

# QA for Clinical Dosimetry with Emphasis on Clinical Trials




Geoffrey S. Ibbott, Ph.D.  
and RPC Staff

---

*G. Ibbott, AAPM Summer School, June 24, 2009*

# QA Infrastructure for Clinical Trials



AAPM June 24, 2009

# What QA is Required?

Depends on the accuracy desired:

---

- ❖ D. Herring & D.M.J Compton (1971):
  - ❖ Delivered dose should be accurate to  $\pm 5\%$
- ❖ L. Taylor, commenting on remarks by R.R. Newell (1940):
  - ❖ Physical dosimetry must be accurate, even though biological effects are more uncertain.
- ❖ Data from the RPC show that differences among institutions decrease when uniform protocols are followed (Hanson 1991)
- ❖ The 5% figure repeated in numerous publications, including ICRU 24



# What do clinical trials require?

---

- ❖ RTOG 0813:
- ❖ Doses falling within criteria established by the Medical Physics Committee will be deemed acceptable. The criteria for acceptable agreement between measured doses in the RPC lung phantom and calculated doses ... shall be within 5% or 5 mm.



AAPM June 24, 2009

# What do clinical trials require (2)?

---

- ❖ RTOG 0848 (Acceptable variation):
- ❖ At least 95% of the PTV receives at least 95% of the prescription dose and at least 99.9% of the CTV receiving at least 95% of the prescribed dose of 50.4 Gy (= 47.9 Gy).

# Radiological Physics Center

---

- Formed when AAPM received funding from NCI and announced competition
- Founded in 1968 to monitor institution participation in clinical trials
- Funded continuously by NCI as structure of cooperative group programs have changed
- Now 40 years of experience of monitoring institutions and reporting findings to study groups and community

# Mission

---

The mission of the Radiological Physics Center is to **assure NCI and the Cooperative Groups that** institutions participating in clinical trials deliver prescribed **radiation doses that are clinically comparable and consistent.** We do this by assessing the institution's radiotherapy programs, helping the institutions implement remedial actions, assisting the study groups in developing protocols and QA procedures, and summarizing our findings for the radiation therapy community.




AAPM June 24, 2009

# Components of a QA Program

---

- Remote audits of machine output
  - ◆ 1,674 institutions, 14,188 beams measured with TLD (2008)
- Treatment record reviews
  - ◆ Review for GOG, NSABP, NCCTG, RTOG (brachy)
- Independent recalculation of patient dose
  - ◆ Continue to find errors
- On-site dosimetry reviews
  - ◆ 50 institutions visited (~150 accelerators measured)
- Credentialing
  - ◆ Phantoms, benchmarks, questionnaires, rapid reviews



# RPC TLD NETWORK

1,674 RT facilities in 27 countries throughout the world,  
including 58 EORTC members



**Office Hours:**  
 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.  
 M-F Central time.

**Holidays**

- Services
- Forms
- Publications
- Brachy Sources
- Research/TG-51
- Upcoming Meetings

**Monitored Institution Search**

City  Institution Name (wildcard = %)

State/Province  or RTF Number

Zip Code  Show Institutions reset clear

Country

Total number of distinct institutions: 1674 (1674 total active institutions monitored)

on Friday Apr 03, 2009 at 8:53 AM

- ✓ USA
- CANADA
- Non-USA
- AUSTRALIA
- AUSTRIA
- BELGIUM
- CHINA
- HUNGARY
- INDIA
- IRELAND
- ISRAEL
- ITALY
- JAPAN
- N/A
- NETHERLANDS
- NEW ZEALAND
- PERU
- POLAND
- REPUBLIC OF KOREA
- SAUDI ARABIA
- SERBIA
- SINGAPORE
- SLOVAKIA
- SOUTH AFRICA
- SPAIN
- SWEDEN
- SWITZERLAND
- TAIWAN
- TURKEY

# RPC T NETWORK

1,674 RT facilities in 27 countries throughout the world,  
 including 58 EORTC members

The screenshot shows the RPC Radiology website interface. At the top left is the RPC logo with a globe and the tagline "Excellence in Radiology". Below the logo are navigation links: Home, About us, Newsletter, and a red "Credent" link. To the right of the logo is a search bar with the text "Search RPC by Google" and a "GO" button. Below the search bar is the phone number "13-745-8989" and links for "Contact us", "Links", and "Site map".

On the left side, there is a section for "Office Hours: 8 A.M. to 5 P.M. M-F Central time." and "Holidays". Below this is a vertical menu with buttons for "Services", "Forms", "Publications", "Brachy Sources", "Research/TG-51", and "Upcoming Meetings".

In the center, there is a search filter panel with a table:

City
State/Province
Zip Code
Country
Total number of distinct

To the right of this panel is a vertical list of countries, with "CHINA" highlighted in blue. The list includes: USA, CANADA, Non-USA, AUSTRALIA, AUSTRIA, BELGIUM, CHINA, HUNGARY, INDIA, IRELAND, ISRAEL, ITALY, JAPAN, N/A, NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, PERU, POLAND, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, SAUDI ARABIA, SERBIA, SINGAPORE, SLOVAKIA, SOUTH AFRICA, SPAIN, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, TAIWAN, and TURKEY.

On the far right, there is another search filter panel with input fields for "and = %" and "number", a "clear" button, and a "Go" button. Below these fields, it displays "(1674 total active institutions monitored)" and "3 AM".

RPC T  
1,674 RT facilities  
includ


WORK  
oughout the world,  
mbers



# TLD IRRADIATION

Institutions receive acrylic block containing dosimeters

# Institutions with One or More Unacceptable TLD Measurements



G. Ibbott, AAPM June 24, 2009

# Why are TLDs out of criteria?



Inexperience  
Variations in training  
Mistakes at commissioning  
New technologies pull resources  
from basic QA procedures

Laoer

# Benefits of the TLD Program

---

- Helps institutions stay vigilant
- Problems contribute to priorities for visits
- May satisfy state/local requirements for independent review
- Identifies problems that have direct impact on every patient treated
- It is a model for other remote programs

# Components of a QA Program

---

- Annual checks of machine output
  - ◆ 1,674 institutions, 14,188 beams measured with TLD (2008)
- Treatment record reviews
  - ◆ Review for GOG, NSABP, NCCTG, RTOG (brachy)
- Independent recalculation of patient dose
  - ◆ Continue to find errors
- On-site dosimetry reviews
  - ◆ 50 institutions visited (~150 accelerators measured)
- Credentialing
  - ◆ Phantoms, benchmarks, questionnaires, rapid reviews

# Purpose of Patient Dose Review

---

- Maintain low uncertainty in doses delivered to protocol patients by discovering and correcting errors
- Provide study groups with accurate dose data

# Purpose of Patient Dose Review

---

- ✎ Maintain low uncertainty in doses delivered to protocol patients by discovering and correcting errors
- ✎ Provide study groups with accurate dose data

*Improve Clinical Trials*



AAPM June 24, 2009

# RPC Patient Dose Review

---

- ❖ Independent calculation of tumor dose
- ❖ Agree within 5% (15% for implants)
- ❖ Verify dose, time, fractionation per protocol
- ❖ Notify institution if major deviation seen during review to prevent further deviations




AAPM June 24, 2009

# Components of a QA Program

---

- Annual checks of machine output
  - ◆ 1,674 institutions, 14,188 beams measured with TLD (2008)
- Treatment record reviews
  - ◆ Review for GOG, NSABP, NCCTG, RTOG (brachy)
- Independent recalculation of patient dose
  - ◆ Continue to find errors
- On-site dosimetry reviews
  - ◆ 50 institutions visited (~150 accelerators measured)
- Credentialing
  - ◆ Phantoms, benchmarks, questionnaires, rapid reviews

# Visit Priority



AAPM June 24, 2009

# On-Site Dosimetry Review Visit

 The only completely independent comprehensive radiotherapy quality audit in the USA and Canada

- Identify errors in dosimetry and QA and suggest improvements.
- Collect and verify dosimetry data for chart review.
- Improve quality of patient care.



# On-Site Dosimetry Review

Selected discrepancies discovered 2004 – 2008

Errors Regarding	Number of Institutions (%)
Review QA Program	127 (77%)
*Wedge Transmission	53 (32%)
*Photon FSD (small fields)	46 (28%)
Off-Axis, Beam Symmetry	42 (25%)
*Photon Depth Dose	34 (21%)
*Electron Calibration	25 (15%)
*Photon Calibration	22 (13%)
*Electron Depth Dose	19 (12%)

\*70% of institutions received at least one of the significant dosimetry recommendations.



# Components of a QA Program

---

- Annual checks of machine output
  - ◆ 1,674 institutions, 14,188 beams measured with TLD (2008)
- Treatment record reviews
  - ◆ Review for GOG, NSABP, NCCTG, RTOG (brachy)
- Independent recalculation of patient dose
  - ◆ Continue to find errors
- On-site dosimetry reviews
  - ◆ 50 institutions visited (~150 accelerators measured)
- Credentialing
  - ◆ Phantoms, benchmarks, questionnaires, rapid reviews

# Credentialing

Why?

- Education
- Evaluate ability to deliver dose
- Improve understanding of protocol

**Reduce deviation rate**

AAPM June 24, 2009

22

# General Credentialing Process

- ★ Previous patients treated with technique
- ★ Facility Questionnaire
- ★ Knowledge Assessment Questionnaire
- ★ Benchmark case or phantom
- ★ Electronic data submission
- ★ RPC QA & dosimetry review

# General Credentialing Process


- ★ Previous patients treated with technique
- ★ Facility Questionnaire
- ★ Knowledge Assessment Questionnaire
- ★ Benchmark case or phantom
- ★ Electronic data submission
- ★ RPC QA & dosimetry review

**Feedback  
to  
Institution**


# Treatment Planning Benchmark

---


- ❖ Demonstrates ability of planner to generate a dose distribution that complies with protocol




# RPC Phantoms



**Pelvis (14)**




**Thorax (15)**



**H&N (30)**




**SRS Head (4)**




**Liver (2)**


# RPC Phantoms



**Pelvis (14)**




**Thorax (15)**



**H&N (30)**




**SRS Head (4)**




**Liver (2)**

## Lung Phantom and Moving Platform



AAPM June 24, 2009

# Number of Phantoms Mailed per Year



AAPM June 24, 2009

**Treat phantom  
as if it were a  
patient**



Tuesday, June 23, 2009




# Deliver treatment




Tuesday, June 23, 2009

# RPC Compares Treated Distribution with Plan



# RPC Compares Treated Distribution with Plan



# Phantom Results

Comparison between institution's plan and delivered dose.  
Criteria for agreement: 7% or 4 mm DTA (5%/5mm for lung)

Site	Institutions	Irradiations	Pass
H&N	472	631	75%
Pelvis	108	130	82%
Lung	67	77	71%
Liver	15	18	50%



G. Ibbott, AAPM June 24, 2009

# Explanations for Failures

Explanation	Minimum # of occurrences
<b>incorrect output factors in TPS</b>	<b>1</b>
incorrect PDD in TPS	1
<b>IMRT Technique</b>	<b>3</b>
Software error	1
<b>inadequacies in beam modeling at leaf ends (Cadman, et al; PMB 2002)</b>	<b>14</b>
QA procedures	3
<b>errors in couch indexing with Peacock system</b>	<b>3</b>
equipment performance	2
<b>setup errors</b>	<b>7</b>

AAPM June 24, 2009

# Value of QA

- Meets goal of improving compliance with protocol
- Reduces deviations
- Detected significant errors, misunderstandings, equipment failures, QA issues



<http://rpc.mdanderson.org>

---



Supported by NCI  
grants CA10953  
and CA81647

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS  
MD ANDERSON  
CANCER CENTER  
*Making Cancer History®*

