Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: http://www.elsevier.com/locate/rpor

Original research article

Evaluating deviations in prostatectomy patients treated with IMRT

Ana Cravo Sá[a,*], *Ana Peres*[a], *Mónica Pereira*[a], *Carina Marques Coelho*[a], *Fátima Monsanto*[a], *Ana Macedo*[b], *Adrian Lamas*[c]

[a] *Radiotherapy Department, Lisbon School of Health Technology, Polytechnic Institute of Lisbon, Avenida D. João II, lote 4.69.01, 1990-096 Lisbon, Portugal*

[b] *Mathematic Department, Lisbon School of Health Technology, Polytechnic Institute of Lisbon, Avenida D. João II, lote 4.69.01, 1990-096 Lisbon, Portugal*

[c] *Dosimetry Department, Meixoeiro Hospital, Meixoeiro s/n, 36200 Vigo, Spain*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 5 August 2015
Accepted 30 November 2015
Available online 29 December 2015

Keywords:
Prostate tumour
Intensity modulated radiotherapy
Planning target volume margin
Cone beam computed tomography
Geometric uncertainty

ABSTRACT

Aim: To evaluate the deviations in prostatectomy patients treated with IMRT in order to calculate appropriate margins to create the PTV.

Background: Defining inappropriate margins can lead to underdosing in target volumes and also overdosing in healthy tissues, increasing morbidity.

Material and methods: 223 CBCT images used for alignment with the CT planning scan based on bony anatomy were analyzed in 12 patients treated with IMRT following prostatectomy. Shifts of CBCT images were recorded in three directions to calculate the required margin to create PTV.

Results and discussion: The mean and standard deviation (SD) values in millimetres were -0.05 ± 1.35 in the LR direction, -0.03 ± 0.65 in the SI direction and -0.02 ± 2.05 the AP direction. The systematic error measured in the LR, SI and AP direction were 1.35 mm, 0.65 mm, and 2.05 mm with a random error of 2.07 mm; 1.45 mm and 3.16 mm, resulting in a PTV margin of 4.82 mm; 2.64 mm, and 7.33 mm, respectively.

Conclusion: With IGRT we suggest a margin of 5 mm, 3 mm and 8 mm in the LR, SI and AP direction, respectively, to PTV1 and PTV2. Therefore, this study supports an anisotropic margin expansion to the PTV being the largest expansion in the AP direction and lower in SI.

1. Background

Radiotherapy after prostatectomy aims to reach a higher efficacy of the treatment, by increasing local control and decreasing disease recurrence.[1–4] Recent data reveals that radiotherapy has enhanced survival without disease in patients with T3N0 stage.[3] The development of techniques, like intensity modulated radiotherapy (IMRT), allows the administration of higher doses and more conformational to

* *Corresponding author*. Tel.: +351 218980470; fax: +351 218980460.
E-mail address: anacravosa@estesl.ipl.pt (A.C. Sá).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rpor.2015.11.004

the target volume, sparing healthy tissues.[5–7] However, IMRT does not allow the reduction of treatment margins that are used to account for geometric uncertainties.[8] In this context, image guided radiotherapy (IGRT), associated with IMRT, enables a more exact location of the target volume,[8] allowing the margin reduction.[9]

Geometric uncertainties that arise during the treatment include deviations due to systematic errors and randomized errors.[10] Systematic errors occur during the preparation of the treatment, from the data transference to the treatment administration.[11,12] On the other hand, randomized errors appear during setup and they are due to organ motion.[1] By using imaging protocols it has been possible to reduce systematic errors through online and offline corrections, and randomized errors through online corrections.[5]

The image acquisition to treatment verification results in a dose increment beyond the prescribed dose.[13] However, cone beam computed tomography (CBCT), allows the visualization of treatment target volumes (TTV) and organs at risk (OAR).[14] Thus, corrections are made before the treatment[14] leading to a more precise dose control.[1] Even with image verification, there are still uncertainties associated to treatment.[15] According to the International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements (ICRU), uncertainties that exist during treatment should imply the definition of margins to create the planning target volume (PTV), which derives from clinic target volume (CTV).[16] With these margins, there is an assurance that CTV receives the prescribed dose,[17] considering setup errors and internal movements of the target.[6]

Today there are consensual guidelines to CTV definition,[18] although there is no evidence of margin dimensions between CTV and PTV.[18,19] According to van Herk et al., when applying the formula $2.5\Sigma + 0.7\sigma$, it is possible to calculate appropriate margin to make sure that 90% of the population receives a 95% minimum of the prescribed dose to the CTV.[15] Defining inappropriate margins can lead to underdosing in target volumes and also an overdosing in healthy tissues, increasing the morbility.[15] Some studies show that surgical bed in patients submitted to prostatectomy presents larger mobility compared with patients that were not subjected to surgery.[20–22] There are imaging strategies, such as portal image, to correct geometric uncertainties that allow the verification of bony anatomy, although this may be insufficient for the correction of uncertainties.[21] On the other hand, CBCT images allow the visualization of soft tissues leading to the improvement in the correction of uncertainties.[21]

2. Aim

The aim of this study is to evaluate the deviations in prostatectomy patients treated with IMRT in order to calculate the appropriate margins to create the PTV.

3. Material and methods

3.1. Patient characterization

The present study evaluated 12 prostatectomy patients submitted to radiotherapy at the Hospital of Meixoeiro in Vigo. They were evaluated between March and May 2015. The patient characteristics are described in Table 1.

Table 1 – Patients' characteristics.

Number of patients	12
Age (years)	
Mean	65
Amplitude	54–73
PSA (ng/ml)	
Average	22.56
Amplitude	5.38–48.63
Gleason, *n*	
7	6
8	1
9	5
Total dose (Gy)	
PTV 1	46.39
PTV 2	63.84
Dose per fraction (Gy)	
PTV 1	1.66
PTV 2	2.28
Pathological T stage, *n*	
T2	1
T3	11

3.2. Computed tomography scan

All patients performed the bladder and rectum protocol of the institution for the computed tomography (CT). This protocol consists in emptying the rectum with an enema. Regarding the bladder, the patients were instructed to empty it before the simulation/treatment and then intake 1 l of water with 5 ml of Gastrografin®. Patients were positioned in a supine position with their hands on the chest, a pillow under the head and a leg support. Prior to the acquisition of the images, iopremol was administered for the nodes visualization. Image acquisition started in L4 to the lower limit of the smaller trochanter, with slices of 2 mm in the surgical bed and 5 mm in the remaining pelvis.

3.3. Definition of regions of interest

The normal tissues including the rectum, bladder, femoral heads and penile bulb were contoured as OAR in Focal® software. The GTV was defined as the surgical bed for all patients. The CTV1 includes the surgical bed and the pelvic lymph nodes. For the PTV1, 8 mm was added to the CTV1 in all directions. The CTV2 was created by adding a margin of 3 mm from GTV. For PTV2 a margin of 6 mm was added to the posterior axis and 8 mm in other directions from the CTV2.

3.4. Dosimetric planning

Dosimetric planning was performed in the treatment planning system Xio® 4.80, using IMRT with integrated boost. 9 treatment fields with 6 MV were used in all patients. A total dose of 46.39 Gy was prescribed to the PTV1, with 1.66 Gy/fraction and a total dose of 63.84 Gy was prescribed to PTV2 with 2.28 Gy/fraction (Table 1). All patients were treated in Elekta Synergy™ linear accelerator.