Published in final edited form as:

Phys Med Biol. 2012 December 21; 57(24): 8271–8283. doi:10.1088/0031-9155/57/24/8271.

Adaptive IMRT using a multiobjective evolutionary algorithm integrated with a diffusion-invasion model of glioblastoma

C H Holdsworth^{1,2}, D Corwin¹, R D Stewart¹, R Rockne¹, A D Trister^{1,3}, K R Swanson¹, and M Phillips¹

C H Holdsworth: choldsworth@partners.org

¹University of Washington Medical Center, 1959 N. E. Pacific Street, Seattle, WA 98195

²Brigham and Women's Hospital, 75 Francis Street, Boston, MA 02115

³Sage Bionetworks, 1100 Fairview Avenue N, Seattle, WA 98109

Abstract

We demonstrate a patient-specific method of adaptive IMRT treatment for glioblastoma using a multi-objective evolutionary algorithm (MOEA). The MOEA generates spatially optimized dose distributions using an iterative dialog between the MOEA and a mathematical model of tumor cell proliferation, diffusion, and response. Dose distributions optimized on a weekly basis using biological metrics have the potential to substantially improve and individualize treatment outcomes. Optimized dose distributions were generated using three different decision criteria for the tumor and compared with plans utilizing standard dose of 1.8 Gy/fraction to the CTV (T2-visible MRI region plus a 2.5 cm margin). The sets of optimal dose distributions generated using the MOEA approach the Pareto front (the set of IMRT plans that delineate optimal tradeoffs amongst the clinical goals of tumor control and normal tissue sparing). MOEA optimized doses demonstrated superior performance as judged by three biological metrics according to simulated results. The predicted number of reproductively viable cells 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment was found to be the best target objective for use in the MOEA.

1. Introduction

Glioblastoma multiforme (GBM) is the most common primary brain malignancy and is characterized by extensive infiltration of normal tissue. This highly resilient tumor cannot be cured using current clinical methods, and patients have a median survival of approximately 14 months with the standard of care including surgery, radiation, and chemotherapy (Stupp *et al* 2005). These therapies are often limited by the potential toxicities to the normal brain.

Large clinical target margins and volumes are routinely used in radiation therapy of GBM due to its widely diffuse nature. Based on a number of dose escalation trials for GBM, a dose of ~50 Gy in standard fractions to the clinical target volume (CTV) of the T2 enhancing region plus a 2.5 cm margin followed by a boost dose of ~10 Gy to the gross tumor volume (GTV) of the T1Gd enhancing region plus a 2 cm margin results in a modest prolongation in patient survival with low risk of radiation necrosis and cognitive decline within the first 12–24 months after treatment (Lawrence *et al* 2010). However, uniform prescription doses such as these do not take into account the patient-specific diffuse disease distribution peripheral to the imaging abnormality or the biological tumor heterogeneity of these tumors. Other tissue-level factors governing the response, reoccurrence and progression of disease such as hypoxia (Brown 2000, Carlson *et al* 2011), genomic instability (Perez-Garcia *et al* 2012), and the presence of cancer stem cells (Binda *et al* 2012) are also not considered in these non-optimized plans.

As an alternative to the standard practice of prescribing uniform doses to targets, IMRT can be used to deliver non-uniform dose distributions that are tailored to patient-specific, biological, and spatial metrics derived from models of tumor and normal cell radiation response. An optimal treatment plan must incorporate the effects of radiation with respect to both cancer cells and normal tissue in addition to the evolving cell distributions during a course of treatment (Tome and Fowler 2003). The high level of spatial complexity required to optimize these treatment plans is challenging using conformal dose delivery methods, but may be quite practical by combining IMRT with biologically based plan optimization.

In multiobjective IMRT optimization, a plan is only considered to *dominate* (be superior to) another plan if all of its decision criteria (clinical objectives) are more optimal than all of the decision criteria of the inferior plan. Each structure (target or OAR) typically has one decision criteria, so one IMRT plan with more uniform target coverage may have higher dose to OARs than another IMRT plan with worse target coverage. In this case, neither plan would dominate or be considered superior to the other in a multiobjective context. Hence, in multiobjective IMRT optimization there is no single optimal plan, and the best possible solution is the set of plans that can not be dominated and that represents the optimal tradeoffs amongst all decision criteria. This set is known as the Pareto Front.

Current practice in radiation therapy is to assume a steady state model of the tumor and to optimize based on the size and location of the tumor at the beginning of treatment. Tumor growth is occasionally accounted for in different fractionation schedules by calculating the biologically equivalent dose with a term included for repopulation. In this work, strategies for biologically-guided radiation therapy (Stewart and Li 2007) are used to examine potential gains in treatment effectiveness that are possible by combining a patient-specific, diffusion-invasion model of glioblastoma (Rockne *et al* 2009, Rockne *et al* 2010) with a multiobjective evolutionary algorithm (MOEA) for dose optimization (Holdsworth *et al* 2010, Holdsworth *et al* 2011, Holdsworth *et al* 2012). We present an algorithm for IMRT optimization that includes the effects of radiation-induced cell kill, tumor diffusion, and proliferation. The optimization algorithm accounts for the temporal development of the tumor by performing weekly optimizations and by including the future state of the tumor in the optimization objectives.

2. Methods

2.1 Linear-Quadratic (LQ) Cell Survival Model and Equivalent uniform dose (EUD)

In the LQ model (Hall *et al* 1994), the fraction of cells, S , that survive absorbed dose d (Gy), delivered to a region of tissue in n fractions, is given as $S(nd) = \exp(-\alpha nd - \beta Gn^2 d^2)$, where α (Gy^{-1}) and β (Gy^{-2}) are intra- and inter-track radiation sensitivity parameters and G is the Lea-Catcheside dose-protraction factor (Sachs *et al.* 1997). For a typical radiation therapy treatment consisting of n well separated fractions, G can be approximated by $G \cong 1/n$ (Stewart and Li 2007), and the LQ survival model can be re-written as $S(nd) = \exp(-\alpha nd - \beta nd^2)$. In this study, we used $\alpha = 0.12 \text{ Gy}^{-1}$ and $\alpha/\beta = 3 \text{ Gy}$ for normal brain tissue.

Equivalent uniform dose (EUD) is a method for quantifying non-uniform dose distributions. EUD is defined as the absorbed dose, which if uniformly delivered to a tissue region of interest, will produce the same biological effect as delivery of the non-uniform dose distribution to the same tissue region of interest (Niemierko 1997). To compute this we solve iteratively for **EUD** as shown in equation 1:

$$\sum_i c_i v_i e^{-\alpha d_i - \beta_i d_i^2} = \left[\sum_i c_i v_i \right] e^{-\alpha \text{EUD} - \beta \text{EUD}^2}, \quad (1)$$

where c_i , v_i and d_i represent the cell density, volume and dose, respectively, at the spatial location indicated by i .

2.2. Mathematical model of GBM

A patient-specific, proliferation-invasion (PI-RT) mathematical model of GBM (Rockne et al, 2009; Rockne et al 2010) describes the change in tumor cell density with respect to time and space by quantifying net rates of proliferation (ρ time⁻¹) and invasion (D area/time). The radiosensitivity parameters α and β in the PI-RT model are the same as in LQ cell survival model. Patient-specific PI-RT parameters, except normal tissue radiosensitivity parameters, were determined from routinely available pre-treatment MRI imaging (Swanson et al 2003, Harpold et al 2007; Swanson et al 2008; Wang et al 2009; Szeto et al 2009; Rockne et al 2010). Tumor-specific estimates of α have been shown to correlate linearly with the proliferation parameter ρ and can be determined for any patient *a priori* to radiation treatment, assuming the ratio α/β is assumed to be fixed at 10 Gy (Rockne et al 2010).

Tumor cell density evolves in both space and time and represents net density per unit volume, not the behavior of individual cells. Proliferation is assumed to follow a logistic growth curve while invasion is modeled as a Fickian diffusion process. The model is of the form:

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D \nabla c) + \rho c \left(1 - \frac{c}{k}\right) - R c \left(1 - \frac{c}{k}\right), \quad (2)$$

where ρ is the rate of proliferation, D is the rate of diffusion, k is the maximum allowed tumor cell concentration, c is the tumor cell distribution as a function of space and time:

$$c = c(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad (3)$$

and

$$R = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{between daily fractions} \\ 1 - S(\alpha, \beta, d(\mathbf{x}, t)), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $d(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the radiation dose distribution and S is the estimated surviving fraction using the LQ cell survival model with the parameters α and β .

The GBM model uses a “tip of the iceberg” view of clinical imaging, where the boundaries of the enhancing regions on T1Gd and T2 MRIs are associated with isosurfaces of constant density. These isosurfaces are used to infer a gradient of tumor cells, characterized by an invisibility index, the ratio of model parameters D/ρ (Rockne et al 2010, Szeto et al 2009, Wang et al 2009, Harpold et al 2007). The GBM model is a form of the well-studied Fisher’s equation, with solutions that approach a traveling wave with a constant velocity of $2 \sqrt{D \rho}$ (Fisher et al 1937). This is in agreement with observed linear velocities on serial MRI of untreated low-grade gliomas followed over as many as 15 years (Mandonnet et al 2003) as well as untreated GBM (Swanson et al 2002). With these two equations, we can solve for the patient-specific model parameters D and ρ algebraically as in (Rockne et al 2010, Szeto et al 2009, Wang et al 2009, Harpold et al 2007).

Results presented in the work are based on data obtained from two patients. The GBM model parameters used for patients were derived from MRI images taken before and after standard radiation therapy. The values used for the relatively radio-resistant patient 1 and the relatively radio-sensitive patient 2 are given in table 1 (patients 6 and 5 in Rockne et al 2010, respectively). Results were calculated for the standard of care plan that was generated

for clinical use that delivered 61.2 Gy in 1.8 Gy daily fractions to the CTV over 7 weeks. In order to better quantify improvement from radiation therapy, the GBM model was used to predict what the tumor size (T2 MRI visible radius) would be for patient 1 and patient 2 over time if no radiation therapy was used. Quantitative results of tumor control are reported in terms of “Treatment Gain” which is the difference of the time it takes for this baseline to reach a 4cm T2 MRI visible radius versus the time it would take using various forms of radiation treatment as calculated by the model. Normal tissue EUD is used to quantify risk to normal tissue for these simplified example patients.

2.3. MOEA for IMRT optimization

A multiobjective evolutionary algorithm (MOEA) was used for IMRT optimization (Holdsworth *et al* 2010, Holdsworth *et al* 2011, Holdsworth *et al* 2012). The MOEA itself consists of two interacting algorithms each with its own set of objectives: (1) a deterministic IMRT optimization algorithm that generates IMRT plans by minimizing a penalty function that is a weighted sum of clinical objectives and (2) an evolutionary algorithm that selects superior (non-dominated) plans based on a separate set of decision criteria. The population of superior plans is used to generate new formulations of the penalty function which can be minimized to produce new IMRT plans. Using this process of natural selection, the MOEA will produce sets of IMRT plans that approach the Pareto Front and represent the best possible tradeoff amongst decision criteria.

Deterministic multiobjective IMRT algorithms minimize fitness criteria, and then use those same criteria to judge plan quality in the selection process; however, this requires that all fitness criteria are of a mathematical form that lends itself to efficient optimization. The MOEA is a stochastic multiobjective algorithm that uses a set of penalty objectives for individual IMRT optimization, and uses a separate set of decision criteria to judge plan quality in the selection process of the evolutionary algorithm. While the penalty objectives in our algorithm are quadratic, the decision criteria have no mathematical restrictions and can be designed solely to emulate to most appropriate clinical goals. Another advantage is that the set of decision criteria can be kept small for more efficient multiobjective optimization (Holdsworth *et al* 2011), while the set of penalty objectives can be expanded for greater flexibility in the search for more optimal IMRT plans (Holdsworth *et al* 2012).

The IMRT optimization utilized in our MOEA minimizes a fairly standard penalty function that is a weighted sum of quadratic penalty objectives:

$$\sum_i \sum_j H_i(D_{\text{ref},i} - d_{i,j}) W_i (D_{\text{ref},i} - d_{i,j})^2 + F_s \quad (5)$$

where $d_{i,j}$ is dose in the j^{th} voxel of the i^{th} structure, W_i is the weight of the i^{th} structure, $D_{\text{ref},i}$ is the reference dose parameter that defines the i^{th} structure's penalty objective, F_s is a smoothing matrix that ensures the fluence can be translated into a deliverable beam, and $H_i(D_{\text{ref},i} - d_{i,j})$ is a Heaviside function that sets the weight to 0 in OAR voxels when $D_{\text{ref},i} > d_{i,j}$ and is 1 otherwise. Each iteration, the evolutionary algorithm generates sets of W_i and $D_{\text{ref},i}$ based on recombination and mutation from existing non-dominated plans that formulate a new penalty function. This penalty function is minimized generating a new IMRT plan. For this work, the quality of the plan is judged by three decision criteria described below, and all plans are compared and any dominated plans are eliminated prior to beginning the next iteration of the MOEA.

This stochastic algorithm has the advantages of being able to incorporate any form of decision criteria and of not requiring *a priori* determination of the importance of each criterion. The algorithm returns Pareto optimal plans with respect to the decision criteria

utilized in the multiobjective optimization. In this work, three decision criteria were used. Two criteria were used to evaluate all plans: (1) minimizing the maximum dose per fraction to any voxel and (2) minimizing normal tissue EUD. The third decision criterion was varied in order to see the effects of altering target optimization objectives: (3a) tumor cell kill, (3b) tumor survival after 1 week of treatment, or (3c) tumor survival 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment. For criteria 3b and 3c, the GBM model was used to predict tumor growth from that stage of the optimization process. These criteria were used in the weekly adaptive optimization process. Each fraction was scaled such that the EUD to normal brain was less than or equal to that of the standard-of-care plan and such that the maximum dose per fraction to any voxel in the scaled dose distribution was also limited by a given maximum dose (3 Gy, 8 Gy, or no limit).

In this work, the optimal distribution for each week of treatment is generated in 300 iterations, and seven weeks of treatment are generated for each scenario. Optimization of all of the distributions throughout the 34 fractions to be delivered to one patient takes anywhere from 6 minutes to 10 hours. When maximum cell kill is used as target decision criteria and there is a low allowed maximum dose, the adaptive optimization is much faster. If decision criteria for the target is calculated using the model to simulate 12 weeks of response for each iteration and if no maximum dose is used, the optimization takes much longer. The optimal distribution to be used in the GBM model for each week of treatment is selected based on a weighted sum of decision criteria. The GBM model then simulates of growth, diffusion, and radiation damage for five days using this radiation dose distribution and two weekend days without radiation. The resulting tumor cell distribution is used for the following week's optimization.

For ease of model integration and computation, simulations were carried out in a simplified three dimensional geometry where the tumor cell density was spherically symmetric and the structures in the optimization consisted of concentric shells. Each shell had its own proportion of tumor cells and genes (objectives and weights used in the penalty function) to be optimized by the MOEA. In this work, the simulations included a few sets of simple decision criteria, but other objectives such as dose to specific structures, DVH information, or any quantifiable metrics specific to a given clinical situation can be used to either judge or scale dose distributions.

Adaptive therapy was implemented by performing weekly MOEA IMRT optimizations using the most up-to-date predictions of tumor cell distributions obtained from the GBM model. Each week of treatment is simulated with the GBM model using the generated dose distribution to determine the tumor cell density used in the next round of optimization. Figure 1 demonstrates the iterative dialogue between the two algorithms.

The GBM model is used to (1) simulate each week of treatment *and* (2) calculate decision criteria in the MOEA. The results of the optimizations were compared using four metrics:

1. tumor radius as would be visible on T2 MRI;
2. dose-volume histograms of total normal tissue EUD outside of the T2 enhancing region;
3. dose-volume histograms of total tumor tissue EUD;
4. treatment gain, the delay in days for the T2 radius to reach 4 cm compared to the untreated control.

3. Results

3.1. Tumor Control Performance

In each simulation, three decision criteria were used to judge plan quality. Two of these criteria are used in every simulation while the third criterion was varied to test different models of tumor control. Results are reported in terms of the T2 MRI radius over time as predicted by the GBM model, treatment gain, and normal tissue EUD.

The predicted radius of the T2 MRI region over time is plotted for the standard plan and for the results of five different MOEA optimizations in figure 2. Three of the optimized plans were generated using minimum tumor cell survival after 1 week of treatment as the tumor control decision criteria with three different maximum dose/fraction restrictions: 3 Gy, 8 Gy, and no restriction. The other two MOEA optimizations shown use an 8 Gy/fraction maximum dose restriction using either maximum tumor cell kill per fraction or minimum tumor survival 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment for tumor control decision criteria.

A summary of results are in table 2 below. Normal tissue EUD is calculated by solving equation 1 iteratively. Treatment gain is the added number of days for the T2 MRI radii to reach 4cm using RT versus no treatment.

Note that for some simulations, the radius plot shows a steep jump in radius before resuming linear growth. This does not represent change in overall growth rate, but instead occurs when a large region of the tumor cell population achieves the minimum T2 cell density still visible on an MRI image. This reflects the complex interplay between a diffuse distribution of gliomas cells and the ability to reach a local threshold of detection to be visible on MRI.

For both patients, optimized plans with the maximum dose per fraction limited to 3 Gy resulted in response slightly worse than the standard plan for 1/4th the dose to normal tissue. For patient 1 that had lower parameter values for the net proliferation rate, ρ , and radiosensitivity, the treatment gain was lower for all RT plans, and results were similar for all optimized plans with maximum dose per fraction > 3 Gy. For patient 2 that had larger values for the net proliferation rate, ρ , and radiosensitivity, tumor response was highly dependent on both the maximum dose and the tumor control decision criterion implemented. When no maximum dose was used, the treatment gain improved to 157 days; however, the high dose in small volumes of tissue would be prohibitive for practical use in the clinical. The MOEA optimized treatment scheme that used tumor survival 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment demonstrated the best simulated performance for this patient with a treatment gain of 153 days. All results were simulated by the GBM model for two simplified example patients.

3.2. Tumor cell population dose volume histograms

Cumulative dose volume histograms (DVHs) are used to demonstrate how different tumor decision criteria and maximum dose restrictions affect dose distributions. In figure 4, DVHs using total dose delivered in 34 fractions to the tumor cell population for the standard plan compared to the five same MOEA optimized dose distributions as in figures 2 and 3 for the second patient are displayed.

The maximum dose restriction directly affects the dose delivered to the bulk of the tumor; however, the predicted tumor control of the plan that used 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment cell survival as decision criteria had a much lower dose level and performance that was comparable to the MOEA plan that did not have a maximum dose restriction according to the GBM model. This result implies that the location of tumor cells targeted for radiation therapy is as important as dose level to the tumor core when it comes to predicted long term tumor control. There is wide patient-to-patient variation in the extent of diffusely invaded

tumor cells peripheral to the imaging abnormality (Harpold 2007, Wang 2009, Szeto 2009, Rockne 2010) that supports the need for patient-individualized treatment optimization to carefully incorporate this diffuse disease extent.

Without setting a maximum dose, the optimization can reach doses over small volumes that are far higher than current clinical practice. By forcing the maximum dose of optimizations to be lower, distributions will be more acceptable for clinical use, but tumor control may be sacrificed. As previously discussed (Holdsworth *et al* 2011), the specific goals or decision criteria used during multiobjective optimization play an important role in the final dose distributions and the quality of the radiation therapy with regard to what is best for the patient.

3.3. Normal tissue dose volume histograms

In figure 5, DVHs of the normal cell population for the optimized dose distributions for the second patient are compared to the DVHs resulting from the conventional clinical radiation therapy. Minimum tumor cell survival after 1 week of treatment is used as decision criteria in the MOEA for three optimizations using different restrictions on maximum dose. DVHs for normal tissue are also displayed for two other MOEA optimizations using maximum tumor cell kill and minimum tumor cell survival 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment that are also displayed (both with an 8Gy maximum dose restriction).

4. Discussion

In this work, we report on a novel integration of an IMRT optimization algorithm with a spatially and temporally dependent glioma tumor response model. This integration has allowed for potential adaptation of the radiation delivery in response to changes in the tumor due to radiation killing, diffusion, and proliferation of the tumor cells. The use of a multiobjective optimization algorithm provides a means of searching for the best set of IMRT plans without needing to make decisions regarding the relative importance of the clinical goals before it is known what can be achieved. The choice of a stochastic MOEA has allowed us to use a number of different objectives (mathematical forms of clinical goals) that are difficult to use in deterministic optimization algorithms. These *decision criteria* provide a robust method for searching and evaluating different IMRT plans.

The use of a space-, time- and radiation-dependent model of tumor growth and distribution highlights the role that high-level biological models can play in radiation therapy. The fact that this particular model uses measured patient-specific parameters is a significant step beyond the normal use of radiobiological models in treatment optimization. In addition, the model allows us to investigate two aspects of adaptive therapy that have not been explored to any great extent, namely, to adapt the dose distribution to changes in physical distribution of the tumor and to adapt to the temporal evolution of the system.

With respect to the spatial distribution, results predicted by the mathematical model for two simplified patient examples suggest that the standard plan of uniform dose to the bulk of the tumor with a 2.5 cm margin has the potential to be improved in terms of both tumor control and normal tissue dose. MOEA optimized doses that used biological decision criteria based on a mathematical model of GBM and were adapted as the predicted tumor cell distribution changed for each week of treatment demonstrated the potential for improvement in tumor control and lower normal tissue EUD over current standard clinical practice. In results predicted by the GBM model, restricting the maximum dose per fraction to 3 Gy diminished the performance of optimized plans to control tumor invasion to the level of the standard plan; however, the EUD delivered to normal tissue in the brain was reduced by about a factor of 4 for the two simplified patient examples. Due to the greater normal tissue sparing,

one outcome could be designing dose/fractionation schedules that increase the total amount of radiation while keeping the potential risks low.

When the maximum dose restriction was increased to 8 Gy per fraction, simulated tumor control was greatly enhanced. When no restriction was used, tumor control performance improved further; however, the MOEA plan that used predicted tumor cell survival 11 weeks post treatment for tumor control decision criteria and an 8 Gy maximum dose also demonstrated the same performance for the patient. This suggests that targeting certain glioblastoma cells in locations on or just outside the edge of the tumor could be as effective as delivering high doses with high risk of brain tissue necrosis to the bulk of the tumor (Mayer *et al* 2008). One of the difficulties of this study has been in modeling the effect on normal tissue when the insidious nature of GBM results in a mixture between brain and tumor.

With respect to advantages of adapting the IMRT delivery to the temporal development of the tumor, figures 2 and 3 and table 2 show the potential advantage of using the model to predict future growth and optimizing the dose based on that prediction. We have accounted for time-dependent tumor response by performing adaptive planning during the course of delivery and by designing decision criteria that evaluate the future state of the tumor. A more general approach that uses a stochastic model of tumor response has been described by Kim *et al* (Kim *et al* 2009, Kim *et al* 2012) in which a Markov Decision Process is developed assuming periodic studies (imaging) that provide information regarding tumor response. This model also results in optimal treatment plans that vary the dose per fraction, as well as the spatial dose distribution, according to the development of the tumor. Other approaches to account for stochastic radiation effects have usually relied on applying probability distribution functions of parameters (Webb *et al* 1993).

The optimized MOEA treatment schemes deliver higher doses to smaller volumes of tissue such that each fraction delivers an EUD to normal tissue outside of the T1Gd enhancement that is less than or equal to that of the standard plan. The MOEA is flexible and will optimize on whatever decision criteria it is given. If the “high dose tails” in the optimized plans are clinically unacceptable, a different set of decision criteria could be employed to minimize them. Mathematically, the large volumes of lower dose compensate for the small volumes of high dose in the normal tissue EUD formula.

When large margins are added to targeted volume in radiation therapy to account for set up error, the PTV volumes are greatly increased. This results in much higher dose to large volumes of normal tissue relative to that of the tumor cell population. Precise, non-uniform dose distributions in radiation therapy would have to be used in conjunction with accurate localization and immobilization to minimize set up margins and take advantage of the benefits of non-uniform, biologically optimized dose distributions.

5. Conclusions

Using data from two simple example patients, a patient-specific mathematical model of glioblastoma demonstrated how adaptive radiation therapy using biological optimization of tumor cell control and normal tissue sparing has the potential to improve patient outcome. These results also suggest that using clinical objectives and decision criteria that focus on future states of the tumor has the potential to generate more efficacious dose distributions. A powerful aspect of this combined technique is the flexibility of the MOEA to adapt to any input data and to optimize to any desired end point while being informed by a patient-specific understanding of the proliferation and invasion kinetics of cancerous cells. The long term potential of this approach is greater as modeling becomes more detailed, as more effective decision criteria tailored to specific clinical situations are employed, and by

utilizing voxel-specific IMRT objectives (Holdsworth *et al*/2012) so that any patient can be optimized regardless of complexity. This work demonstrates the roles that a robust model of tumor growth and radiation response and increased information from imaging could play in improving radiation therapy for tumors that are difficult to treat, such as glioblastoma. The multiobjective optimization platform provided a powerful and flexible method for implementing these models in a clinically useful fashion that provides the decision maker with a range of achievable choices.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge NIH grants RO1CA112505 and R01NS060752 as well as the support of the James S. McDonnell Foundation.

References

- Binda E, Visioli A, Reynolds B, Vescovi AL. Heterogeneity of cancer-Initiating cells within glioblastoma. *Front Biosci* (Schol Ed). 2012; 4:1235–48. [PubMed: 22652868]
- Brahme A. Biologically based treatment planning. *Acta Oncologica*. 1999; 38:61–8. [PubMed: 10612498]
- Brahme A, Nilsson J, Belkic D. Biologically Optimized Radiation Therapy. *Acta Oncologica*. 2001; 40:725–34. [PubMed: 11765067]
- Brahme A. Individualizing cancer treatment: biological optimization models in treatment planning and delivery. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics*. 2001; 29:327–73.
- Brown JM. Exploiting the hypoxic cancer cell: mechanisms and therapeutic strategies. *Mol Med Today*. 2000; 6:157–62. [PubMed: 10740254]
- Carlson DJ, Keall PJ, Loo BW, Chen ZJ, Brown JM. Hypofractionation results in reduced tumor cell kill compared to conventional fractionation for tumors with regions of hypoxia. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2011; 79:1188–95. [PubMed: 21183291]
- Cappuccio A, Herrero M, Nunez L. Biological Optimization of tumor radiosurgery. *Medical Physics*. 2009; 36:98–104. [PubMed: 19235378]
- Craft DL, Halabi TF, Shih HA, Bortfeld TR. Approximating Convex Pareto Surfaces in Multiobjective Radiotherapy Planning. *Medical Physics*. 2006; 33:3399–407.
- Perez-Garcia A, Carrion-Navarro J, Bosch-Fortea M, Lazaro-Ibanez E, Prat-Acin R, Ayuso-Sacido A. Genomic instability of surgical sample and cancer-initiating cell lines from human glioblastoma. *Front Biosci*. 2012; 17:1469–79. [PubMed: 22201815]
- Harpold HLP, Alvord EC, Swanson KR. The evolution of mathematical modeling of glioma growth and invasion. *Journal of Neuropathology and Experimental Neurology*. 2007; 66:1–9. [PubMed: 17204931]
- Holdsworth CH, Kim M, Liao J, Phillips MH. A hierarchical evolutionary algorithm for multiobjective optimization in IMRT. *Medical Physics*. 2010; 37:4986–97. [PubMed: 20964218]
- Holdsworth CH, Kim M, Liao J, Phillips MH. Investigation of Effective Decision Criteria for Multiobjective Optimization in IMRT. *Medical Physics*. 2011; 38:2964–74. [PubMed: 21815370]
- Holdsworth CH, Kim M, Liao J, Phillips MH. The use of a multiobjective evolutionary algorithm to increase flexibility in the search for better IMRT plans. *Medical Physics*. 2012; 39:2261–74. [PubMed: 22482647]
- Kim M, Ghatge A, Phillips M. A Markov Decision Process Approach to Temporal Modulation of Dose Fractions in Radiation Therapy Planning. *Phys Med Biol*. 2009; 54:4455–76. [PubMed: 19556687]
- Kim M, Ghatge A, Phillips M. A Stochastic Control Formalism for Dynamic Biologically Conformal Radiation Therapy. *European Journal of Operations Research*. 2010; 219:541–56.
- Lawrence YR, Li XA, el Naqa I, Hahn CA, Marks LB, Merchant TE, Dicker AP. Radiation dose-volume effects in the brain. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2010; 76:20–7.

- Mandonnet E, Delattre HY, Tanguy ML, Swanson KR, Carpentier AF, Duffau H, Cornu P, Van Effenterre R, Alvord EC, Capelle L. Continuous growth of mean tumor diameter in a subset of WHO grade II gliomas. *Annals of Neurology*. 2003; 53:524–8. [PubMed: 12666121]
- Marsh JC, Gielda BT, Herskovic AM, Wendt JA, Turian JV. Sparing of the hippocampus and limbic circuit during whole brain radiation therapy: A dosimetric study using helical tomotherapy. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol*. 2010; 54:375–82. [PubMed: 20718919]
- Mayer R, Sminia P. Reirradiation Tolerance of the Human Brain. *Int J Radiat Biol Phys*. 2008; 70:1350–60.
- Neal ML, Rockne R, Trister A, Swanson KR. Predicting outcomes following therapy for glioblastoma using response metrics from patient-specific, 3D tumor models. *Annual Meeting of the Society for Neuro-Oncology*. 2011; 13(suppl 3):iii76–iii84.
- Niemierko A. Reporting and analyzing dose distributions: a concept of equivalent uniform dose. *Medical Physics*. 1997; 24:103–110. [PubMed: 9029544]
- Niyazi M, Söhn M, Schwarz SB, Lang P, Belka C, Ganswindt U. Radiation treatment parameters for re-irradiation of malignant glioma. *Strahlenther Onkol*. 2012; 188:328–33. [PubMed: 22349710]
- Qi XS, Semenenko VA, Li XA. Improved critical structure sparing with biologically based IMRT optimization. *Medical Physics*. 2009; 36:1790–9. [PubMed: 19544798]
- Rockne R, Alvord EC, Swanson KR. Prognostic significance of growth kinetics in newly diagnosed glioblastomas revealed by combining serial imaging with a novel biomathematical model. *Cancer Research*. 2009; 69:9133–40. [PubMed: 19934335]
- Rockne R, Alvord EC, Rockhill JK, Swanson KR. A Mathematical Model for Brain Tumor Response to Radiation Therapy. *Journal of Mathematical Biology Special Issue on Computational Oncology*. 2009; 58:561–78.
- Rockne R, Rockhill JK, Mrugala M, Spence AM, Kalet I, Hendrickson K, Lai A, Cloughesy T, Alvord EC, Swanson KR. Predicting the efficacy of radiotherapy in individual glioblastoma patients in vivo: a mathematical modeling approach. *Physics in Medicine and Biology*. 2010; 55:3271–85. [PubMed: 20484781]
- Sachs RK, Hahnfeld P, Brenner DJ. The link between low-LET dose-response relations and the underlying kinetics of damage production/repair/misrepair. *Int J Radiat Biol*. 1997; 72:351–74. [PubMed: 9343102]
- Semenenko VA, Reitz B, Day E, Qi XS, Miften M, Li XA. Evaluation of a commercial biologically based IMRT treatment planning system. *Medical Physics*. 2008; 35:5851–60. [PubMed: 19175141]
- Stavrev P, Hristov D, Warkentin B, Sham E, Stavreva N. Inverse treatment planning by physically constrained minimization of a biological objective function. *Medical Physics*. 2003; 30:2948–58. [PubMed: 14655942]
- Stewart RD, Li XA. BGRT: Biologically Guided Radiation Therapy – the future is fast approaching! *Medical Physics*. 2007; 34:3739–51. [PubMed: 17985619]
- Swanson KR, Bridge C, Murray JD, Alvord EC. Virtual and real brain tumors: using mathematical modeling to quantify glioma growth and invasion. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*. 2003; 216:1–10. [PubMed: 14607296]
- Swanson KR, Rostomily R, Alvord EC. Predicting Survival of Patients with Glioblastoma by Combining a Mathematical Model and Pre-operative MR imaging Characteristics: A Proof of Principle. *British Journal of Cancer*. 2008; 98:113–9. [PubMed: 18059395]
- Swanson KR, Harpold HLP, Peacock DL, Rockne R, Pennington C, Kilbride L, Grant R, Wardlaw J, Alvord EC. Velocity of Radial Expansion of Contrast-Enhancing Gliomas and Effectiveness of Radiotherapy in Individual Patients: A Proof of Principle. *Clinical Oncology*. 2008; 20:301–8. [PubMed: 18308523]
- Tome WA, Fowler JF. On the inclusion of proliferation in tumour control probability calculations for inhomogeneously irradiated tumours. *Physics in medicine and biology*. 2003; 48:261–8.
- Webb S, Nahum AE. A model for calculating tumour control probability in radiotherapy including the effects of inhomogeneous distributions of dose and clonogenic cell density. *Phys Med Biol*. 1993; 38:653–66. [PubMed: 8346278]

Wang C, Rockhill JK, Mrugala M, Peacock DL, Lai A, Jusenius A, Wardlaw JM, Cloughesy T, Spence AM, Szeto MD, Chakraborty G, Hadley J, Rockne R, Muzi M, Alvord EC Jr, Krohn K, Spence AM, Swanson KR. Quantitative Metrics of Net Proliferation and Invasion Link Biological Aggressiveness Assessed by MRI with Hypoxia Assessed by FMISO-PET in Newly Diagnosed Glioblastomas. *Cancer Research*. 2009; 69:4502–9. [PubMed: 19366800]

\$watermark-text

\$watermark-text

\$watermark-text

Figure 1.

A diagram of the data flow between the GBM model and the MOEA IMRT optimization algorithm.

Figure 2.

Plot of simulated T2 MRI radii versus time for the first patient. The untreated case and the standard protocol are compared to MOEA optimized dose distributions using maximum allowed doses per fraction of 3Gy, 8Gy, and no maximum (all using 1 week tumor survival decision criteria). Also included are simulations using tumor cell kill and tumor survival 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment (both using an 8Gy maximum dose restriction). Similar results are shown in figure 3 for the second example patient.

Figure 3.

Plot of simulated T2 MRI radii versus time for the second patient. The untreated case and standard protocol are compared to optimized dose distributions using maximum allowed doses per fraction of 3Gy, 8Gy, and no maximum (all using 1 week tumor survival decision criteria). Also included are simulations using tumor cell kill and tumor survival 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment (both using an 8Gy maximum dose restriction).

Figure 4.

Dose volume histograms of the tumor cell population are displayed for the standard plan and for the MOEA optimized plans using 1 week tumor survival decision criteria with either a 3 Gy restriction on maximum dose, an 8 Gy restriction on maximum dose, or without restriction. Also shown are DVHs for the MOEA plans that used 8 Gy maximum dose and either tumor cell kill or tumor population 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment.

Figure 5.

Dose volume histograms of the normal brain cell population are displayed for the standard plan and MOEA optimized plans using 1 week predicted tumor survival decision criteria with either a 3 Gy restriction per fraction on maximum dose, an 8 Gy per fraction restriction on maximum dose, or without a maximum dose per fraction restriction for the second patient. Normal tissue DVHs are also shown for two optimizations using an 8 Gy restriction with either tumor cell kill or tumor survival 11 weeks after 1 week of treatment.

\$watermark-text

\$watermark-text

\$watermark-text

Table 1

GBM Model Parameters Used for Study Patients

Patient	T1Gd Radius at Diagnosis (cm)	T2 Radius at Diagnosis (cm)	T1Gd Radius at 2nd Timepoint (cm)	T2 Radius at 2nd Timepoint (cm)	Time Between Scans (days)	D (cm ² /yr)	ρ (/yr)	α (/Gy)
1	1.7	2.2	1.7	2.0	13	0.11	13.68	0.02
2	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.9	19	0.09	50.29	0.27

Table 2

Patient 1		
Radiation Therapy Plan	Normal Tissue EUD (Gy)	Treatment Gain (Days)
Standard	1.00	27
3 Gy maximum with tumor survival after 1 week	0.22	16
8 Gy maximum with tumor survival after 1 week	0.81	84
No maximum with tumor survival after 1 week	0.85	84
8 Gy maximum with tumor cell kill	0.71	77
8 Gy maximum with tumor survival after 12 weeks	0.82	90
Patient 2		
Radiation Therapy Plan	Normal Tissue EUD (Gy)	Treatment Gain (Days)
Standard	1.00	68
3 Gy maximum with tumor survival after 1 week	0.27	61
8 Gy maximum with tumor survival after 1 week	0.56	113
No maximum with tumor survival after 1 week	0.93	157
8 Gy maximum with tumor cell kill	0.55	111
8 Gy maximum with tumor survival after 12 weeks	0.87	153