Comparative Evaluation of a 6MV Flattened Beam and a Flattening Filter Free Beam for Carcinoma of Cervix – IMRT Planning Study
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Abstract

Purpose: Intensity modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) plan quality, beam on time and integral dose were compared using 6MV FB (Flattened Beam) and FFFB (Flattening filter free beam) for carcinoma of cervix. Materials and Methods: Ten patients with stage II–IIIB cervix cancer (Ca.Cx) were retrospectively identified from the department database. Target volume (TV) and organ at risk (OAR) were delineated as per Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG) cancer guidelines. Dose prescribed to planning target volume (PTV) was 50.4Gy in 28 fractions. Two plans (6MV FB IMRT and 6MV FFFB IMRT) were generated to achieve 95% of prescription dose to PTV and sparing OAR as per normal tissue guidelines. Numbers of beams and their orientations were the same for all plans. The homogeneity index (HI), conformity index (CI), treatment monitor unit (MU), beam on time (BOT) and non-tumor integral dose (NTID) were chosen for comparison. Results: FFFB generated plans were clinically acceptable. There was a statistically significant difference among the FB IMRT and FFFB IMRT plans with respect to CI, HI, D50%, D2% in PTV coverage, bladder V50Gy, MU, mean NTID and non-tumor low dose volume. Conclusions: 6MV flattened and flattening filter free photon beams produce comparable plans by IMRT. FFF beams allow time efficient treatment delivery and may help reduce the risk of secondary malignances in carcinoma cervix cases.
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Introduction

IMRT technique is the treatment choice for gynecologic cancer due to adequate TV coverage and increased OAR’s sparing as compared to three dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3DCRT) (Georg, 2006). Historically, flattened beam was used to generate the clinically acceptable doses in TV and for reducing doses to OAR’s by 3DCRT or advanced technique such as IMRT or volumetric modulated arc therapy (VMAT). In recent years, utilization of advanced technique increased due to creation of conformal plans. In this technique, flattened beam is modified by fluence modification algorithm to generate required dose distribution, thereby invalidating need for flatten beam. Therefore, flattening filter becomes unnecessary in advanced technique (Georg, 2011).

Kry (2005) and Hall (1995; 2003; 2006) noted that IMRT technique needs higher MU’s to achieve the treatment goal and resulted in increased non-tumor integral dose to the patient. Presence of flattening filter increases the leakage and scatter radiation in the treatment head, multiple beam angles contribute to higher volume of non-tumor tissue being exposed to lower doses which may lead to a higher chance of radiation-induced second cancer risk (SCR) after IMRT.

Various authors Cashmore et al., (2008); Kry et al., (2007) and Kragl et al., (2009) showed that that the, flattening filter removed from linear accelerator treatment head resulted in increased dose rate by a factor 2 to 4, reduced collimator scatter factor, head leakage, peripheral dose and neutron leakage in higher energies (>10MV). Present study to analyze, whether FFFB generate clinically acceptable treatment plans and compared them with FB in Carcinoma cervix cases using IMRT modality.

Materials and Methods

Patients Characteristics

Ten cervix cancer (stage II–IIIB) patients were retrospectively selected for this study. Mean PTV volume was 1493.9±264.8cm³ (Ranges 1154.8cm³ to 1859.22cm³). The mean rectum and bladder volumes were 113.462±68.2 cm³ (Ranges 39.83 cm³ to 218.14 cm³) and 346.03±91.8 cm³ (Ranges 168.02 cm³ to 456.36 cm³).
cm³) respectively. The mean volume was 3137.40±890.83 cm³ (Ranges 742.62 cm³ to 3274.06 cm³). The mean right femur and left femur volumes were 99.03±14.68 cm³ (Ranges 87.2 cm³ to 132.19 cm³) and 100.77±16.26 cm³ (Ranges 88.3 cm³ to 130.41 cm³) respectively. The average anterior-posterior and right-left separation of the patient body was 23.5±2.9 cm (Ranges 21.0 cm to 29.8 cm) and 35.3±4.2 cm (Ranges 29.8 cm to 44.0 cm), respectively. Average PTV length was 18.9±1.9 cm (Ranges 15.5 cm to 22.0 cm).

Imaging and contouring

All patients were immobilized with thermoplastic cast (Orfit Industry NV, Belgium), in supine position with the help of All-in One board (AIO, Orfit Industry NV, Belgium), and knee rest support with full bladder protocol. Radio opaque fiducials were placed over the thermoplastic cast to guide the isocenter shift during first day of treatment delivery. CT scans were acquired on a CT-simulator at 3-mm slice intervals using Siemens SOMATOM Sensation Open CT Scanner (Siemens Medical Systems, Germany) CT axial images were obtained from the L2 vertebral body to 5 cm below the ischial tuberosith with intravenous contrast. After CT simulation, DICOM images were transferred to Eclipse Treatment Planning System (version 11.0 Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto, California, USA).

Target volume and organs at risk definition

TV and OAR’s were delineated in axial CT slices by radiation oncologists as per the recommendations of International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements Reports (ICRU) 50 and 62, (ICRU Report 50, 1993; ICRU Report 62, 1999). The gross tumor volume (GTV) includes the cervix with visible tumor extension of International Atomic Energy Agency. Plans were optimized selecting a maximum dose rate of 600MU/min in 6MV FB and 1,400MU/min for 6MV FFMB. For all patients, two plans 6MV FB IMRT and 6MV FFMB IMRT were designed using Eclipse Treatment planning system (TPS) version 11.0 (Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto, CA, USA) using IMRT technique. Anisotropic analytical algorithm with 0.25 cm grid size was used for photon dose calculation for all plans.

Sliding window IMRT Planning

A fixed multiple beam arrangement was chosen. Isocentre was placed approximately at the Centre of mass of PTV. Fields were equally spaced at 50° intervals coplanar beams consisting of the following gantry angles: 0°, 50°, 100°, 150°, 200°, 250°, and 300°. IMRT plans were created with inverse planning optimization with dose volume optimizer and AAA for final dose calculation. Collimator rotation of 3° were used in each beam angle to cover the entire PTV and reduce tongue and groove effect which subsequently minimizes inter-leaf leakage (Deng, 2001).

Plan Evaluation and statistical Methods

As per ICRU Report 83 (ICRU Report 83, 2010) doses to the TV and OARs were recorded from their respective cumulative dose volume histogram (cDVHs).

Homogeneity index (HI)

A ratio evaluating the dose homogeneity (D1%-D95%/D50%), in TV, where D1%, D50%, and D95% are the minimum dose delivered to 2%, 98%, and 50% volume of the TV, respectively. HI of zero indicated homogeneous dose distribution.

Conformity index (CI)

A ratio evaluating the coverage of the prescription dose in treatment plans. CI = Volume within 98% isodose line/TV. CI of one indicated the good dose conformity.

Rectum and bladder were evaluated for mean dose and V50Gy, where V50Gy is the volume of rectum and bladder receiving a dose of 50 Gy. Bowel, right and left femoral heads were evaluated for mean doses.

Normal tissue integral dose (D’Souza, 2003) (NTID), defined as the integral of the absorbed dose extending to overall voxels excluding those within the TV. It was calculated to assess the plan quality based on the following formula.

\[
\text{Normal tissue integral dose (NTID)} = \text{Mean dose} \times \text{Volume of normal tissue outside TV}
\]

In addition, treatment parameters including the monitor units (MU) and beam ON time (BOT) for each treatment plan were recorded for evaluation. BOT was defined as the radiation delivery time and did not include gantry movement, the patient positioning and imaging procedures, which was noted while performing QA.
A test of significance was required in order to quantify the differences between parameters in FF and FFF plans. All statistical tests were done using paired sample t-test for comparisons of data performed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software (release 20.0, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Statistical significance was defined as \( p < 0.05 \).

**Results**

All the plans satisfied our dosimetric criterion and were evaluated using cumulative dose volume histogram. Dose to PTV and OAR’s are tabulated in Table 1. Isodose distribution of axial, coronal and sagittal views of one patient resulted from IMRT planning using 6MV FB and FFF beams were represented in Figure 1. Comparison of the dose volume histograms of TV and OAR’s for 6MV FB IMRT and 6MV FFFB IMRT beam represented in Figure 2.

**Target Volume Coverage**

CI and HI of target PTV were improved in 6MV FB IMRT when compared to 6MV FFFB IMRT. There was no big difference in dose distribution between FB and FFFB, except D50% and D2%. The present study indicated that the HI, CI and D2% of target PTV for 6MV FB IMRT in comparison to FFFF IMRT plans, the p value were significant (\( p<0.05 \)). The p values were not significant for D98% and D95% of the PTV coverage. HI and CI of FB are 0.046 ± 0.005 and 1.12 ± 0.03 respectively and 0.059 ± 0.007 and 1.17 ± 0.05 for FFFB. 6MV FB IMRT produces more homogenous and highly conformal plans in comparison to FFFB IMRT.

Table 1. Target Parameters, NTID and Low Dose Volume Comparison between 6MV FB and FFFB for HI (Homogeneity index), CI (Conformity index), MU (Monitoring units) and BOT (Beam on time in minutes). Vx is the volume receiving \( x\% \) of the prescribed dose. Dx% is dose received by \( x\% \) of volume. SD, Standard deviation; NS, No significant.

| Parameters          | 6MV FB IMRT | 6MV FFFB IMRT | p value |
|---------------------|-------------|---------------|---------|
| \( D_{50\%} \) (Gy) | 50.09       | 50.04         | NS      |
| \( D_{95\%} \) (Gy) | 50.42       | 50.41         | NS      |
| \( D_{98\%} \) (Gy) | 51.32       | 51.62         | <0.05   |
| \( V_{50Gy} \) (%) | 47.48       | 43.22         | NS      |
| \( V_{1Gy} \) (cc) | 19668.27    | 19517.07      | <0.05   |
| \( V_{2Gy} \) (cc) | 15824.42    | 15767.03      | <0.05   |
| \( V_{3Gy} \) (cc) | 14634.08    | 14316.88      | <0.05   |
| \( V_{4Gy} \) (cc) | 13366.11    | 13146.82      | <0.05   |
| \( V_{5Gy} \) (cc) | 12387.08    | 12188.11      | <0.05   |

Table 2. OAR’S Comparison between 6MV FB and UFB. Abbreviations: Dmean is mean dose and Dmax is the maximum dose.

| Organ    | Dose Volume | 6MV FB IMRT | 6MV FFFB IMRT | p value |
|----------|-------------|-------------|---------------|---------|
| Bladder  | \( D_{mean} \) (Gy) | 45.43       | 45.48         | 1.33    | NS      |
|          | \( V_{50Gy} \) (%) | 46.09       | 47.48         | 4.5     | <0.05   |
| Rectum   | \( D_{mean} \) (Gy) | 42.83       | 43.22         | 3.61    | NS      |
|          | \( V_{50Gy} \) (%) | 33.94       | 33.93         | 10.7    | NS      |
| Rt.Femur | \( D_{mean} \) (Gy) | 22.28       | 22.21         | 3.06    | NS      |
| Lt.Femur | \( D_{mean} \) (Gy) | 22.79       | 22.72         | 2.46    | NS      |
| Bowel    | \( D_{mean} \) (Gy) | 18.2        | 18.31         | 4.92    | NS      |

Figure 1. The Isodose Distribution Generated from IMRT Planning in Case of Ca.Cervix for Same Patient in Axial, Coronal and Sagittal Planes with (a) 6 MV FB IMRT and (b) 6 MV FFFB IMRT.

**OAR’s**

Mean dose to bladder, rectum, femur and bowel were not statistically significant difference between two plans. But \( V_{50Gy} \) of bladder was statistically significant (\( p<0.05 \)) and \( V_{50Gy} \) of rectum also not significant.

**Non-tumor integral dose and low dose volume on normal tissue**

Difference among two plans in terms of mean non-tumor tissue integral dose and low dose volume was

Figure 2. Comparison of the DVH of TV and OAR’s for 6MV FB IMRT (Triangle) and 6MV FB FFF Beam (Square).
increased by a factor of 2.06 as compared to 6MV FB. In the flattening filter, recalibration of MU was not performed.

In our study, both FB and FFF x-ray beams were calibrated, and the dose per MU was kept as 1 for at 10x10 cm2 field size at a depth of dose maximum. (1cGy=1MU).

Fu et al., (2004) found reduced treatment time by 46% for FFF beam IMRT treatment, depending upon the dose per fraction. This time advantage increased further, when using higher dose per fraction. However, difference was insignificant for standard fractionation of 2Gy per fraction.

This study is purely a dosimetric study. Further studies are required to note the clinical impact of FFF beam in cervical cancer cases.

In conclusion, 6MV flattening filter free x-ray beam produces dosimetrically and clinically acceptable plans by IMRT technique. The FFFB has the benefit of faster treatment delivery with lesser dose to normal tissues. Choosing advanced innovative technology plays an important role in modern radiotherapy and will help increase patient safety, reduce patient waiting time and chance of developing secondary cancers after radiotherapy. In this study, we recommended that 6MV FFF x-ray beam was a good choice for Cervical Cancer IMRT. Further clinical and radiobiological studies are needed for other sites.
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