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Workflow (user’s perspective)

Physician’s Plan Order

CT simulation

Autoplanner

Radiotherapy treatment plan

Documentation
Primary Planning
- CT Table Removal
- Body Contour Definition
- Marked Isocenter Detection
- Atlas-Based Contouring
- Create fields
- Optimize dose
- Calculate dose

Secondary Verification
- CT Table Removal
- Body Contour Definition
- Marked Isocenter Detection
- Atlas-Based Contouring
- Create fields
- Optimize dose
- Calculate dose

Do primary and secondary methods agree?
- Yes
- No

Plan Documentation

Manual planning
- Yes
- No

Transfer Plan to Record and Verify

MD approves plan?
- Yes
- No

Key
- Radiation oncologist
- Medical physicist
- Technologist

Primary dose: Eclipse
Secondary dose: Mobius
CT Console ➔ RPA Client Apps ➔ Approved CT Doc
Approved Plan Order
CT Series

Option 1:
MDACC Cluster Computing
• RPA Engine
• Eclipse Boxes
• Mobius Boxes

Option 2: Local Computing
• RPA Engine
• Eclipse Box
• Mobius Box

Local Plan Report
Local DICOM Plan

RV System ➔ Linac

Version 3 Architecture
PRE-PROCESSING
CT Table Removal

Method 1: *Peak Detection*
By finding peaks slice by slice at sum projection signal along lateral direction.

Method 2: *Line Detection*
By detecting Hough lines at maximum intensity projection image.

- Average difference between two approaches: $2.6 \pm 1.6\text{mm}$ (max: $4.9\text{mm}$)
Body Contour

Method 1: *Active Contour*
By contracting initial active contour to the body edge.

Method 2: *Intensity Thresholding*
By thresholding CT image into binary mask.

- Average agreement = 0.6mm, Average max: 7.6mm
Auto Body Contour Check

Instructions
Two independent methods were used to detect body contour. The difference between them are compared to decide the result of primary method is passed or failed.

Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Method</th>
<th>Secondary Method</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Threshold</td>
<td>By ActiveContour</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Distance Difference</td>
<td>0.28cm</td>
<td>Pass: &lt;= 0.5cm. Fail: &gt; 0.5cm.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance Difference</td>
<td>0.046cm</td>
<td>Pass: &lt;= 0.5cm. Fail: &gt; 0.5cm.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dice Index</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pass: &gt;= 0.97. Fail: &lt; 0.97.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Images

Primary Body Contour

Secondary Body Contour
Marked Isocenter Detection

Method 1: *Body Ring Method*
By searching BB candidates in the body ring domain.

Method 2: *BB Topology Method*
By searching BBs that constitute the triangle topology.

- Average difference between two approaches: $0.4 \pm 0.8\text{mm}$ (max: $3.0\text{mm}$)
CERVICAL CANCER 4-FIELD BOX
For cervical cancer treatment:
Determine the jaws and blocks

1st Algorithm
“3D Method”

Input: Patient CT
And Isocenter

2nd Algorithm
“2D Method”

Inter-compare

Output: treatment fields
Create Treatment Beams (3D method)

**INPUT:** Patient CT and Isocenter

**OUTPUT:** 4 treatment fields
Retrospective Testing

- Total 500+ patients
- Reviewed by physicians from MD Anderson (USA) and Stellenbosch University (South Africa)
- Most recent version
  - n = 150
  - 89% Approval Rate
  - #1 cause of rejection: superior border
  - Otherwise, 99% of plans are acceptable
Clinical Version Deployed at MD Anderson

Auto-planned fields After physician edits

Anterior

Right Lateral

20 patients so far

~10 minutes per patient

Clinical Version Deployed at MD Anderson

Auto-planned fields After physician edits

Anterior

Right Lateral

20 patients so far

~10 minutes per patient
Beam weight optimization

- **Goal:** minimize dose heterogeneity in the treatment volume
- **Results:**
  - Average hotspot reduction of 1.7%
  - No loss in coverage
Optimized vs. equal weighting

Large reduction in max dose for patients with high max doses (≥107%)
  – 3.5% on average

# of patients with dose ≥110% was reduced from 16 to 1
Use of secondary algorithm for QA

“3D Method” algorithm

- Segment bony anatomy using multi-atlas deformable registration
- Project these 3D segmentations into the 2D plane of the BEV
- On the projections, identify landmarks (e.g. inferior edge of the obturator foramen)
- Define the treatment field borders based on these landmarks

Output: 4-field box treatment fields

“2D Method” algorithm

- Create DRRs at each beam angle from the patient CT
- Deform an atlas of DRRs to the patient DRRs. The atlas DRRs have corresponding treatment fields.
- Apply deformations to the treatment fields to obtain deformed blocks
- Define the treatment field borders by least-squares fitting to the set of deformed blocks

Output: 4-field box treatment fields

“3D Method” algorithm

- Inputs: Patient CT and Isocenter

“2D Method” algorithm

- Inputs: Patient CT and Isocenter
Comparison of primary and verification algorithms (39 patients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physician Rating</th>
<th>3D Method</th>
<th>2D Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Protocol</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Variation</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable Deviation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of cervical cancer autoplanning

- 3D algorithm deployed to MDACC clinical use
- Workflow designed and integrated
- Secondary (verification) algorithms developed
- Still working on superior border issue
- Next: Further testing using local data at Stellenbosch, Santo Tomas, and others
- Beth Beadle to present some sample plans for feedback......
HEAD/NECK VMAT
Head and neck treatments

- Range of complexities in treatments
  - VMAT or IMRT
  - Opposed laterals / off-cord cone-downs
  - Complex conformal plans
- Starting with VMAT (IMRT)
  - Auto-contouring normal tissue
  - Auto-contouring low-risk CTV
  - Manual contouring of GTV
  - RapidPlan (Eclipse)
Workflow overview (user’s perspective)

1. Add GTV
2. review / edit contours

Radiotherapy treatment plan

QA report

Physician’s Plan Order

CT

Autoplanner

1. Add GTV
2. review / edit contours

30 min approve

approve

approve
The search for a good contouring algorithm

Eight Contouring algorithms options evaluated:

1. Eclipse Smart Detection (Heuristic)
2. Eclipse Smart Segmentation (DIR)
   a) Single Atlas
   b) Fused Atlas
3. Varian Deeds (DIR)
   a) Varian Atlas
   Two fusion techniques:
   – Majority voting
   – STAPLE fusion
   b) MDACC Atlas
4. In-house multi-atlas technique - MACS (DIR) [STAPLE fusion]
   a) MDACC Atlas
   b) Original Varian Atlas
Validation- MACS

- MACS – developed in-house
- Normal tissues
- Scored by MDACC radiation oncologist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Physician Rating</th>
<th>Dice</th>
<th>MSD (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brain</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.04 ± 0.48</td>
<td>0.98 ± 0.01</td>
<td>1.03 ± 0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstem</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.14 ± 0.48</td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.12</td>
<td>2.31 ± 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochlea</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3.91 ± 0.81</td>
<td>0.47 ± 0.16</td>
<td>1.75 ± 0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>4.13 ± 0.58</td>
<td>0.85 ± 0.06</td>
<td>1.33 ± 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.95 ± 0.49</td>
<td>0.48 ± 0.12</td>
<td>21.88 ± 10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.27 ± 0.54</td>
<td>0.84 ± 0.07</td>
<td>1.89 ± 1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parotid</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4.33 ± 0.66</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.07</td>
<td>2.39 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpinalCord</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.94 ± 0.24</td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.13</td>
<td>4.77 ± 6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung Modified</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93 ± 0.04</td>
<td>2.05 ± 1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal Cord Modified</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.06</td>
<td>1.16 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validation - MACS

- MACS – developed in-house
- 1 MDACC radiation oncologist
- 5 outside (international) physicians
- Evaluated 10 patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physician 1</th>
<th>Physicians 2-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brain</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.48</td>
<td>3.51 ± 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstem</td>
<td>3.4 ± 0.52</td>
<td>3.08 ± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochlea</td>
<td>3.45 ± 0.60</td>
<td>4.03 ± 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>3.7 ± 0.66</td>
<td>3.48 ± 0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>4.1 ± 0.32</td>
<td>3.74 ± 0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.53</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parotid</td>
<td>3.85 ± 0.67</td>
<td>3.76 ± 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpinalCord</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.42</td>
<td>3.52 ± 0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deployed to clinical use at MDA
- 200+ patients since May 2016

Compare auto-contour pre- and post-edits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>MDA (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochlea</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esophagus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parotid</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal Cord</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DSC: Dice similarity coefficient

$DSC = \frac{2(D \cap T)}{|D| + |T|}$

>0.7 is considered acceptable
Auto-contouring of targets

- GTV – this will have to be done manually (for now.....)
- Lymph nodes (left / right):
  - Levels II-IV
  - Levels IB-V
  - Levels IA-V
  - Retropharyngeal lymph node

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Stdev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Node_RP, L</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node_RP, R</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node_II-IV, L</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node_II-IV, R</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node_Ib-V, L</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node_Ib-V, R</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node_Ia-V, L</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node_Ia-V, R</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use Eclipse RapidPlan to predict DVHs

- mandible
- Right parotid
- Left parotid
- cord
- brain
And optimization constraints

cord

cord constraint

Left parotid

Left parotid constraint
Then optimize the plan

- (RapidPlan model required fine-tuning)
- Our current process is to simultaneously optimize 4 plans
  - Standard RPA constraints vs. additional weights for parotid, cord, brainstem
  - 2 vs. 4 arcs
- Final plan chosen automatically based on homogeneity etc. (TBD)
- (most vendors are working on multi-criteria optimization which will help...)
- Beth Beadle to present some sample plans for feedback.......

![Contralateral Parotid](chart.jpg)
Quality Assurance

• Basic QA of input data
  – Does the site match?
    • H/N vs. pelvis
  – Is the orientation correct?
  – CT scan length sufficient?

• Comparison of primary and secondary algorithms
  – Dose calculation: Eclipse vs. Mobius
  – Other independent algorithms for all other functions
    • Couch removal
    • Contours
    • Beam apertures

Simple image registration
Quality Assurance

- Comparison with population values
  - MU
  - Jaw positions
  - ........
- Data transfer checks (automatic)
- Manual plan checks
  - Physics
  - Radiation oncology

Jaw positions – population statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>gantry: 0deg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. dev.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total MU – population statistics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. dev.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How long does it take?

- Cervical cancer 4-field box: 21 minutes
- Head/neck VMAT (current, AAA dose calculation):
  - 2-arc plan: 46 minutes
  - 4-arc plan: 54 minutes
- Head/neck VMAT (future – distributed MACS and Acuros dose calculation):
  - 2-arc plan: 32 minutes
  - 4-arc plan: 36 minutes
Automation of treatment planning: Summary

• Automatic treatment planning may help reduce the planning burden, reducing staff shortages
• Fully automated cervical cancer 4-field box treatments –
  – Field aperture task already deployed at MDA
• Fully automated H/N IMRT/VMAT treatment planning – almost ready
  – Normal tissue contouring task already deployed at MDA
  – Fine-tuning plan quality
• Breast / chest wall – next
• (and also work on 2D plans, not mentioned today......)

Contact: lecourt@mdanderson.org