FEASIBILITY OF POSITRON EMISSION TOMOGRAPHY OF DOSE DISTRIBUTION IN PROTON-BEAM CANCER THERAPY*

J. J. Beebe-Wang[†], F. A. Dilmanian, S. G. Peggs, D. J. Schlyer and P. Vaska Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973, USA

Abstract

Proton therapy is a treatment modality of increasing utility in clinical radiation oncology mostly because its dose distribution conforms more tightly to the target volume than x-ray radiation therapy. One important feature of proton therapy is that it produces a small amount of positron-emitting isotopes along the beam-path through the non-elastic nuclear interaction of protons with target nuclei such as ¹²C, ¹⁴N and ¹⁶O. These radioisotopes, mainly ¹¹C, ¹³N and ¹⁵O, allow imaging the therapy dose distribution using positron emission tomography (PET). The resulting PET images provide a powerful tool for quality assurance of the treatment, especially when treating inhomogeneous organs such as the lungs or the head-and-neck, where the calculation of the dose distribution for treatment planning is more difficult. This paper uses Monte Carlo simulations to predict the yield of positron emitters produced by a 250 MeV proton beam, and to simulate the productions of the image in a clinical PET scanner.

1 INTRODUCTION

Positron emission tomography (PET) is potentially a very useful and powerful tool for monitoring of the distribution of the dose deposited in the patient from proton therapy [1-6]. This method is based on the detection of the positron-annihilation γ -rays following the decay of the small amounts of β^+ emitters (typically ¹¹C, ¹³N and ¹⁵O) produced via non-elastic nuclear reaction of protons with the target nuclei of the irradiated tissue. Verification of the therapy can be achieved by comparing the PET images discerning the β^+ activity distribution with the predicted target dose distribution used to plan the treatment.

The PET image is essentially the negative image of the target volume because the non-elastic nuclear reaction cross sections provide signal along most of the beam path, but diminish at the Bragg peak, where most of the proton energy is deposited via other interactions. However, an effective dose verification can still be made by comparing the radioisotope distribution measured by PET and the yield of the positron emitters predicted from the treatment planning code.

The possibility of proton therapy monitoring by means

of PET was investigated by various groups [1-6]. However, due to the limitations of available non-elastic nuclear cross section data and detailed simulation codes, most of the simulation studies carried out in the past did not address the issue of the low energy end of the proton track, which is essential in monitoring the Bragg peak. In this paper, we examine the potential of PET as a quality assurance method for the full energy range (0.1-250 MeV) of the proton. The incentive for this work was the design of the Rapid Cycling Medical Synchrotron (RCMS) [7] at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

2 POSITRON EMITTER PRODUCTION

During proton therapy, even though many isotopes are produced through different nuclear interactions, there are only 6 major channels producing the positron emitters ¹¹C, ¹³N and ¹⁵O in human tissue. Table 1 summarizes this reactions. The cross sections shown in Fig.1 and Fig.2, were extracted from the emission spectra of recoils in the data files provided by the ICRU Report 63 [8].

Table 1: Relevant positron-emitter production reactions

	Threshold	Half-life	Positron
Reaction	Energy	Time	Max. E.
	(MeV)	(min)	(MeV)
¹⁶ O (p, pn) ¹⁵ O	16.79	2.037	1.72
$^{16}O(p, 2p2n)$ $^{13}N^{a)}$	5.66 ^{c)}	9.965	1.19
$^{14}N(p, pn)^{13}N$	11.44	9.965	1.19
$^{12}C(p, pn)^{11}C$	20.61	20.39	0.96
$^{14}N(p, 2p2n)^{11}C^{a)}$	3.22 ^{c)}	20.39	0.96
$^{16}O(p, 3p3n)^{11}C^{b)}$	59.64 ^{c)}	20.39	0.96

a): (p,2p2n) is inclusive of (p,α)

b): (p, 3p3n) is inclusive of (p, α pn)

c): The listed thresholds refer to (p, α) and $(p, \alpha pn)$



Fig. 1 Cross sections of nuclear reactions ${}^{12}C(p, pn){}^{11}C$, ${}^{14}N(p, 2p2n){}^{11}C$ and ${}^{16}O(p, 3p3n){}^{11}C$ vs. proton energy.

^{*}Research supported by the Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) program of Brookhaven National Laboratory, funded by the U.S. Department of Energy.

[†] bbwang@bnl.gov



Fig. 2 Cross sections of nuclear reactions ${}^{16}O(p, 2p2n){}^{13}N$, ${}^{14}N(p, pn){}^{13}N$ and ${}^{16}O(p, pn){}^{15}O$ vs. proton energy.

3 MONTE CARLO SIMULATION

SRNA-BNL software package was used in this study. It was originally developed by R. D. Ilic (SRNA-2KG) [9], and was modified for this work to include also the production of positron emitter nuclei. SRNA-2KG is a Monte Carlo code for use in proton transport, radiotherapy, and dosimetry. Protons within an energy range of 100 keV to 250 MeV with pre-specified spectra are transported in a 3D geometry through material zones confined by planes and second order surfaces. SRNA can treat proton transport in 279 different kinds of materials including elements from Z=1 to Z=98 and 181 compounds and mixtures.

The simulation of proton transport is based on the multiple scattering theory of charged particles and on a model for compound nucleus decay after proton absorption in non-elastic nuclear interactions. For each part of the range, an average loss of energy [10] is calculated with a fluctuation from Vavilov's distribution and with Schulek's correction [9]. The deflection angle of protons is sampled from Moliere's distribution [9]. SRNA have been benchmarked with the well know programs GEANT-3 [11] and PETRA [12]. Very good agreement was reached under the same conditions. Fig. 3 shows the results comparison of a 250 MeV proton pencil beam in water phantom from SRMA-2KG and GEANT-3.



Fig.3 Comparison of simulation results obtained from SRNA-2KG and GEANT-3. (Courtesy of Dr. R.D. Ilic)

The positron emitters ¹¹C, ¹³N and ¹⁵O are created through the decay processes of compound nuclei which include emission of protons, deuterons, tritons, alpha particles or photons. The decay products are sampled using Poisson's distribution with appropriate average multiplication factors for each particle. Energy and angle of particle emissions, and the multiplication factors are obtained from comparing the direct cross sections available for reaching the daughter nuclei with that from the integration of differential cross sections [8] for nonelastic nuclear interactions. Energy and angle of secondary neutron emission are sampled from emission spectra. Transport of secondary protons follows that of primary protons of that particular energy. Spatial location and angle of neutron and photon are recorded, but not further treated. Emitted deuterons, tritons and alpha particles are assumed to be absorbed at the location of their creation.

In order to assess the feasibility of effectively imaging the resulting positron emitter distribution, a realistic PET scan was then simulated using the SimSET Monte Carlo PET simulation package [13]. The software tracked each positron decay which occurred during a simulated 60minute post-therapy scan. SimSET handles the most important aspects of the image formation process, including photon attenuation and scatter, geometry and photon acceptance of the tomograph, and binning of the coincidence data. The clinical whole-body Siemens/CTI HR+ tomograph was simulated with the proton beam direction aligned with the scanner axis. The binned projection data was reconstructed into volumetric images using the standard filtered back-projection technique.

4 RESULTS

A 250 MeV proton beam with 2mm diameter and a zero angle of divergence was transported in a human tissue using the SRNA-BNL simulation code. The soft tissue (ICRU 4-component) used in the simulation had a 0.55 ratio of the averaged atomic number to atomic mass (Z/A), and a density of 1.0 g/cm³. The elemental composition of the tissue was 10.11% hydrogen, 11.11% carbon, 2.60% nitrogen, and 76.18% oxygen. The number of protons used in each set of the simulations was 4×10^6 . This proton beam was estimated to produce an average absorbed dose of 2 Gray in the last 8.5 cm of its track, which is an appropriate estimate for treating a target volume 8.5 cm in diameter.

The positron emitter spatial distributions were simulated with the cross-sections shown in Figs. 1 and 2. The results of linear production densities of ¹¹C, ¹³N and ¹⁵O are presented in Fig. 4. In order to observe the details close to the Bragg peak, deta were presented in the depth range of 250-400 mm. The linear production densities remain nearly constant at the depth under 250 mm due to the nearly constant values of the cross sections at proton energies above 100 MeV. In order to reduce the random

noise, the values are obtained from averaging 225 sets of simulation data. The total energy absorbed by the tissue is superimposed with a right-side vertical scale in the same figure for depth comparison.

Fig. 5 is a coronal slice from the reconstructed PET image. Despite less than 3000 coincidence counts in the entire image, the narrow transaxial distribution and lack of background activity gives sufficient contrast to provide a reasonable definition of the distribution. The depth distribution of the activity is plotted in Fig. 6.



Fig.4 The simulation results of linear production densities of ¹¹C, ¹³N and ¹⁵O vs. depth. The absorbed energy by the tissue is superimposed using a right-side vertical scale for depth comparison.



Fig.5 A 0.8 mm slice through the activity distribution of the 3-dimentional PET image. The beam entered from left. Horizontal (axial) dimension is 15 cm (full scanner FOV) and pixel size is 2.4 mm (H) by 0.8 mm (V).



Fig.6 Depth distribution of induced activity as determined from PET image.

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The simulations demonstrate that, for 250 MeV protons and a typical radiotherapy dose of 2 Gray to the target volume during a therapy session, a subsequently acquired PET image will have sufficient signal-to-noise ratio to determine the depth profile of the induced activity distribution. Further work will be necessary. The ultimate goal is the verification of the measured PET image with a simulated PET image. Matching of these two images implies that the treatment was according to the Plan. For treatment involving multiple ports including some opposing angles, in addition to the above effect, the centroid of the target dose can be computed with that of the PET image.

6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to think Dr. R.D. Ilic and the Imaging Research Lab at University Washington for providing SRNA-2KG and SimSET software packages. We also appreciate invaluable discussions with Drs. J. Liang, C. Woody, and J. S. Kovach.

7 REFERENCES

[1] W. Enghardt et al, Positron emission tomography for quality assurance of cancer therapy with light ion beams, Nucl. Phys. A 654, p.1047c-50c, (1999)

[2] K. Parodi and W. Enghardt, Potential application of PET in quality assurance of proton therapy, Phys. Med. Biol. 45, N151-N156 (2000)

[3] A. Fassò et al, FLUKA-98, (1998)

[4] U. Oelfke, G.K.Y Lam and M.S. Atkins, Proton dose monitoring with PET: quantitative studies in Lucite, Phys. Med. Biol. 41, p.177-196, (1996)

[5] K. Parodi, W. Enghardt, and T. Haberer, In-beam PET measurements of β + radioactivity induced by proton beams, Phys. Med. Biol. 47 p.21-26 (2002)

[6] A.M.J. Paans and J.M. Schippers, Proton Therapy in combination with PET as monitor: A feasibility study, IEEE Trans. Nucl. Science, 40, p.1041-1043, (1993)

[7] S. Peggs et al, "The Rapid Cycling Medical Synchrotron, RCMS", these proceedings, (2002)

[8] ICRU Report 63, "Nuclear Data for Neutron and Proton Radiotherapy and for Radiation", MD,USA (2000) [9] R.D. Ilic, "SRNA-2KG - Proton Transport Simulation by Monte Carlo Techniques", Institute of Nuclear Sciences Vinca, Phys. Lab., (010), Beograd, Yugoslavia, February, (2002)

[10] ICRU Report 49, Stopping Power and Ranges for Protons and Alpha Particles, MD, USA (1993)

[11] GEANT 1994 CERN Program Library Long Writeup W5013, (1994)

[12] J. Medin, "Studies of Clinical Proton Dosimetry Using Monte Carlo Simulation and Experimental Techniques", Ph. D. thesis, Stockholm Univ., (1997)

[13] R.L. Harrison, S.D. Vannot, M.S. Kaplan, T.K. Lewellen, "Slat collimation and cylindrical detectors for PET simulations using simSET", IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium Conf. Record, vol.3, p.20/89-20/92 (2000)