

# Applications of the RUBY phantom

at the high field MRI-linac Elekta Unity



THE DOSIMETRY COMPANY

# Abstract

The aim of this white paper is the application of the RUBY phantom at the MRgRT system Elekta Unity, a 1.5 T high field MRI-linac. A possible workflow for point-based plan verification in a homogenous phantom based on RUBY and Patient QA insert is

presented. Furthermore, a complete End-to-End test workflow based on RUBY and SystemQA insert is described. With RUBY, both clinical workflows - adapt-to-shape and adapt-to-position have been completely run through and tested.

# Introduction

Magnetic resonance guided radiotherapy (MRgRT) is the latest achievement in radiation therapy. The combination of MR imaging and linear accelerator enables a new quality of imaging during the performance of radiation therapy using linear accelerators. However, MRgRT also brings new challenges for quality assurance. Products not only have to be usable in a magnetic field, i.e. classified as MR conditional, they also should be MRI visible. The goal of this white paper is the application of the RUBY phantom in MRgRT using an Elekta Unity accelerator. First, the article describes the use of RUBY combined with the

Patient QA insert for plan verification in combination with the Elekta Unity imaging system MVIC and second, the application of RUBY as an End-to-End phantom for MRgRT. Considering the complexity of MRgRT, especially adaptive MRgRT, the implementation of an end-to-end test is essential for the QA workflow. The RUBY SystemQA insert includes MRI visible elements, CT visible inhomogeneities as well as the possibility to insert a detector for dose measurements. The article describes step-by-step the use of the SystemQA insert for an end-to-end test of the workflows adapt-to-position and adapt-to-shape at an Elekta Unity.

## Plan verification

### Point measurement

#### Preparation

#### Planning CT

A planning CT with slice thickness of 3 mm from RUBY with RUBY insert Patient QA - detector and homogeneous plug was performed and imported into the Monaco TPS. During the CT,

the RUBY phantom was positioned with an indexing bar and the room laser system. The indexing bar was positioned on position 20, so that the center of RUBY was placed at position 22.

TPS

Three treatment plans with target volumes of 17.6 cm<sup>3</sup> and 5.9 cm<sup>3</sup> were calculated in the treatment planning system (Monaco 5.40, Elekta AB, Sweden) on the RUBY CT data set. All plans consisted of a 9 beam step and shoot technique with a dose prescription of 1.8 Gy per fraction to the PTV. Plans were optimized for conformality and steep dose gradients outside the PTV. Calculation uncertainty was 1 % over the calculation. The isocenter position corresponds in longitudinal and lateral orientation to the phantom center, which is indicated by the

CT marker positions. The phantom center corresponds to the reference point of the inserted detector. In vertical orientation, the isocenter position does not correspond to the phantom center. Since the treatment couch of the Unity System is not movable in vertical direction, the isocenter is located above the phantom center (see Figure 1). The dose was calculated in a volume whose position corresponds to the reference point of the chamber. The CT markers were used to localize this position. The size of the calculation volume corresponds to the active volume of the ionization chamber used (Semiflex 3D)



Figure 1: Slice of the CT dataset where the center of RUBY is visible according to the six visble CT marker. The isocenter is visible as well as the dose calculation point in the center of the phantom according to the detector positioning during measurement. Color shades show doses between 0.6 Gy (blue) and 1.9 Gy (red).

#### Measurement

#### Phantom positioning

The RUBY phantom with RUBY insert Patient QA – detector, dein Figure 2. The Semiflex 3D was connected with an UNIDOS tector holder for Semiflex 3D and Semiflex 3D ionization chamwebline electrometer (+400 V) positioned outside the treatment ber were positioned on the treatment table according to the room. The table position was exported from the TPS and RUBY planning CT using indexing bar and room laser system as shown was positioned in the bore.



The positioning was checked using the MV imaging controller system (MVIC) as shown in Figure 3. Reference geometries of the ionization chamber can be identified in the MV image and the positioning of RUBY can be checked.

Figure 2: RUBY positioning according to the planning CT. Longitudinal positioning with adapter plate, lateral positioning with laser.



Figure 3: MVIC image of the Semiflex 3D positioning in the RUBY phantom

#### Dose measurement

After pre-irradiation of the chamber, the plan dose was assessed by measuring the ionization chamber signal M. The final plan dose to water was calculated according to the following equation:

$$\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{N} \cdot \mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{Q}} \cdot \mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \cdot \mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{TP}}$$

where N represents the calibration factor for Co60,  $k_{Q}$  is the beam quality correction,  $k_{B}$  represents the correction for the

presence of a magnetic field and  $k_{TP}$  the correction for pressure and temperature.  $k_q$  and  $k_g$  depend on detector type and detector orientation. For this report  $k_q = 0.9924$  and  $k_g = 0.984$  were applied.  $k_g$  was derived by an chamber individual crosscalibration with alanin. Temperature in air and pressure were T=24.43° and p=978.3 hPa which leads to a correction factor of  $k_{TP} = 1.051$ . Saturation effect as well as polarity effect were neglected.

#### Results

The results are shown in Table I. The differences between measurement and TPS are within 2 %.

	Measurement [Gy]	TPS [Gy]	Difference [%]
Plan 1	1.886	1.858	1.5
Plan 2	1.878	1.863	0.8
Plan 3	1.707	1.680	1.6

Table I: Results of measurement and TPS calculation for plan verification measurements with RUBY and Patient QA insert.

## End-to-End testing

## Preparation

#### Planning CT

A planning CT from RUBY with RUBY insert System QA was performed and imported into the Monaco TPS. During the CT, the RUBY phantom was positioned with an indexing bar and the

#### ▶ TPS

The CT dataset was imported into the Monaco TPS and a "RUBY patient" was created. The MRI and tissue equivalent inserts were contoured as well as the external contour (Figure 5). The relative electron density values were defined for the external structure as well as for the brain, lung and bone structure according to the RUBY specification and summarized in table II.

A PTV structure was added in the center of the phantom and an IMRT plan with 9 gantry angles [180°/140°/90°/60°/25°/340°/



Figure 4: Screenshot from TPS (Monaco) before the adaptation

Material	Relative electron density (RED)	
Bone	1.567	
Brain	1.038	
Lung	0.235	
RUBY material	1.012	

300°/270°/220°] was optimized. The plan was optimized with a prescription dose of 50.4 Gy in 28 fractions (1.8 Gy/Fx) based on a rectum plan template with one target objective and conformality as additional optimization parameter (Figure 4). The optimized reference plan before the online adaptation consisted of 24 segments and 249.5 MU. All optimized plans were calculated with a monte-carlo uncertainty of 1 % over the calculation.



Figure 5: Contoured RUBY insert System QA and defined electron density values

## Adapt to position workflow

The RUBY phantom with RUBY insert System QA, detector holder for Semiflex 3D and Semiflex 3D ionization chamber was positioned on the treatment table in the same way as for the planning CT. In contrast to the previous test, no misalignment was applied. The body coil was positioned above the phantom and RUBY was positioned in the bore according to the treatment planning table position (see Figure 6).



Figure 6: RUBY with lateral misalignment and inserted Semiflex 3D ionization chamber.

The patient workflow within MOSAIQ was started and an MR image sequence (T2 3D, 2 min) was generated. Using Online Monaco the MR image was fused to the reference CT dataset. Based on the isocenter shift between the reference image and the online MRI a geometric shift of the MLC positions was applied and the new dose distribution on the reference CT was calculated. The online plan therefore consisted of the same segments (24) and MU (249.5 MU). The dose to the chamber



Figure 7: RUBY phantom in the bore with body coil.

was calculated based on spherical volume at the center of the phantom with diameter of 2.5 mm according the chamber dimensions. A dose value of 1.884 Gy was calculated. Then, the plan was irradiated and the chamber signal was recorded. A dose of 1.891 Gy was measured.

The comparison between calculated value of 1.884 Gy and measured value of 1.891 is 0.4 %.

	Measurement [Gy]	TPS [Gy]	Difference [%]
Plan 1	1.891	1.884	0.4

Table III: Result of measurement and TPS calculation for End-to-End test of adapt-to-position workflow with RUBY phantom and System QA insert.



Figure 8: Re-optimized treatment plan on the reference CT dataset based on the adapt to position workflow

## Adapt to shape workflow

The RUBY phantom with RUBY insert System QA, detector holder for Semiflex 3D and Semiflex 3D ionization chamber was positioned on the treatment table in the same way as for the planning CT. Then a lateral misalignment was applied by positioning RUBY laterally (2.5 cm) on the grey line. The body coil was positioned above the phantom and RUBY was positioned in the bore according to the treatment planning table position (see Figures 6 and 7). The patient workflow within MOSAIQ was started and an MRI image sequence (T2 3D, 2 min) was generated. Using Online Monaco the MRI image was fused to the reference CT dataset and the lateral misalignment was detected with 2.47 cm (see Figure 9). The Semiflex 3D ionization chamber produced small artifacts on the MR image data, which however did not impact the registration (see Figure 10).



Figure 9: CT/MR fusion: Misalignment was detected correctly.

After the CT/MR fusion a synthetic CT based on the MRI image<br/>was created (see Figure 11) and the treatment plan was re-op-<br/>timized and adapted to the new PTV position (see Figure 12).at the center of the phantom. The dose to the chamber was<br/>evaluated in a spherical volume according to the active volume<br/>of the Semiflex 3D with a diameter of 2.5 mm. A dose value of<br/>1.820 Gy was calculated.MU. The dose point was positioned according to the CT marker1.820 Gy was calculated.

Figure 10: Artifacts caused by the Semiflex 3D chamber. Artifcats did not impact the image registration.



Figure 11: Synthetic CT.



Figure 12: Re-optimized treatment plan based on adapt to shape workflow

The re-optimized treatment plan was applied to the phantom and the chamber signal was recorded. A dose of 1.811 Gy measured, yielding a relative difference of 0.5 % with respect to the calculated dose value.

	Measurement [Gy]	TPS [Gy]	Difference [%]
Plan 1	1.811	1.820	0.5

Table IV: Result of measurement and TPS calculation for End-to-End test of adapt-to-shape workflow with RUBY phantom and System QA insert.

# Summary

The RUBY phantom is an appropriate QA tool for QA at the high field MRI-linac Unity. The RUBY phantom is suitable for plan verification based on a single detector measurement combined with MVIC imaging. Moreover, RUBY combined with System QA insert enables a complete End-to-End testing of the system. It was shown that both possible workflows – adapt-to-shape and adapt-to-position - could be fully tested with RUBY.



**Dr. Daniela Poppinga** Research Scientist / Medical Physicist PTW Freiburg GmbH

PTW Freiburg GmbH Lörracher Str. 7 79115 Freiburg · Germany Phone +49 761 49055-0 Fax +49 761 49055-70 info@ptwdosimetry.com

ptwdosimetry.com



**Julian Horn** Medical Physicist / Product Management PTW Freiburg GmbH



Marcel Nachbar Medical Physicist Section for Biomedical Physics, Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Tübingen



**Prof. Dr. Daniela Thorwarth** Professor for Biomedical Physics Section for Biomedical Physics, Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Tübingen

© PTW. All Rights Reserved. Specifications subject to change without prior notice. All trademarks mentioned in this document are the property of their respective owners. D968.208.00/00 2020-07

