

A theoretical evaluation of transmission dosimetry in 3D conformal radiotherapy

Paul D Reich

*Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
The School of Chemistry and Physics,
University of Adelaide*



September 2008

Contents

Abstract	xxiii
Signed Statement	xxv
Acknowledgements	xxvii
Dedication	xxxii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Patient dose verification: A major challenge in modern radiotherapy	1
1.2 Aims of the current thesis	3
1.3 Thesis outline	4
2 <i>In vivo</i> dosimetry in radiotherapy: A review	7
2.1 The need for dosimetric verification in radiotherapy	7
2.2 Techniques for <i>in vivo</i> dosimetry in external beam radiotherapy	8
2.2.1 Entrance and exit dosimetry	8
2.2.2 Midplane dosimetry using the entrance and exit dose	9
2.2.3 Two-dimensional midplane dosimetry	12
2.2.4 The transition from film to EPID	15
2.2.5 Midplane dosimetry: 2D back-projection techniques	16
2.2.6 Alternative back-projection techniques	22
2.2.7 Transmitted dose prediction	23

2.2.8	Transmitted dose prediction using Monte Carlo	34
2.3	Summary and conclusions	34
3	Evaluation of a treatment planning system for modelling transmitted dose	37
3.1	Introduction	37
3.2	Materials and methods	38
3.2.1	Pinnacle ³ treatment planning system	38
3.2.2	Dosimetric calibration of the SLIC-EPID	38
3.2.3	Simulation of phantom and EPID	42
3.2.4	Simulation of transmitted dose using treatment planning system . .	44
3.2.5	Extraction of the transmitted dose plane from Pinnacle ³	45
3.2.6	Orientation, scaling and alignment of measured and computed images	46
3.2.7	Noise analysis of images	47
3.2.8	Comparison of measured and predicted images	48
3.3	Results	51
3.3.1	Noise analysis of images	51
3.3.2	Comparison of measured and predicted EPID doses for varying phantom thicknesses	52
3.3.3	Evaluation of minimum detectable phantom thickness changes using transmitted dose	59
3.4	Discussion	60
3.4.1	Overestimation of transmitted dose calculations relative to mea- surement	60
3.4.2	Dosimetric uncertainties in the SLIC-EPID measurements	63
3.4.3	Image alignment	65
3.5	Summary and conclusions	65
4	Resolution of Pinnacle³ dose calculations for predicting changes in trans- mitted dose	67

4.1	Introduction	67
4.2	Materials and methods	68
4.2.1	Predicting the presence of small inhomogeneities	68
4.2.2	Predicting shifts in inhomogeneity position	69
4.2.3	Predicting changes in transmission in presence of surface contour	72
4.2.4	Predicting changes in transmission in presence of surface contour and heterogeneities	75
4.3	Results	77
4.3.1	Predicting the presence of small inhomogeneities	77
4.3.2	Predicting shifts in inhomogeneity position	80
4.3.3	Predicting changes in transmission due to surface contour	85
4.3.4	Predicting changes in transmission in the presence of surface con- tour and heterogeneities	91
4.3.5	Conclusions	97
5	An evaluation of transmission dosimetry for a 3D conformal four-field box prostate treatment	99
5.1	Introduction	99
5.2	Materials and methods	100
5.2.1	Expansion of patient CT images	100
5.2.2	Transmitted dose calculations for a four-field box technique	101
5.2.3	Simulation of dosimetry errors	104
5.2.4	Evaluation of dosimetric errors at the transmitted dose plane	105
5.2.5	Evaluation of dosimetric errors inside the patient	106
5.3	Results	106
5.3.1	Gamma analysis results for anterior and posterior beams	106
5.3.2	Gamma analysis results for left- and right-lateral beams	112
5.3.3	Gamma analysis results at the patient midplane	116
5.3.4	DVHs	119

5.4	Summary/conclusions	124
6	An evaluation of transmission dosimetry for a 3D conformal head and neck treatment	127
6.1	Introduction	127
6.2	Materials and methods	129
6.2.1	Modification of patient head and neck CT scans	129
6.2.2	A 3D CRT Head and Neck treatment plan using the modified CT scans	129
6.2.3	Simulation of the 2D transmitted dose	130
6.2.4	Simulation of MLC errors in the head and neck treatment plan . . .	135
6.3	Results	139
6.4	Summary and conclusions	160
7	An evaluation of transmission dosimetry for a 3D conformal opposing tangential breast treatment	163
7.1	Introduction	163
7.2	Materials and Methods	165
7.2.1	Construction of the <i>virtual</i> EPID	165
7.2.2	Dose extraction at the virtual EPID	168
7.2.3	Simulation of respiratory motion	169
7.2.4	Two-dimensional gamma analysis	171
7.2.5	Dose-Volume Histograms	172
7.3	Results	173
7.3.1	Two-dimensional gamma analysis	173
7.3.2	Dose volume histograms	181
7.3.3	Summary and conclusions	183
8	Conclusions	185
8.1	Major conclusions of this thesis	185

8.2	Future directions	187
A	Appendix	191
A.1	Expansion of the original patient CT images	191
A.2	3D dose reconstruction of dose file from Pinnacle ³	192
A.3	Masking of transmitted dose images	194
A.4	Gamma function	195
	Bibliography	201

List of Tables

3.3.1 Isocentric set up: Gamma evaluation study to determine which (ideal) combination of DD and DTA yield gamma scores of 90 % or more averaged over all phantom thicknesses.	57
3.3.2 Fixed SSD set up: Gamma evaluation study to determine which (ideal) combination of DD and DTA yield gamma scores of 90 % or more averaged over all phantom thicknesses.	57
5.3.1 Comparison of gamma scores and maximum (absolute) dose differences between transmitted and midplane dose maps for the anterior-posterior beam.	111
5.3.2 Comparison of gamma scores and maximum (absolute) dose differences between transmitted and midplane dose maps for the left-lateral beam. . .	115
5.3.3 Clinical dose statistics for the planning target volume and critical structures (single fraction) for beam shifts in the anterior direction.	124
5.3.4 Clinical dose statistics for the planning target volume and critical structures (single fraction) for beam shifts in the right-lateral direction.	125
5.3.5 Clinical dose statistics for the planning target volume and critical structures (single fraction) for beam shifts in the superior direction.	125
6.3.1 The number of leaves detected at the transmitted dose plane resulting from the MLC displacement errors simulated in each of the six beams.	141
6.3.2 Gamma scores calculated with 3%/2.5 mm criteria for 0.25 cm and 0.50 cm leaf shifts introduced into each of the six fields.	142

6.3.3 D_{max} , D_{min} and D_{avg} DVH statistics recorded in the original plan and for plans simulated with MLC errors in the left-posterior oblique beam.	155
6.3.4 D_{max} , D_{min} and D_{avg} DVH statistics recorded in the original plan and for plans simulated with MLC errors in the anterior-posterior (supraclavicular) beam.	156
6.3.5 D_{max} , D_{min} and D_{avg} DVH statistics recorded in the original plan and for plans simulated with MLC errors in the left-lateral beam.	157
6.3.6 D_{max} , D_{min} and D_{avg} DVH statistics recorded in the original plan and for plans simulated with MLC errors in the anterior-posterior (neck) beam.	158
6.3.7 D_{max} , D_{min} and D_{avg} DVH statistics recorded in the original plan and for plans simulated with MLC errors in all six beams.	159
7.2.1 Magnitude and direction of beam shifts used to simulate the breathing and setup errors.	171
7.3.1 Gamma scores calculated using clinical gamma criteria (3 %/2.5 mm) and less strict criteria of 5 %/2.5 mm and 10 %/2.5 mm for the combined breathing and set up errors in the lateral beam.	178
7.3.2 Clinical dose statistics for the planning target volume and critical structures (single fraction) for simulated breathing. NB. breathing excursions are combined in the same direction in both beams.	183

List of Figures

2.2.1	The homogeneous water phantom geometry used by Rizzotti <i>et al</i> to determine the midplane dose from measurements of entrance and exit doses.	10
2.2.2	A schematic representation of the phantom and variables used in the geometric mean method (figure courtesy of Huyskens <i>et al</i> [1]).	12
2.2.3	A schematic of an equivalent rectilinear phantom (with varying off-axis density) used to represent a curved phantom geometry as proposed by Broggi <i>et al</i> . The beam entrance is indicated by the arrow located to the left of the figure (figure courtesy of Broggi <i>et al</i> [2]).	14
2.2.4	A schematic of the phantoms used to determine the geometric factor, G . SPRs are measured at the exit surface of an inhomogeneous phantom with a symmetrically placed inhomogeneity, and an equivalent homogeneous phantom with the same radiological thickness (figure courtesy of Boellaard <i>et al</i> [3]).	18
2.2.5	Geometry used in the convolution/superposition algorithm. The primary interaction site and dose deposition site are represented by vectors \mathbf{r}' and \mathbf{r} (relative to the surface), respectively (figure adapted from Metcalfe <i>et al</i> [4]).	28
2.2.6	Schematic of the anthropomorphic phantom (“thorax” phantom) and the corresponding virtual EHP used to predict the transmitted dose. The variables $t_{x,y}$ and $L_{x,y}$ correspond to the polystyrene thickness of the EHP along a beam ray-line at (x, y) and the distance from the exit surface of the EHP to the transmitted dose plane, respectively (figure courtesy of Pasma <i>et al</i> [5]).	30

3.2.1 Calibration curves for the SLIC-EPID at different nominal linac repetition settings (MU/min). The curve corresponding to 300 MU/min was used in this study. Error bars may not be visible due to their similar size to corresponding data points. (Figure courtesy of M. Mohammadi [6])	40
3.2.2 A Correction Factor matrix defined for a 6MV photon beam in an open field ($15.8 \times 19.5 \text{ cm}^2$ at isocenter) at an SED of 140 cm. (Figure courtesy of M. Mohammadi [6])	42
3.2.3 CT arrangement of RW3 used to simulate a phantom and EPID separated by an air gap. (Not to scale).	43
3.2.4 Isocentric (a) and SSD (b) treatment setups simulated by the planning system for the RW3 phantom geometry.	44
3.2.5 Relative depth dose values (on the central axis) obtained from Matlab, to confirm the position of d_{max} (plane # 246) inside the water-equivalent EPID. Plane separation = 0.25 cm.	46
3.2.6 A reference alignment image for determining “left” and “right” orientations in the EPID images.	47
3.2.7 A geometric interpretation of the gamma concept used in this study. (Figure courtesy of Depuydt <i>et al</i> [7]).	49
3.3.1 SNRs in measured and predicted EPID doses on CAX as a function of phantom thickness.	52
3.3.2 Comparison of calculated and measured mean doses on CAX for different phantom thicknesses. (a) Isocentric set up. (b) Fixed SSD set up. All points contain error bars, but are too small to appear in the vertical scale.	53
3.3.3 Isocentric set up: comparison of calculated and measured EPID dose beam profiles with gamma profiles also shown. (a)–(b) Phantom thickness of 30 cm. (c)–(d) Phantom thickness of 20 cm. (e)–(f) Phantom thickness of 10 cm.	54

3.3.4 Fixed SSD set up: comparison of calculated and measured EPID dose beam profiles with gamma profiles also shown. (a)–(b) Phantom thickness of 28 cm. (c)–(d) Phantom thickness of 22 cm. (e)–(f) Phantom thickness of 18 cm.	55
3.3.5 Gamma maps. (a)–(c) Isocentric set up. (a) Phantom thickness 30 cm (3%/3.8 mm), (b) Phantom thickness 20 cm (2%/3.8 mm), (c) Phantom thickness 10 cm, (3%/3.8 mm). (d)–(f) Fixed SSD set up. (a) Phantom thickness 28 cm (3%/3.8 mm), (b) Phantom thickness 22 cm (4.5%/3.8 mm), (C) Phantom thickness 18 cm (4.5%/3.8 mm). Corresponding gamma scores are shown in tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.	58
3.3.6 Minimum detectable resolution in collapsed-cone superposition dose calculations at the transmitted dose plane (d_{max}) as a function of phantom thickness. (a)–(c) Isocentric set up. (a) reference phantom thickness 25 cm, (b) reference phantom thickness 15 cm, (c) reference phantom thickness 6 cm. (d)–(e) Fixed SSD set up. (d) reference phantom thickness 26 cm, (e) reference phantom thickness 22 cm.	60
3.4.1 The total error (variance) in the dose calibration curve and the sum of its parts, as a function of phantom thickness. (a) Isocentric set up. (b) Fixed SSD set up.	63
4.2.1 Model of an inhomogeneity inside a homogeneous phantom using Pinnacle ³ . (a) Set up for increasing the width of the inhomogeneity from 0.1 – 5 cm. (b) Set up for increasing the height of the inhomogeneity from 0.5 –1.5 cm.	69
4.2.2 The $5 \times 5 \times 5$ cm ³ inhomogeneity used for simulating inhomogeneity displacements off-axis from 0 – 8.0 cm.	70
4.2.3 The semi-infinite inhomogeneity contained inside a 20 cm thick phantom for simulating displacements at three different depths.	71
4.2.4 Set up for CT scanning the two cylindrical phantoms and EPID representation. (a) Large cylinder. (b) Small cylinder.	73

4.2.5 Pinnacle ³ plans of the cylindrical phantoms for simulating relative beam displacements (0.5 - 3.0 cm). (a) Large cylinder and (b) Small cylinder.	74
4.2.6 A pelvic section from Rando used for the surface contour study.	75
4.2.7 Anthropomorphic phantoms. (a) Rando head and neck phantom and (b) breast and lung phantom.	76
4.3.1 The dose distribution calculated by Pinnacle ³ for the 0.1 x 0.1 x 0.5 cm inhomogeneity. Insert(upper): a magnified view of the inhomogeneity on the central axis. Insert(lower): a magnified view of the slightly perturbed isodose lines as a result of a small inhomogeneity present above.	78
4.3.2 (a) Cross-plane beam profiles ((a) and (c)) predicted at the transmitted dose plane for the different sized inhomogeneities and predicted transmitted doses on the central axis as a function of inhomogeneity size ((b) and (d)). NB. Dose differences displayed in each graph represent “reference” plan subtracted from “perturbed” plan, and normalised to the central axis of the reference plan beam profiles.	80
4.3.3 (a) The dose distribution calculated by Pinnacle ³ for the 5 × 5 × 5 cm ³ inhomogeneity. (b) Predicted transmitted dose on the central axis versus displacement in inhomogeneity. NB All plotted points contain error bars but are too small to be visible with the vertical scale.	82
4.3.4 Cross-plane beam profiles in the transmitted dose plane resulting from the off-axis inhomogeneity shifts of (a) 0.1 cm, (b) 0.2 cm, (c) 0.4 cm, and (d) 0.7 cm.	83
4.3.5 Predicted cross-plane beam profiles in the transmitted dose plane resulting from the semi-infinite inhomogeneity at three different depths inside the phantom. The two inserts are magnified views of the beam profiles 5 cm off-axis.	84
4.3.6 Pinnacle ³ isodose distributions calculated for the, (a) large cylinder and (b) Small cylinder.	86
4.3.7 Pinnacle ³ isodose distributions calculated for the pelvis phantom.	87

4.3.8	Predicted transmitted doses on the central axis for the three homogeneous curved phantoms plotted against relative shift between beam path and phantom geometry. NB All plotted points contain error bars but are too small to be visible with the vertical scale.	87
4.3.9	Predicted cross-plane beam profiles in the transmitted dose plane resulting from relative beams shifts of 0.5 - 1.0 cm in the large cylinder ((a)–(c)), small cylinder ((d)–(f)), and the pelvic phantom (g)–(i).	88
4.3.10	Gamma maps and gamma scores calculated within the 50 % isodose lines resulting from relative shifts in the large cylinder. (a), (b) and (c) Relative shifts of 0.5, 0.75 and 1.0 cm, respectively using 3 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria. (d), (e) and (f) Relative shifts of 0.5, 0.75 and 1.0 cm, respectively using 1 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria.	90
4.3.11	Gamma maps and gamma scores calculated within the 50 % isodose lines resulting from relative shifts in the small cylinder. (a), (b) and (c) Relative shifts of 0.5, 0.75 and 1.0 cm, respectively using 3 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria. (d), (e) and (f) Relative shifts of 0.5, 0.75 and 1.0 cm, respectively using 1 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria.	91
4.3.12	Gamma maps and gamma scores calculated within the 50 % isodose lines resulting from relative shifts in the pelvis phantom. (a), (b) and (c) Relative shifts of 0.5, 1.0 cm and 2.0 cm, respectively using 3 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria. (d), (e) and (f) Relative shifts of 0.5, 1.0 and 2.0 cm, respectively using 1 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria.	92
4.3.13	(a) Pinnacle ³ isodose distributions calculated for (a) the breast phantom and (b) head and neck phantom.	93
4.3.14	Normalised predicted transmitted doses on the central axis for the two anthropomorphic phantoms versus relative phantom shift.	94
4.3.15	Predicted cross-plane beam profiles in the transmitted dose plane for the anthropomorphic phantoms resulting from relative beams shifts of 0.25 - 0.75 cm. (a)–(c) Breast phantom. (d)–(f) Head and neck phantom.	95

4.3.16	Gamma maps and gamma scores calculated within the 50 % isodose lines resulting from relative shifts in the anthropomorphic breast phantom. (a), (b) and (c) Relative shifts of 0.25, 0.5 and 0.75 cm, respectively using 3 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria. (d), (e) and (f) Relative shifts of 0.5, 0.75 and 1.0 cm, respectively using 1 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria.	96
4.3.17	Gamma maps and gamma scores calculated within the 50 % isodose lines resulting from relative shifts in the anthropomorphic head and neck phantom. (a), (b) and (c) Relative shifts of 0.25, 0.5 and 0.75 cm, respectively using 3 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria. (d), (e) and (f) Relative shifts of 0.5, 0.75 and 1.0 cm, respectively using 1 %/2.5 mm gamma criteria.	97
5.2.1	An expanded axial CT slice (1024 pixel \times 1024 pixel) of a prostate radiotherapy patient.	101
5.2.2	Pinnacle ³ dose distributions for the anterior-posterior beam and (b) left lateral beams.	102
5.2.3	Beam's eye view transmitted dose distributions (cropped at 20 % isodose lines) extracted at d_{max} for (a) the anterior-posterior, (b) posterior-anterior beam, (c) Left lateral, and (d) right lateral beams.	103
5.2.4	Dosimetry errors simulated by shifting the coordinates of the beam and transmitted dose plane in the planning system (shown in the lateral directions only).	105
5.2.5	A schematic illustrating the locations of the transmitted dose plane and midplane. The midplane is defined relative to patient anatomy, where as the transmitted dose plane is defined relative to the radiation field.	107
5.3.1	Gamma maps (3 %/2.5 mm and 1 %/2.5 mm) resulting from beam path displacements in the anterior-posterior beam. (a) and (d) 0.5 cm, right-lateral, (b) and (e) 1.0 cm, left-lateral, and (c) and (f) 1.5 cm, anterior. . .	108

5.3.2 Gamma maps (3 %/2.5 mm and 1 %/2.5 mm) resulting from beam path displacements in the left-lateral beam. (a) and (d) 0.5 cm, posterior, (b) and (e) 1.0 cm, superior, and (c) and (f) 1.5 cm, left-lateral.	113
5.3.3 Gamma maps calculated using 3 %/2.5 mm in the midplane ((a), (c), (e)) and corresponding gamma maps in the transmitted dose plane ((b), (d), (f)). (a)–(b) left-lateral beam, 0.5 cm shift, superior, (c)–(d) left-lateral beam, 1.0 cm shift, posterior, and (e)–(f) anterior-posterior beam, 1.5 cm shift, posterior.	118
5.3.4 Dose-volume histograms evaluated by Pinnacle ³ for beam shifts in the anterior direction. (a) PTV, (b) rectum, (c) bladder, and (d) left femoral head.	121
5.3.5 Dose-volume histograms evaluated by Pinnacle ³ for beam shifts in the right-lateral direction (a) PTV, (b) rectum, (c) bladder, and (d) left femoral head.	122
5.3.6 Dose-volume histograms evaluated by Pinnacle ³ for beam shifts in the superior direction (a) PTV, (b) rectum, (c) bladder, and (d) left femoral head.	123
6.2.1 A modified CT slice consisting of the original 512×512 matrix surrounded by two pairs of matrices of dimensions 428×1152 and 512×320	130
6.2.2 (a) Simulation of transmitted dose in a water-equivalent medium for one of the oblique beams, and (b) close up of the surface of the transmitted dose medium showing artifacts in the isodose lines. The artifacts are only present at the surface of the virtual EPID.	131
6.2.3 The co-ordinate system in Matlab used to derive the coordinates of d_{max} in the virtual EPID following the 3D matrix rotation. The dose matrix for the right-posterior oblique beam is shown. The beam focus-to-isocentre distance is denoted by d_{BI} , and the isocentre-to-EPID distance (defined at d_{max} , not at the surface) is denoted by d_{IE}	133

6.2.4 (a) An axial view through the transmitted dose medium before rotation and (b) after rotation. A direct comparison of isodose lines (20 %, 40 %, 60 %, 80 %, 90 %, and 100 % - relative to d_{max}) revealed no significant changes in dose after rotating the 3D dose array.	134
6.2.5 Calculated transmitted dose maps (at $d_{max} = 1.5$ cm in the plane of the virtual EPID) cropped at the 5 % isodose lines. (a) Left-lateral beam, (b) anterior beam (neck), (c) right-lateral beam, (d) left posterior-oblique beam, (e) anterior beam (supraclavicular), and (f) right posterior-oblique beam.	135
6.2.6 The anterior-posterior (supraclavicular) field. The locations of leaves A20 and B20 are circled. (Note that leaf B20 is hidden behind jaw B).	136
6.2.7 (a) Location of the midplane relative to the transmitted dose plane for the anterior-posterior (supraclavicular) beam.	138
6.3.1 Difference maps in the transmitted dose plane resulting from five leaves (leaf # 1- leaf# 5) shifted by (a) 0.01 cm, (b) 0.02 cm, (c) 0.05 cm, and (d) 0.1 cm.	140
6.3.2 Comparison of gamma maps (3 %/2.5 mm) for two different combinations of shift size and number of leaves shifted. (a) Five leaves/0.5 cm shift in the L-OBL beam, (b) bank of leaves/0.25 cm shift in the L-OBL beam, (c) five leaves/0.5 cm shift in the R-OBL beam, (d) bank of leaves/0.25 cm shift in the R-OBL beam, (e) five leaves/0.5 cm shift in the AP(neck) beam, and (f) bank of leaves/0.25 cm shift in the AP(neck) beam.	143
6.3.3 The variation in transmitted dose as a function of leaf displacement for two different leaf positions (leaf 20A and 20B).	144
6.3.4 Variation in transmitted dose as a function of leaf displacement for different dose grid sizes.	146
6.3.5 Typical beam profiles (calculated using a 0.1×0.1 cm ² grid size) intersecting at leaf A20 for a 0.3 cm leaf shift in leaf A20.	147

6.3.6 Magnified views of beam profiles (with and without an MLC shift) at the plane of the virtual EPID for the anterior-posterior (supraclavicular) field. Dose difference profiles are superimposed. (a) Leaf A20 shifted by 0.3 cm shift along the negative axis using a $0.1 \times 0.1 \text{ cm}^2$ calculation grid size, and (b) leaf A20 shifted by 0.3 cm shift along the positive axis using a $0.4 \times 0.4 \text{ cm}^2$ calculation grid size.	148
6.3.7 Comparison of dose variations in the transmitted dose plane and midplane at two different leaf locations in the anterior-posterior (supraclavicular) field.(a) Leaf 20A and (b) leaf 20B.	149
6.3.8 Original DVHs and DVHs due to MLC errors present in the left-posterior oblique beam. (a) PTV, (b) a zoom in of PTV, (c) spinal cord, (d), larynx, (e) left parotid, and (f) right parotid.	151
6.3.9 Original DVHs and DVHs due to MLC errors present in the left-posterior oblique beam. (a) PTV, (b) a zoom in of PTV, (c) spinal cord, (d), larynx, (e) left parotid, and (f) right parotid.	152
6.3.10 Original DVHs and DVHs due to MLC errors present in all beams. (a) PTV, (b) a zoom in of PTV, (c) spinal cord, (d), larynx, (e) left parotid, and (f) right parotid.	153
6.3.11 Original DVHs and DVHs due to MLC errors present in all beams. (a) PTV, (b) a zoom in of PTV, (c) spinal cord, (d), larynx, (e) left parotid, and (f) right parotid.	154
7.2.1 A wedged parallel opposed breast plan created in Pinnacle ³ used to simulate patient breathing.	166
7.2.2 (a)An axial slice through the virtual EPID (water-equivalent) displaying the isodose lines calculated by Pinnacle ³ , (b) beam profiles predicted by the Pinnacle ³ treatment planning system through an axial cross-section of the virtual EPID. Dose artifacts are clearly present at the surface of the virtual EPID but not at d_{max}	167

7.2.3	Calculated isodose lines through the cross section of the virtual EPID. (a) Before matrix rotation and (b) after matrix rotation. The rotation had minimal effect on the isodose lines (0.3 % at d_{max}).	168
7.2.4	Two-dimensional computed transmitted dose distributions at d_{max} for (a) lateral tangent, and (b) medial lateral beam.	169
7.2.5	Respiratory motion simulated in the anatomy frame of reference, in which the beam and virtual EPID move relative to the fixed anatomy. (a) Inhale breathing and (b) exhale breathing.	170
7.3.1	Gamma maps (for the lateral beam) resulting from (a) Breathing inhale of 2 mm, (b) breathing exhale of 2 mm, (c) breathing inhale of 11 mm, and (d) breathing exhale of 11 mm.	174
7.3.2	Gamma maps (for the lateral beam) resulting from (a) Breathing exhale of 2 mm combined with 2.5 mm beam shift (superior), (b) Breathing exhale of 2 mm combined with 2.5 mm beam shift (inferior), (c) Breathing inhale of 2 mm combined with 2.5 mm beam shift (superior), and (d) Breathing inhale of 2 mm combined with 2.5 mm beam shift (inferior).	175
7.3.3	Gamma maps (for the lateral beam) resulting from (a) Breathing exhale of 11 mm combined with 2.5 mm beam shift (superior), (b) Breathing exhale of 11 mm combined with 2.5 mm beam shift (inferior), (c) Breathing inhale of 11 mm combined with 2.5 mm beam shift (superior), and (d) Breathing inhale of 11 mm combined with 2.5 mm beam shift (inferior).	177
7.3.4	A comparison of gamma maps (3 %/2.5 mm) for the medial tangent beam in the midplane and transmitted dose planes resulting from breathing simulations. (a)–(b) Shallow breathing in the inhale direction, (c)–(d) shallow breathing in the exhale direction, (e)–(f) shallow breathing in the inhale direction combined with a 2.5 mm setup error in the superior direction (ie beam shift in the inferior direction).	180

7.3.5 Dose-volume histograms resulting from simulated breathing excursions combined in the same direction in both beams. (a) Planning Target Volume (ipsilateral breast), (b) ipsilateral lung, and (c) heart. 182

Abstract

Two-dimensional transmission dosimetry in radiotherapy has been discussed in the literature for some time as being a potential method for *in vivo* dosimetry. However, it still remains to become a wide spread practice in radiotherapy clinics. This is most likely due to the variety in radiotherapy treatment sites and the challenges they would present in terms of detection and interpretation at the transmitted dose level. Thus, the full potential and limitations of applying transmission dosimetry in the presence of dosimetry errors still need to be demonstrated.

This thesis is a theoretical evaluation of transmission dosimetry using the Pinnacle³ treatment planning system. The accuracy of predicting reliable and accurate absolute transmitted dose maps using the planning system dose algorithm for comparison with measured transmitted dose maps was initially investigated. The resolution in the dose calculations at the transmitted level was then evaluated for rectilinear and curved homogeneous phantoms and rectilinear inhomogeneous phantoms, followed by studies combining both surface curvature and heterogeneities using anthropomorphic phantoms. In order to perform transmitted dose calculations at clinically relevant beam focus-to-transmitted dose plane distances using clinical patient CT data it was first necessary to extend the CT volume. Finally, the thesis explored the efficacy of applying transmission dosimetry in the clinic by simulating realistic dosimetry errors in the planning system using patient treatment plans for a prostate, head and neck, and breast CRT (Conformal Radiotherapy) treatment. Any differences at the transmitted dose level were interpreted and quantified using the gamma formalism. To determine whether the transmitted dose alone was a sufficient indicator

of the dosimetry errors, the magnitude in transmission dose differences were compared with those predicted at the midplane of the patient. Dose-Volume Histograms (DVHs) were also used to evaluate the clinical significance of the dose delivery errors on the target volume and surrounding healthy tissue structures.

Signed Statement

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

SIGNED: DATE:

Acknowledgements

Firstly I owe my gratitude to Tim van Doorn who planted the first seed for this project in 2003. It seems like only yesterday that I first step foot in your office and asked to do a PhD. I would also like to thank you for your supervision throughout the first half of my candidature and for sharing your expertise with me.

Although it is slightly unorthodox to thank a building, however I must thank the RAH Medical Physics department itself! It has been a pleasure to share the same office space once occupied by previous PhD students (the likes of Paul Keall, Wayne Beckham, Peter Hoban, Jeremy Booth and Peter Greer, who's door name placards are enshrined on one of the office walls) whom some of which have become house-hold names in the Medical Physics community. I have fond memories of this place and I am proud to have been a member of a highly regarded and well established Medical Physics department.

A warm thank you to Loredana Marcu, whom I had the pleasure of sharing an office with during the first years. Thanks for your patience, honesty, approachability and words of encouragement.

Mohammad Mohammadi (“Momo”). What can I say? I have never met such a dedicated and hard-working individual in my life. It was a pleasure having you as a close colleague and friend whom I bonded so well with. Thank you for sharing many laughs with me and for burning the midnight oil with me towards the end of our candidatures. Your Xmas party antics shall live on . . .

There are so many other people to thank along the way. I would like to start with Christine Robinson for just being her - a happy and cheerful individual to have around. Thanks also for organising all the social events and lunches for the department. In particular, I would also like to thank Kurt Byas, Kym Quach, Madhava Bhat, Ralph Nicholls, Lotte Fog, Judith Pollard, Neil Piller, and all the students in the department whom I got to know. Please forgive me if I have left anybody out!

Last but not least, I would like to express my warmest and sincere thanks to Eva Bezak, who'm I am grateful for accepting to take over the reins from Tim as my supervisor in the second half of my candidature. She is a true professional and great leader whom I have tremendous respect for as a physicist and individual. Thank you for your patience, mentorship and diligence towards my project throughout the years.

On a personal note, I would like to thank my family, particularly my parents for their patience and support throughout this large undertaking. Above all, thank you for having faith in me. Now its time to celebrate!

Publications in refereed journals

1. **P. Reich** and E. Bezak, “The use of a treatment planning system to investigate the potential for transmission dosimetry in detecting patient breathing during breast 3D CRT,” *Australas. Phys. Eng. Sci. Med.* 31(2), 110-21 (2008).
2. M. Mohammadi, E. Bezak, and **P. Reich**, “Verification of dose delivery for a prostate sIMRT treatment using a SLIC-EPID”, *Applied Radiation and Isotopes*. In press.
3. M. Mohammadi, E. Bezak, and **P. Reich**, “The use of extended dose range film for dosimetric calibration of a scanning liquid-filled ionization chamber electronic portal imaging device”, *J Appl Clin Med Phys.* 8, 69-84 (2007).
4. **P. Reich**, E. Bezak, M. Mohammadi, and L. Fog, “The prediction of transmitted dose distributions using a 3D treatment planning system,” *Australas. Phys. Eng. Sci. Med.* 29, 18-29 (2006).
5. M. Mohammadi, E. Bezak, and **P. Reich**, “Comparison of two-dimensional transmitted dose maps: evaluation of existing algorithms,” *Australas. Phys. Eng. Sci. Med.* 29, 179-187 (2006).

Papers submitted in refereed journals

P. Reich, E. Bezak, and M. Mohammadi, “A theoretical evaluation of transmission dosimetry for a 3D conformal four-field box prostate treatment.” *Submitted to Physics in Medicine and Biology*.

Conference presentations

International

1. Mohammadi, E. Bezak, and **P. Reich**. “Using a Scanning Liquid Ionization Chamber EPID for Prostate and Head and Neck Treatments”. *World Congress on Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering*. 2006. Seoul, South Korea.
2. **P. Reich**, E. Bezak, and M. Mohammadi. “Using a TPS to model the impact of 3D CRT patient treatment set up errors on predicted transmitted dose”. *9th International Workshop on Electronic Portal Imaging*. 2006. Melbourne, Australia.
3. M. Mohammadi, E. Bezak, and **P. Reich**. “Verification of sIMRT for prostate dose delivery using a SLIC-EPID”. *9th International Workshop on Electronic Portal Imaging*. 2006. Melbourne, Australia.
4. **P. Reich**, E. Bezak, L. Fog, and M. Mohammadi. “Predicting 2D transmitted dose maps using a 3D treatment planning system”. *8th Biennial ESTRO Meeting on Physics and Radiation Technology for Clinical Radiotherapy*. 2005. Lisboa, Portugal.

National

5. **P. Reich**, E. Bezak, and M. Mohammadi. “What accuracy is required of predicted transmitted dose maps for EPID dosimetry in breast CRT?”. *Engineering and the Physical Sciences in Medicine 31st Annual Conference*. 2007. Fremantle, Australia.
6. **P. Reich**, E. Bezak, and M. Mohammadi. “The effects of simulated patient set-up errors on transmitted dose in 3D prostate CRT”. *Engineering and the Physical Sciences in Medicine 29th Annual Conference*. 2005. Adelaide, Australia.
7. M. Mohammadi, E. Bezak, and **P. Reich**. “Investigation of two-dimensional dose

distribution evaluation tools”. *Engineering and the Physical Sciences in Medicine 29th Annual Conference*. 2005. Adelaide, Australia.

- Awarded IOP Publishing Student Poster Prize.

8. M. Mohammadi, E. Bezak, and **P. Reich**. “Verification of two-dimensional transmitted dose measurements in the presence of homogeneous/inhomogeneous phantoms”. *Engineering and the Physical Sciences in Medicine 29th Annual Conference*. 2005. Adelaide, Australia.
9. **P. Reich**, E. Bezak, and L. Fog. “Transmission dosimetry in Pinnacle 3D treatment planning system”. *Engineering and the Physical Sciences in Medicine 28th Annual Conference*. 2004. Geelong, Australia.

Other presentations

1. **P. Reich**, E. Bezak, and M. Mohammadi. “The effect of simulated patient set-up errors on transmitted dose in 3D prostate CRT”. *Postgraduate Student Papers Night*. Adelaide, Australia. 2005. Sponsored by ACPSEM, SAMBE and EACBE (SA branches).
2. **P. Reich**, E. Bezak, and L. Fog. “Transmission dosimetry using Pinnacle 3D treatment planning system: towards an online in vivo dosimetry verification system”. *Postgraduate Student Papers Night*. Adelaide, Australia. 2004. Sponsored by ACPSEM, SAMBE and EACBE (SA branches).

To my parents