.008	1.004	1.000	1.005	1.010
TLD micro-cubes	0.998	…	1.000	1.001	1.009	1.000	1.001	1.007
IBA SFD diode	0.995	…	0.998	1.002	1.006	1.000	0.990	0.969
IBA PFD diode	0.936	…	0.962	0.985	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.001
IBA EFD diode	0.961	…	0.983	0.992	1.002	1.000	0.997	0.989
PTW 60003Diamond (Sensitive area ~ 15 mm^2)	0.995	…	0.983	0.992	1.002	1.000	0.996	0.995
PTW 60019 microDiamond	0.961	…	0.980	0.990	1.001	1.000	0.999	1.000
RPLD (GDM-302M)	…	…	…	0.993	0.998	1.000	0.994	0.997
Al_2O_3:C	0.980	0.982	0.985	0.991	0.999	1.000	…	0.995
Scintillator 1	1.022	1.009	1.000	0.996	1.001	1.000	…	0.992
Scintillator 2	1.028	1.015	1.006	1.000	1.004	1.000	…	0.988
PTW 31018microLion	0.970	…	0.980	0.990	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.005
IBA CC01	1.000	…	0.993	0.993	1.000	1.000	0.997	0.990
IBA CC04	1.096	…	1.007	0.998	1.003	1.000	0.997	0.998
IBA CC13[b]	…	…	1.033	1.008	1.005	1.000	0.996	0.996
Wellhofer IC10[b]	…	…	1.030	1.005	1.005	1.000	0.996	0.996
PTW 31014 PinPoint	1.034	…	1.007	1.002	1.000	1.000	0.998	1.002
PTW 31016 PinPoint 3D	1.078	…	1.013	1.000	1.001	1.000	0.998	0.999
PTW 31010 Semiflex[b]	…	…	1.027	1.002	1.004	1.000	0.996	0.997
PTW 31013 Semiflex[a,b]	…	…	…	…	1.013	1.000	0.992	0.993

[a]This chamber was included in the table for completeness but it is not recommended to use for small field dosimetry in fields smaller than 2.0 × 2.0 cm^2 because the volume averaging effect is unacceptably high.
[b]For these ionization chambers, corrections for the smallest field were unacceptably high (>20%) for field sizes smaller than 1 × 1 cm^2 and therefore were excluded from Table V.











IOP Publishing | Institute of Physics and Engineering in Medicine — Physics in Medicine and Biology
Phys. Med. Biol. 59 (2014) 4973–5002 — doi:10.1088/0031-9155/59/17/4973

Correction-less dosimetry of nonstandard photon fields: a new criterion to determine the usability of radiation detectors

Y Kamio[1,2] and H Bouchard[1,2,3]

[1] Département de physique, Université de Montréal, Pavillon Roger-Gaudry (D-428), 2900 Boulevard Édouard-Montpetit, Montréal, Québec H3T 1J4, Canada
[2] Centre hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal (CHUM), 1560 Sherbrooke est, Montréal, Québec H2L 4M1, Canada
[3] Acoustics and Ionising Radiation Team, National Physical Laboratory, Hampton Road, Teddington TW11 0LW, UK

6 MV

Detectors	Square field size (cm)								
	0.50	0.75	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.50	3.00
MicroLion	3.1	2.0	1.3	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
N. Diamond	3.8	2.4	1.5	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1
U. diode	4.9	3.0	1.9	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.1
Alanine	1.4	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
S. Fiber	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1

[a]Values are rounded to the nearest 0.1%.

25 MV

Detectors	Square field size (cm)								
	0.50	0.75	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.50	3.00
MicroLion	2.4	1.8	1.4	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.2
N. Diamond	3.3	2.1	1.5	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.1
U. diode	4.0	2.8	2.1	1.6	1.3	1.0	0.9	0.5	0.3
Alanine	1.5	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
S. Fiber	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Machine, Cone & Depth?

Can small field diode correction factors be applied universally?

Paul Z.Y. Liu [a,b,*], Natalka Suchowerska [a,b], David R. McKenzie [a]

[a] School of Physics, The University of Sydney; and [b] Department of Radiation Oncology, Chris O'Brien Lifehouse, Camperdown, Australia

Radiotherapy Oncology, 112, 442-446, 2014



IJDas (32) INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Validity of Proposed Method



IJDas (33) INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Summary

- Understand the limit of small field
- Focal spot issues
- Detectors that are water equivalent like, MicroLion, MicroDiamond and Plastic Scintillators are best suited
- Use proper correction factors to correct detector response to correct for the dose
- Watch for IAEA and TG-155 guidelines when they are published

IJDas (34) INDIANA UNIVERSITY