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Paraspinal VMAT Overview

- Treatment delivery with simultaneous gantry rotation
- VMAT is an intuitive treatment option for paraspinal cases
- Gives comparable dose distributions in a significantly reduced treatment time
- Small target volumes can lead to irregular apertures with dosimetric uncertainty
- Must ensure dosimetric deliverability
Aperture comparison: 3DRT

- 3D conformal treatment plan with regularly shaped beam apertures
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Aperture comparison: VMAT

- VMAT optimized beam apertures can be very irregular
  - Optimizer only concerned with cost of cost functions
  - Narrow openings, non-contiguous regions
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Other VMAT Apertures


- Irregular apertures occur even for large target volumes
- Side-effect of inverse planning

Fog et al. showed that open apertures defined by two MLC leaves (0.25 mm width each) underestimated maximum dose by over 20%.

- Penumbra width (10-90% width) overestimated by ~100%.
- Similar results in two leaves covering the center of a field.
Goal: Improve deliverability of plans by preventing the optimizer from generating fields known to result in unacceptable error

- Develop metrics to predict error based on aperture shape
- Incorporate metrics in a cost function that penalizes undesirable aperture shapes
Methods: Treatment Planning

- Treatment Planning
  - UMPlan
    - Direct Aperture Optimization and field weight optimization
    - New Edge algorithm, 1 mm grid size
    - 2 paraspinal VMAT plans for each of 5 patient cases
Methods: Dosimetry

- Measurements
  - Measured dose for 23 apertures from one example case
  - Measured 15 rectangular apertures of varying area and aspect ratio

- Dosimetry
  - Kodak EDR film planar measurements in solid water
  - Verification of film measurements for 15 rectangular fields by measuring dose profiles with scanning stereotactic diode in Wellhofer Blue Phantom water tank
Methods: Dose comparison

- Dose Comparison
  - Image registration to maximize agreement
  - Pixels with at least 5% of maximum dose analyzed
  - $\% \text{ deviation} = \frac{\text{Calculation} - \text{Measurement}}{\text{Max Dose}}$
  - Dosimetric error quantified by % of pixels with greater than 5% deviation

- Correlation methods
  - Aperture area
  - Perimeter/aspect ratio
  - Edge erosion technique
Maximum dose range for all apertures tested: 50 – 70 cGy
Dose difference: Calc - Meas
• Edge error on MLC leaf sides:
  • No compensation for tongue on MLC
  • 11-17% deviation as a percent of maximum dose
• Edge error on MLC leaf ends:
  • Rounded edge of leaf end is better modeled in the planning system
• 0-5% deviation as a percent of maximum dose
Dose calculation errors

- Error in small open areas:
  - 4-11% deviation as a percent of maximum dose
Dose calculation errors

- Leakage between closed MLC leaves:
  - ~22% deviation as a percent of maximum dose
Assessment of dosimetric error

- Errors of small irregular fields occur because we cannot model all parameters of each field perfectly
- What can we learn from looking at these dose deviations?
  - Areas where dose calculation algorithm can be improved
  - Aperture shapes that should be avoided to ensure plans with optimal deliverability
  - Goal is to increase likelihood of accurate delivery
Assessment of Metrics

Percent of pixels with > 5% dose deviation: 7%
Assessment of Metrics: Area

15 Rectangles: area $\rightarrow 0.4 \text{ cm}^2$ to 20 cm$^2$, aspect ratio $\rightarrow 0.2$ to 5
Assessment of Metrics: Aspect Ratio

15 Rectangles:  
- area $\rightarrow$ 0.4 cm$^2$ to 20 cm$^2$,
- aspect ratio $\rightarrow$ 0.2 to 5
Assessment of Metrics: Erosion

Eroded area % = (Expanded-Original)/Original
Correlation with eroded area

Parameters:
- Expand 0.2 cm on leaf end
- Expand 0.05 cm on leaf side

Example expanded area
Correlation with eroded area

Parameters:
- Expand 0.025 cm on leaf end
- Contract 0.025 cm on leaf end
- Expand 0.1 cm on leaf side
- Contract 0.1 cm on leaf side

Eroded area % = (Expanded – Contracted)/Original

Example expanded area
Conclusions

- VMAT is a promising treatment technique, but the accuracy of plans with small, irregular apertures is questionable
  - These inaccuracies can be masked when using distance-to-agreement criteria
- Calculational errors can be better understood by analyzing dose differences
- Edge erosion is a promising metric for identifying undesirable apertures
  - Edge erosion can be used for different dose calculation algorithms if the unique erosion parameters are identified
- Adding a cost function based on aperture shape should help to minimize apertures that will lead to unacceptable error
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Future directions

- Erosion parameters
  - Determine optimal parameters for erosion in x and y
  - Test with other dose calculation algorithms
- Add cost function to optimizer to penalize beams that may lead to large errors
- Compare plans with and without aperture shape cost functions