# Clinical Oncology Research Journal

## Research Article

# Verification of MRI MAGAT Polymer Gel Dosimetry in Clinical Radiotherapy Applications

**Safaeian GH[1*], BahreyniToossi MT[2], BahreyniToossi MH[2], Feyzi A[3], Bayani SH[2], Heravian Shandiz M[1]**

[1]Department of Radiation Technology, School of Paramedical Sciences, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran

[2]Medical Physics Research Center, Faculty of Medicine, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran

[3]Department of radiology, School of Medicine, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran

**(ORCID):**

Ghorban Safaeian: 0000-0001-9409-3110

Mahdi Heravian Shandiz: 0000-0002-5199-3503

**\*Corresponding author:** Safaeian GH, Department of Radiation Technology, School of Paramedical Sciences, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Iran, E-mails: SafaeianGh@mums.ac.ir

## Abstract

**Background:** The purpose of this work was to study the ability of MRI normoxic polymer gel dosimetry system.

**Methods:** To accomplish of this study, 2 liters of the normoxic MAGAT polymer gel was composed. A Perspex phantom and five calibration test tubes were also prepared. The test tubes were filled in with the gel. This phantom was then CT scanner and dose plan was product. The gel phantom and the test tubes were then irradiated. Prior to irradiation, MR scans were performed to measure the background value of R2 of the gel. Immediately after irradiation new images of the gel phantom (and calibration test tubes) were obtained using the MR scanner. Finally, from the MRI images in MATLAB environment R2 maps were calculated.

**Results:** In this study, and in point center (PC) the difference between the treatment planning system TPS and gel dosimeter data was 1.15% (SD = 1.8%). Dose sensitivity and dose resolution of MAGAT gel dosimeter were 5.033 S-1Gy-1 (R2 =0.9953), 1.974 Gy respectively.

**Conclusion:** In this work, the TPS calculations compared with polymer gel dosimeter measurements and found the dose distributions calculated with the TPS is in very good agreement with the Polymer gels measuring.

## Introduction

In radiotherapy there is a great need for accurate determination of the adsorbed dose of tumor tissue as well as to healthy organs at risk. The absorbed dose delivered to the planning target volume (PTV) should be %5 of the stated dose (Other authors suggest %3) [1]. To accomplish this goal, most treatments are executed according to a calculated plan. In clinical cases verification of the calculated dose plan by measurements is often complicated. This is especially true if the treatment comprises server al beams of different field and radiation qualities and if the beams impinge on an irregularly shaped body section containing various kinds of tissues or cavities. One method to verify clinical treatments is to carry out measurements using thermoluminescence (TL) dosimeters in patient-like phantoms [2]. This method is limited with respect to the absorbed dose in a limited number of points.

Furthermore, the detectors may disturb the radiation beam or their signal be dependent on the radiation qualities used as well as the direction of the incident radiation. These are problems which TL dosimeters share with most other dosimetry systems such as diodes and ionization chambers. Most conventional dosimetry techniques that mentioned above are incapable of 3D measurements. Polymer gel dosimeters are able to measure dose distributions for several beams and different beam qualities (e.g., photons and electrons) [3]. The purpose of the present study was to study the ability of MRI normoxic MAGAT polymer gel dosimetry system as a tool to verify the calculated dose distributions in clinical radiotherapy (Prostate cancer).

## Material and Methods

For verification of absorbed dose distribution using the MAGAT gel dosimeter initially, a cylindrical Perspex phantom simulating a patient and a number of calibration test tubes were designed and composed **(Figure 1)**. 2 liters of the normoxic MAGAT polymer gel under normal atmospheric conditions was prepared according to the reference method [4]. Five calibration test tubes and the Perspex phantom were filled in with the prepared gel. The phantom was then CT scanner and a dose plan was generated using the obtained CT data **(Figure 2)**. Prior to the irradiation, MRI scans of the phantom was taken to measure the background value of R2 **(Figure 3** and **Table 1, 2)**. The gel phantom was irradiated according to four field (Box) technique protocol. The calibration test tubes were also irradiated by a cobalt-60 tele therapy unit **(Figure 4)**. Immediately afterthe irradiation, new images of the phantom and the calibration test tubes were acquired using the MRI scanner. Finally, using the MRI images in MATLAB environment R2 maps were calculated.

### The Phantom, Test Tube and Gel Preparation

In this study, a special cylindric Perspex phantom was designed to investigate dose distribution in external beam radiotherapy of urinary bladder. Perspex was chosen because it is relatively soft tissue equivalent and cheap, easily machined and useful for constructing phantoms of varying shapes. Thickness the walls of phantom was 1cm Perspex and the dimensions were 15 cm in diameter, 15 cm in height and 1200 ml capacity. This phantom is composed of 3 separate units. The central one contains gel dosimeter (1200 ml) and the other two contain the pure water (19 x 25 cm, and 3600ml capacity). For calibration purpose, relatively small Pyrex tubes were designed with 2mm wall thickness, 1.5mm diameter, 8cm height and 15.5 ml capacity **(Figure 1)**.

"MAGIC" which stands for "Meth acrylic and Ascorbic acid in Gelatin Initiated by Copper", was the first normoxic polymer gel proposed [4]." MAGAT" polymer gel is one of the most sensitive radiation of the normoxic gels, that had been used in this study. The fabricating of the new gel followed the same manner as reported for MAGIC. For fabricating of 2 liters of this gel we used; 160 gr gelatin (type A, 300 bloom) 662 gr THPC agent, 100 gr meth acrylic acid (MAA) and 1740 ml HPLC water.

### Calibration and Irradiation

In this study a standard calibration multi-tube with five test tubes were employed. A tele-therapy Cobalt-60 machine (Theratron 780- AECL) was used to irradiate the test tubes laterally when they were horizontally fixed inside a water tank at the depth of 5 cm with a source-to-surface distance (SSD) of 80 cm (Figure 4). One tube was left Unirradiated while the others were irradiated to doses of 2,4,6,8 Gy. Front and back surfaces of the tubes were marked by adhesive stickers and the test tubes were irradiated with their front side facing up to the beam. This marking was later used for positioning the imaging slice at the middle of the test tubes between the front and back surfaces where the gel was exactly at the depth of 5 cm during irradiation. The gel phantom was irradiated according to four field (Box) technique protocol that come followed in **Table 1**.



**Figure 1:** Phantom and calibration test tubes to be used (in this study).



**Figure 2:** CT scanner system and DICOM image of phantom.



**Figure 3:** MRI scanner system used in this study.

OPEN ACCESS

**Figure 4:** Calibration set up under the tele Cobalt unit in multi tube method therapy.

| Treatment | (SSD) | Field size | Prescribed dose fromone | Technique |
|-----------|-------|------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| time (Min) | (cm) | (cm) | field (cGy) | |
| 1.8 | 80 | 10 x 10 | 50 | Four field (Box) |

**Table 1:** Irradiation parameters for prostate cancer treatment (Box technique).

## CT and MRI Imaging, Data Post-Processing

CT scanning of the phantom was performed by a Siemens Somatom Plus-s, 64 slice, and rotate-rotate machine of the third generation. MRI scans of the phan- tom and the calibration test tubes were also taken to extract the spin- spin relaxation rates and R2 maps **(Table 2)**. Images were obtained in a plane in the middle and across the longitudinal cross section of the Phantom and test tubes. 16 MRI images for the phantom and 32 images for the test tubes were obtained. MRI images were transferred in DICOM format to a personal computer for further image processing. Image averaging and background subtraction were performed using the special software (is named R2 calc), that is performed in MATLAB™ environment. Also, an Adaptive and a Median filter with different pixel size masks were also applied on the final polymer gel dosimeters images.

| Scanner parameters | Scanner data |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Scanner type | Siemens Avanto (Germany) |
| Field strength | 1.5 Tesla |
| RF frequency | 65 MHz |
| Coil used | Quadrature head coil |
| Pulse sequence | Multi-spin echo (CPMG) |
| TR (ms) | 3000 |
| TE (ms) | 22-704, TEn= 32(TEi =22) |
| FOV Read (mm) | 260, 230 |
| Matrix size | 512□512 |
| Slice thickness (mm) | 4 |

**Table 2:** MRI Scanner Parameters employed in this study.

## Results

### Calibration Results

The calibration results are followed in **Table 3, 4** and **Figure 6**. Based on these results the dose sensitivity of MAGAT gel dosimeter was 5.033 S-1Gy-1 (R Square, (R2),=0.9953). Dose linearity and dose resolution of this normoxic gel were determined also, and were 0 -8 Gy, 1.974 Gy respectively.



**Figure 5:** MRI slices of calibration test tubes.

| Number of test tubes | Dose (Gy) at the central axis of the test tube | Irradia-tion time (min) | $R_2$ (at the central axis of the test tubes and sagital plan) (1/s) | SD ($\sigma_{cal}$) |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Blank | 0 | 0 | 5.35 | 0.34 |
| 2 | 2 | 3.05 | 17.36 | 0.64 |
| 3 | 4 | 6.11 | 28.12 | 1.66 |
| 4 | 6 | 9.16 | 36.03 | 3.53 |
| 5 | 8 | 12.22 | 46.35 | 11.90 |

**Table 3:** Results of multi-tube calibration (in this study).



**Figure 6:** Dose response curve of MAGAT gel dosimeter was built in this study.

OPEN ACCESS

| Comments | Special indexes | Dose-response equilibrium | Features / Linearity(Gy) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Coefficients (with 95% confidence bounds | SSE*=4.7886 R Square=0.9953 | Linear fitted model Polynomial: $R_2(D) = P1*D + P2$ P1 =5.033 (4.397, 5.669) P2 =6.509 (3.395, 9.624) | 0-8 |

**Table 4:** Property of MAGAT gel in multi-tube calibration (in this study).

## Radiotherapy Procedures Results

Four field technique normally applied for treatment of cancer of urinary bladder was implemented to a gel dosimetry phantom. Gel dosimetry and treatment planning system (ALFARD, Version 4.46.7 SPL WP) were employed to obtain the absorbed dose distribution. Homogenous dose distributions were produced by both techniques. R2 maps and dose contours of the MAGAT gel phantom were obtained in different views after using a adaptive and median filter (5x5, 10x10 and 2x10 masks) **(Figure 7, 8, 9, 10, 12)**. R2 profile of MAGAT gel phantom in different views also determined (Figure 11,13). Dose Volume Histograms (DVHs) and the normalized isodose contours for gel and TPS (ALFARD) system obtained and compromised **(Figure 16)**.

ICRU (42) guidelines researches were implemented to comparing and evaluating these dose distributions [6, 7]. The ICRU (42) hasrecommended that the computed dose should deviate from measured dose by less than 2% [6]. In this study and in the region of interest (at the central slice of the phantom, point center) the difference in the dose obtained by gel dosimetry and TPS is 1.15% (SD = 1.8%), and in penumbra region was 2- 4%.



X (Pixel)

Figure 8: The coronal view of the post-irradiated MAGAT gel phantom (Box technique).



**Figure 9:** R2 contour of MAGAT gel phantom in coronal view after Using an adaptive filter (10 x 10 mask) (Box technique).



X(PiXel)

**Figure 7:** The coronal view of the pre-irradiated gel phantom.



**Figure 10:** Dose contour of MAGAT gel phantom in coronal view after Using a adaptive filter (10 x 10 mask) (Box technique).

**Figure 11:** R2 profile of MAGT gel phantom in coronal view (Boxtechnique).





**Z (Pixel)**

**Figure 12:** R2 contour of MAGAT gel phantom in Trans axial view after Using a adaptive filter (2*10 mask) (Box technique).



**Figure 13:** R2 profile of MAGAT gel phantom in Trans axial view (Box technique).

## Discussion

In this study dose distribution of a clinical treatment procedure produced by MRI normoxic polymer gel dosimetry and TPS were investigated. This was accomplished by pixel-by-pixel, isodose and dose volume histogram (DVH) comparison. Based on results, dose-integrating capacity of the gel dosimeter was demonstrated. A good agreement was also found between the data obtained by the two methods employed. The TPS calculated data were in very good agreement with the distribution measured by polymer gel dosimeter. How ere, in a beam abutment region (for the penumbra of the lateral scatter contribution), larger dose difference was found (DD =2- 4 %). The new polymer gel that was fabricated in this study, was also found to have a higher dose sensitivity compared to other normoxic gels.

In order to make a comparison with other studies, we have used one qualitative and one quantitative indicators, respectively Dose Deviation (DD) and Distance To Agreement (DTA).

## Conclusion

Polymer gel dosimetry has been developed into a totally non-invasive and non- destructive dosimetry method, since the dosimeter gel phantom itself forms the detector. The gel dosimeter is capable of measuring dose distributions from several beams and beams of different radiation qualities (e.g. photons and electrons) in all parts of the dosimeter volume [7]. These properties imply that the gel dosimeter may be used to verify a dose plan. The purpose of this work was to study whether computerized planned clinical treatments could be verified using the gel dosimeter and to examine possible explanations to deviations found between the calculated and measured dose distribution. Based on the results of this study, the gel dosimetry method was proven to be a useful tool for radiation treatment planning verification.

**Figure 14:** Isodose curves by ALFARD treatment planning system (Box technique).



**Figure 15:** The normalized isodose contours by MAGAT gel Dosimetry system in this study (Box technique).



(a)



(b)

**Figure 16:** Dose Volume Histogram (DVH) of MAGAT gel phantom and TPS in Box technique (a: gel dosimeter and b: ALFARD TPS).

## References

1. Khan FM (2014) The Physics of radiation therapy. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins. Pp 560.

2. Harshaw TLD Model 3500 Manual TLD Reader with Win REMS, Operators Manual. 3500-W-O-1299.

3. McJury M, Oldham M, Cosgrove V P, Murphy P S, Doran S, et al. (2000) Radiation dosimetry using polymer gels: methods and applications. Br J Radiol 73: 919-929.

4. Fong Peter M, Kiel Derek C, Does Mark D, Gore John C (2001) Polymer gels for magnetic resonance imaging of radiation dose distributions at normal room atmospher. Phys. Med. Biol 46: 3105-3113.

5. Dumas EM, Leclerc G, Lepage M (2006) Effect of container size on the accuracy of polymer. Journal of Physics: Conference Series 56: 239-241.

6. De Deene Y, Carlos Wager De (2006) The Fundamental radiation properties of normoxic polymer gel dosimeters: a comparison between a meth acrylic acid-based gel and acrylamide-based gels. Phys.Med. Biol 51: 653-673.

7. International Commission on Radiation Units and measurements) ICRU (1987) Use of computers in external beam radiotherapy procedures with high energy photons and electrons, Oxford university press.

8. (2004) Prescribing, Recording and reporting electron beam therapy, J ICRU.

9. Van Dyk J, Barnett RB, Cygler JE, Shragge PC (1993) Commissioning and quality assurance of treatment planning computers. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 26: 261-273.

10. De Deene Y, Hurley C, Venning A, Vergote K, Mather M, et al. (2002) A basic study of some Normoxic polymer gel dosimeters.Phys. Med. Biol 47: 3441-3463.

11. De Deene Y (2004) Fundamentals of MRI measurements for gel dosimetry. J. Phys.: Conf. Ser 3: 87-114.

12. De Deene Y and Baldock C (2002) Optimization of multiple spinecho sequences for 3D polymer gel dosimetry. Phys. Med. Biol 47: 3117-3141.

13. De Deene Y and Wagter C De (2001) Artifacts in multi-echo T2 imaging for high precision gel dosimetry III: Effects of temperature drift during scanning Phys. Med. Biol 46: 2697-2711.

14. De Deene Y, Reynaert N, Wagter C De (2001) On the accuracy of mono- mer/polymer gel dosimetry in the proximity of high-dose-rate Ir192 source, Phys. Med Biol 46: 2801-2825.