Published in final edited form as:

Med Dosim. 2010 ; 35(1): 43–48. doi:10.1016/j.meddos.2009.01.004.

Dosimetric Impact of Intrafractional Patient Motion in Pediatric Brain Tumor Patients

Chris Beltran, Ph.D., John Trussell, and Thomas E. Merchant, D.O., Ph.D.
Radiological Sciences, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, Memphis TN

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the dosimetric consequences of intrafractional patient motion on the clinical target volume (CTV), spinal cord, and optic nerves for non-sedated pediatric brain tumor patients. The patients were immobilized for treatment using a customized thermoplastic full-face mask and bite-block attached to an array of reflectors. The array was optically tracked by infra-red cameras at a frequency of 10 Hz. Patients were localized based on skin/mask marks and weekly films were taken to ensure proper setup. Before each noncoplanar field was delivered, the deviation from baseline of the array was recorded. The systematic error (SE) and random error (RE) were calculated. Direct simulation of the intrafractional motion was used to quantify the dosimetric changes to the targets and critical structures. Nine patients utilizing the optical tracking system were evaluated. The patient cohort had a mean of 31 ± 1.5 treatment fractions; motion data were acquired for a mean of 26 ± 6.2 fractions. The mean age was 15.6 ± 4.1 years. The SE and RE were 0.4 and 1.1 mm in the posterior-anterior, 0.5 and 1.0 mm in left-right, and 0.6 and 1.3 mm in superior-inferior directions, respectively. The dosimetric effects of the motion on the CTV were negligible; however, the dose to the critical structures was increased. Patient motion during treatment does affect the dose to critical structures, therefore, planning risk volumes are needed to properly assess the dose to normal tissues. Because the motion did not affect the dose to the CTV, the 3-mm PTV margin used is sufficient to account for intrafractional motion, given the patient is properly localized at the start of treatment.

Keywords

Pediatric brain tumor; intra-fraction motion; target localization

Introduction

Nearly one third of the 12,000 children diagnosed with cancer each year in the United States will receive external beam radiation therapy (EBRT) as part of their initial management. In modern pediatric treatment protocols, the volume targeted to receive the prescription dose is defined based on the specific diagnosis, location, extent of disease, relevant imaging studies, and clinical-and treatment-related factors including prior surgery, response to chemotherapy, and the risk of treatment-related side effects. Considering ICRU-50 and 62 definitions,^{1,2} relevant imaging studies are required to define the gross tumor volume (GTV), which is expanded by an anatomically confined margin to form the clinical target volume (CTV). The CTV is meant to account for potential subclinical invasion of the tumor and defines the

volume at risk. Ideally, the CTV would receive a tumoricidal dose of radiation, and no other tissue would be irradiated.

The concept of the planning target volume (PTV) is meant to account for temporal changes in the position, shape, and volume of the CTV, and variations in patient positioning and beam delivery that naturally occur with fractionated treatment. The former is accounted for by the internal margin (IM), while the variation in patient position is considered the setup margin (SM). The study of the IM for a given clinical scenario is amenable to weekly or daily volumetric imaging over the course of therapy. The study of the SM may be achieved by using a variety of localization tools. Improved knowledge of the components of the PTV would improve patient-specific targeting and localization, and identify opportunities to minimize target volume margins. Similar consideration should be given to the study of organs at risk (OR)² to develop precise definitions for planning risk volumes (PRV).²

The need to understand these margins for pediatric brain tumor patients has become critical, as high-dose conformal radiation therapy, including intensity modulated radiation therapy³ (IMRT) and proton therapy⁴ enter the pediatric mainstream. Given the importance and complexity of determining proper margins, numerous solutions have been proposed using population-based formulas for margin calculations^{5–12} for the SM portion of the PTV. The SM required for various adult sites and localization techniques has received considerable attention. The sites that have been studied include head and neck,^{13–16} brain,¹⁷ liver,^{18,19} prostate,^{20–24} pelvic,²⁵ and lung.^{26–28} However, there has only been one study published that focused on pediatric localization,²⁹ and it attempted to assess the interfraction margin for brain tumors based on weekly portal films.

In this paper, we determine the intrafractional motion for non-sedated pediatric brain tumor patients using optical tracking localization.³⁰ In addition, the dosimetric consequences of patient motion on the PTV, CTV, spinal cord, and optic nerves were investigated.

Methods and Materials

Patient cohort

A cohort of non-sedated pediatric brain tumor patients was immobilized for treatment using a customized thermoplastic full-face mask and frameless bite-block attached to an array of infrared reflectors. The array was registered to the treatment planning CT and the linear accelerator coordinate system then optically tracked by 2 infra-red cameras that gave positional information at a frequency of 10 Hz (Varian Frameless Array, Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto, CA). The patients were localized daily based on mask/skin marks, giving the baseline position. Weekly orthogonal films were taken to ensure proper setup. Immediately prior to the delivery of each treatment field, the deviations from baseline in the patient position as assessed from the array, was recorded.

Intrafraction margin calculations

All of the patients were treated with a noncoplanar beam arrangement, which prompts the need for a slight modification to traditional terminology. To describe the different components of the intrafraction patient motion, the terms interbeam and intrabeam were used. For each treatment field (which usually corresponded to a new table position) during a treatment fraction, the isocenter offset given by the optical system was manually recorded. These data were used to determine the interbeam motion. Because the optical system records data at a 10-Hz frequency with a corresponding time stamp, the isocenter offsets during treatment delivery were extracted and used to estimate the intrabeam motion. For example, the patient was localized via skin marks with the gantry and table at 0°, giving the baseline position of the array. The first field was then loaded and the table and gantry were moved to

the proper location. The reading of the optical array was recorded, then the treatment for that field was delivered. That reading minus the baseline gave one data point for the interbeam motion. During offline analysis, the position data of that field during beam on was shifted by the interbeam amount, giving the intrabeam motion. This insured that the interbeam and intrabeam motions were decoupled.

Interbeam and intrabeam margins for each axis; posterior-anterior (PA), left-right (LR), and superior-inferior (SI); were calculated based on the geometric¹¹ methods described by van Herk. The geometric setup margin used was $2.5 + 0.7$, where 2.5 is the systematic error (SE), given by the standard deviation of the means, and 0.7 is the random error (RE), given by the root mean square (RMS) of the standard deviations. Variation in size and shape of the target was not examined, as these are part of an internal margin.

Phantom studies were also conducted to assess the accuracy of table position given noncoplanar beam arrangements. The array phantom and solid water (for additional weight) were placed on the treatment table and subjected to 10 different treatment plans with 5 table positions per plan. The SE and RE for the phantom were calculated.

Dosimetric consequences of motion via direct simulation

For each patient, a direct simulation³¹ was performed using the PlanUNC (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) treatment planning system. The direct simulation replan consisted of creating a treatment plan with a different isocenter for each field of every fraction. The isocenter was based on the interbeam isocenter displacement registered by the optical tracking system during treatment. Dosimetric changes to the CTV, PTV, spinal cord, and optic nerves were calculated for the individual patients. The generalized EUD (gEUD)³² value was used to compare the direct simulation plan (motion) with the initial plan (static). The gEUD “A” value used was -10 for the targets and 10 for the serial-type normal structures.

Results

Patient cohort

The cohort consisted of 9 pediatric brain tumor patients with a median age of 15.6 ± 4.1 years. The median number of treatment fractions was 31 ± 1.5 and motion data was recorded for a median of 266.2 fractions, giving a total of 234 isocenters that were used in the direct simulation replans. The optical system was out of operation for 2 weeks, which was the cause of the reduced amount of motion data. There were 5 female patients. The PTV margin used for the plans was 3 mm.

Setup margin calculations

Table 1 shows the mean, standard error (SE), random error (RE), and geometric-based margin¹¹ for the interbeam and intrabeam motion in each direction. Figure 1 is the interbeam motion for 23 fractions of patient A1. Figure 2 displays the mean and standard deviation of the interbeam motion for each patient. Figure 3 is a sample of intrabeam motion. The mean number of table positions per treatment was 3.8 ± 1.0 . The SE for the phantom was 0.2 in the PA and LR direction and 0.3 mm in the SI direction, with the RE 0.5 mm PA and LR, and 0.6 mm SI. The phantom motion was significantly different from the patient motion ($p < 0.01$).

Dosimetric consequences of motion via direct simulation

As shown in Table 2, there was no change in the mean gEUD value between the motion and static plans of the PTV and CTV. There was an increase in the gEUD for the optic nerves,

and a large standard deviation for the spinal cord. Figure 4 show the changes in the gEUD value for the optic nerves, and Fig. 5 shows the change in gEUD of the spinal cord, PTV, and CTV. There was no significant correlation between the degree of motion and dosimetric changes.

Discussion

With the various image-guided modalities currently available, some of which are currently being used at our institution, it is reasonable to imagine reducing the interfractional setup error for pediatric brain tumor patients to a negligible amount; however, the intrafractional motion will still be a source of uncertainty. Therefore, the setup margin portion of the PTV will be dominated by intrafraction motion. In this study, we investigated the intrafractional motion for pediatric brain tumor patients and simulated its dosimetric affect on the target and various critical structures.

The geometric margin formula gives ~2.0-mm margin in each direction for the intrafraction motion. One note here is that this formula was developed primarily for prostate radiotherapy, but we believe the formulas can be as a guide in this situation. The direct simulation data support the margin calculation because the gEUD value of the CTV did not change in the direct simulation plan. Because the gEUD dose to the PTV was essentially the same for the composite and static plans (<1% difference), it is possible that an intrafraction motion margin is not required. Siebers and Gordon³³ introduced a concept called dosimetric margin distribution (DMD) in a recent article. In the article, they show that a high dose cloud exists around the PTV for prostate plans due to non-ideal conformality, which allows for a smaller PTV margin than the geometric margin formula indicates. A similar dose cloud exists for these plans.

As shown in Table 2 and Figs. 4 and 5, the optic nerves and spinal cord receive a higher dose than the static plan indicates. Formulas have been proposed³⁴ for PRV margins, and Stroom and Heijmen³⁵ have discussed the uses and limitations of such formulas. Using the formula, a PRV margin of ~1.0 mm would be required around the small serial-type structures. The data gathered here give clear evidence that a planning risk volume for organs at risk are required and appropriate margins should be studied further. Though there was not a correlation between degree of motion and dosimetric changes, this is most likely due to the complexity between target site, direction of motion, and relative location of critical structures.

Conclusions

Patient motion during treatment does affect the dose to critical structures, therefore planning risk volumes are needed to properly assess the dose to normal tissues. The 3-mm PTV margin used in the static plans is more than sufficient to account for intrafractional motion, given that the patient is properly localized at the start of treatment. This is supported by the fact that the direct motion simulation did not affect the dose to the CTV.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Pediatric Oncology Education Program (NCI grant #5 R25 CA23944) and the American Lebanese Syrian Associated Charities (ALSAC).

References

1. International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements. ICRU Report 50: Prescribing, Recording, and Reporting Photon Beam Therapy. Bethesda, MD: ICRU; 1993.

2. International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements. ICRU Report 62: Prescribing, Recording, and Reporting Photon Beam Therapy. Bethesda, MD: 1999. Supplement to ICRU Report 50
3. Huang E, Teh BS, Strother DR, et al. Intensity-modulated radiation therapy for pediatric medulloblastoma: Early report on the reduction of ototoxicity. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2002; 52:599–605. [PubMed: 11849779]
4. Wilson VC, McDonough J, Tochner Z. Proton beam irradiation in pediatric oncology: an overview. *J Pediatr Hematol Oncol.* 2005; 27:444–8. [PubMed: 16096529]
5. Astreinidou E, Bel A, Raaijmakers CP, et al. Adequate margins for random setup uncertainties in head-and-neck IMRT. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2005; 61:938–44. [PubMed: 15708278]
6. Papiez L, Langer M. On probabilistically 170 defined margins in radiation therapy. *Phys Med Biol.* 2006; 51:3921–39. [PubMed: 16885615]
7. Parker BC, Shiu AS, Maor MH, et al. PTV margin determination in conformal SRT of intracranial lesions. *J Appl Clin Med Phys.* 2002; 3:176–89. [PubMed: 12132939]
8. Remeijer P, Rasch C, Lebesque JV, et al. Margins for translational and rotational uncertainties: A 175 probability-based approach. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2002; 53:464–74. [PubMed: 12023151]
9. Stroom JC, de Boer HC, Huizenga H, et al. Inclusion of geometrical uncertainties in radiotherapy treatment planning by means of coverage probability. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 1999; 43:905–19. [PubMed: 10098447]
10. Stroom JC, Heijmen BJ. Geometrical uncertainties, radiotherapy planning margins, and the ICRU-62 report. *Radiother Oncol.* 2002; 64:75–83. [PubMed: 12208578]
11. van Herk M, Remeijer P, Rasch C, et al. The probability of correct target dosage: Dose-population histograms for deriving treatment margins in radiotherapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2000; 47:1121–35. [PubMed: 10863086]
12. van Herk M, Remeijer P, Lebesque JV. Inclusion of geometric uncertainties in treatment plan evaluation. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2002; 52:1407–22. [PubMed: 11955756]
13. Burton KE, Thomas SJ, Whitney D, et al. Accuracy of a relocatable stereotactic radiotherapy head frame evaluated by use of a depth helmet. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol).* 2002; 14:31–9. [PubMed: 11898783]
14. Humphreys M, Guerrero Urbano MT, Mubata C, et al. Assessment of a customised immobilisation system for head and neck IMRT using electronic portal imaging. *Radiother Oncol.* 2005; 77:39–44. [PubMed: 16154217]
15. Linthout N, Verellen D, Tournel K, et al. Six dimensional analysis with daily stereoscopic x-ray imaging of intrafraction patient motion in head and neck treatments using five points fixation masks. *Med Phys.* 2006; 33:504–13. [PubMed: 16532958]
16. Suzuki M, Nishimura Y, Nakamatsu K, et al. Analysis of interfractional set-up errors and intrafractional organ motions during IMRT for head and neck tumors to define an appropriate planning target volume (PTV)- and planning organs at risk volume (PRV)-margins. *Radiother Oncol.* 2006; 78:283–90. [PubMed: 16564594]
17. Kumar S, Burke K, Nalder C, et al. Treatment accuracy of fractionated stereotactic radiotherapy. *Radiother Oncol.* 2005; 74:53–9. [PubMed: 15683670]
18. Coolens C, Evans PM, Seco J, et al. The susceptibility of IMRT dose distributions to intrafraction organ motion: An investigation into smoothing filters derived from four dimensional computed tomography data. *Med Phys.* 2006; 33:2809–18. [PubMed: 16964857]
19. Dawson LA, Brock KK, Kazanjian S, et al. The reproducibility of organ position using active breathing control (ABC) during liver radiotherapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2001; 51:1410–21. [PubMed: 11728702]
20. Fung AY, Enke CA, Ayyangar KM. Prostate motion and isocenter adjustment from ultrasound-based localization during delivery of radiation therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2005; 61:984–92. [PubMed: 15752877]
21. Herman MG, Pisansky TM, Kruse JJ, et al. Technical aspects of daily online positioning of the prostate for three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy using an electronic portal imaging device. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2003; 57:1131–40. [PubMed: 14575846]

22. Kupelian PA, Willoughby TR, Meeks SL, et al. Intraprostatic fiducials for localization of the prostate gland: Monitoring intermarker distances during radiation therapy to test for marker stability. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2005; 62:1291–6. [PubMed: 16029784]
23. Parker CC, Damyanovich A, Haycocks T. Magnetic resonance imaging in the radiation treatment planning of localized prostate cancer using intra-prostatic fiducial markers for computed tomography co-registration. *Radiother Oncol.* 2003; 66:217–24. [PubMed: 12648794]
24. Beltran C, Herman MG, Davis BJ. Planning target margin calculations for prostate radiotherapy based on intrafraction and interfraction motion using four localization methods. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2007; 70:289–95. [PubMed: 17919837]
25. Muren LP, Smaaland R, Dahl O. Organ motion, set-up variation and treatment margins in radical radiotherapy of urinary bladder cancer. *Radiother Oncol.* 2003; 69:291–304. [PubMed: 14644489]
26. Ekberg L, Holmberg O, Wittgren L, et al. What margins should be added to the clinical target volume in radiotherapy treatment planning for lung cancer? *Radiother Oncol.* 1998; 48:71–7. [PubMed: 9756174]
27. Underberg RW, Lagerwaard FJ, Cuijpers JP, et al. Four dimensional CT scans for treatment planning in stereotactic radiotherapy for stage I lung cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2004; 60:1283–90. [PubMed: 15519801]
28. Underberg RW, Lagerwaard FJ, Slotman BJ, et al. Benefit of respiration-gated stereotactic radiotherapy for stage I lung cancer: An analysis of 4DCT datasets. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2005; 62:554–60. [PubMed: 15890600]
29. Zhu Y, Stovall J Jr, Butler L, et al. Comparison of two immobilization techniques using portal film and digitally reconstructed radiographs for pediatric patients with brain tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2000; 48:1233–40. [PubMed: 11072183]
30. Meeks SL, Bova FJ, Wagner TH, et al. Image localization for frameless stereotactic radiotherapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2000; 46:1291–9. [PubMed: 10725643]
31. Lujan AE, Ten Haken RK, Larsen EW, et al. Quantization of setup uncertainties in 3-D dose calculations. *Med Phys.* 1999; 26:2397–402. [PubMed: 10587223]
32. Niemierko A. A generalized concept of equivalent uniform dose (EUD). *Med Phys.* 1999; 26:1100.
33. Siebers JJ, Gordon JV. Evaluation of dosimetric margins in prostate IMRT treatment plans. *Med Phys.* 2008; 35:569–75. [PubMed: 18383678]
34. McKenzie A, van Herk M, Mijnheer B. Margins for geometric uncertainty around organs at risk in radiotherapy. *Radiother Oncol.* 2002; 62:299–307. [PubMed: 12175561]
35. Stroom JC, Heijmen BJ. Limitations of the planning organ at risk volume (PRV) concept. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2006; 66:279–86. [PubMed: 16904527]

Fig. 1.

The interbeam data points for patient A1 in the posterior-anterior (PA) direction are shown above. There were 23 fractions of position data. C1–C6 are the 6 different treatment fields (for this patient also the 6 treatment table position) per fraction.

Fig. 2.
The mean and standard deviation of the interbeam motion for each patient in the 3 cardinal directions.

Fig. 3. The intrabeam motion data for patient A1's second fraction in the 3 cardinal directions.

Fig. 4.

The difference in the optic nerves of group A between the composite and static treatment plans using a gEUD “A” value of 10.

Fig. 5.

The difference in the PTV, CTV, and spinal cord of group A between the composite and static treatment plans using a gEUD “A” value of -10 for the PTV and CTV, and 10 for the spinal cord.

Table 1
The mean, standard error (SE), random error (RE), and geometric-based margin for the interbeam and intrabeam motion in each direction

	Interbeam			Intrabeam		
	PA	LR	SI	PA	LR	SI
Mean (mm)	-0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
SE (mm)	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1
RE (mm)	1.1	1.0	1.3	0.2	0.4	0.3
Margin (mm)	1.8	1.9	2.4	0.4	0.5	0.5

Table 2
Dose per fraction and average difference per fraction of the gEUD values for the targets and critical structures between the direct simulation (motion) and the original treatment plan (static)

	Dose/Fraction (cGy)		Difference (Motion-Static) (cGy)	
	A-Value	Average	SD	Range
PTV	-10	181.4	1.7	0.6 1.1 (-1.9, 1.7)
CTV	-10	182.1	1.7	0.6 1.1 (-1.9, 1.8)
Spinal Cord	10	35.2	11.2	0.2 1.9 (-4.0, 2.5)
Optic nerves	10	104.5	54.6	2.2 3.2 (-3.4, 8.4)

Abbreviation: SD, Standard deviation.