Effects of anatomical changes on pencil beam scanning proton plans in locally advanced NSCLC patients

DOI:

[10.1016/j.radonc.2016.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2016.04.002)

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Szeto, Y. Z., Witte, M. G., van Kranen, S. R., Sonke, J.-J., Belderbos, J., & van Herk, M. (2016). Effects of anatomical changes on pencil beam scanning proton plans in locally advanced NSCLC patients. *Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2016.04.002>

Published in:

Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.

Effects of anatomical changes on pencil beam scanning proton plans in locally advanced NSCLC patients

Yenny Z. Szeto, Marnix G. Witte, Simon R. van Kranen, Jan-Jakob Sonke, José
Belderbos, Marcel van Herk

Department of Radiation Oncology, The Netherlands Cancer Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract

Background and Purpose. Daily anatomical variations can cause considerable differences between delivered and planned dose. This study simulates and evaluates these effects in spot-scanning proton therapy for lung cancer patients.

Materials and methods. Robust intensity modulated treatment plans were designed on the mid-position CT scan for sixteen locally advanced lung cancer patients. To estimate dosimetric uncertainty, deformable registration was performed on their daily CBCTs to generate 4DCT equivalent scans for each fraction and to map recomputed dose to a common frame.

Results. Without adaptive planning, eight patients had an undercoverage of the targets of more than 2GyE (maximum of 14.1GyE) on the recalculated treatment dose from the daily anatomy variations including respiration. In organs at risk, a maximum increase of 4.7GyE in the D_1 was found in the mediastinal structures. The effect of respiratory motion alone is smaller: 1.4GyE undercoverage for targets and less than 1GyE for organs at risk.

Conclusions. Daily anatomical variations over the course of treatment can cause considerable dose differences in the robust planned dose distribution. An advanced planning strategy including knowledge of anatomical uncertainties would be recommended

24 to improve plan robustness against interfractional variations. For large anatomical
25 changes, adaptive therapy is mandatory.
26 *Keywords:* IMPT, NSCLC, interfractional anatomical changes, respiratory motion,
27 deformable image registration

28 **Introduction**

29 When treating locally advanced Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) patients,
30 proton therapy may spare Organs-At-Risk (OARs) significantly better than photon ther-
31 apy [1, 2]. However, the sensitivity to changes in range [3] makes it challenging to
32 deliver the planned dose. The classical Planning Target Volume (PTV) does not nec-
33 essarily improve the robustness of a treatment plan against geometrical uncertainties,
34 since dose errors can occur inside or beyond the target volume. Therefore alternative
35 methods such as worst case optimization [4, 5], minmax optimization [6] and stochastic
36 programming [7, 8] have been proposed. These methods consider range and rigid setup
37 uncertainties in their robust optimization, but typically disregard inter- and intrafraction
38 anatomical changes and respiratory motion.

39 Studies handling anatomical changes have mainly concentrated on the effects of the
40 respiratory motion [9–13] on the dose delivery. A definition of Internal Gross Tumor
41 Volume (IGTV) [14] has been suggested to mitigate these effects. Others proposed
42 re-scanning and tracking.

43 While Intra-Thoracic Anatomical Changes (ITACs) were observed in 72% of lung
44 cancer patients during the course of radiotherapy [15], the published number of studies
45 on the effects of interfractional anatomical changes on the proton dose is small. The
46 few that reported on the interfractional anatomical changes made use of limited repeat
47 Computed Tomography (CT) scans [3, 16–18]. However, the effects of anatomical
48 changes on the dose based on data representative of the whole course of treatment have
49 not been reported.

50 The purpose of this study is to evaluate the separate and combined effects of respira-
51 tion and interfractional anatomical changes during the course of treatment on the dose
52 delivery in spot scanning proton therapy using daily Cone-Beam CT (CBCT) scans.
53 These scans capture daily variations as well as progressive anatomical changes.

54 **Method and materials**

55 *Patient selection*

56 In our clinic, about 5% of NSCLC patients are treated to a lower dose than the stan-
57 dard 66Gy (24×2.75Gy) Intensity Modulated Radiotherapy (IMRT) prescription due to
58 normal tissue constraints, mainly high mean lung dose. With proton therapy, these pa-
59 tients might be treated to the intended dose while meeting normal tissue constraints.
60 Therefore we have selected retrospectively and consecutively sixteen of these stage
61 IIIA/B patients (Table S1) with available daily motion compensated (MC)CBCTs, [19],
62 treated in 2012-2013.

63 *Treatment planning*

64 Spot-scanning proton plans were created using the Pinnacle³ research version 9.100
65 Treatment Planning System (TPS) with a prescription dose of 66GyE (relative biolog-
66 ical effectiveness = 1.1 [20]). Plans were designed, using one oblique and one lateral
67 beam if possible, on the mid-position (MidP) scan [21] derived from the 4D-planning-
68 CT (pCT). To improve robustness against respiratory induced motion, a density over-
69 ride (1 g/cm³) was applied to an IGTV [10] generated by expansion of the GTV using
70 the motion trajectory of the primary tumor derived from local tumor registration on the
71 4DCT scan. As the lymph nodes are embedded in the mediastinum, a density override
72 was not applied here. In our clinic, no margin for microscopic disease is applied, i.e.,
73 GTV = Clinical Target Volume (CTV). The generated IGTV was used only for the dose
74 calculation density grid and not for margin purposes. Plans were optimized (1) without
75 constraining beam uniformity (labeled Intensity Modulated Proton Therapy (IMPT)),

and (2) using a single field uniformity tolerance (amount of deviation from uniformity tolerated as a percentage of the target dose) of 3% (labeled Single Field Uniform Dose (SFUD)). For both, a weighted scenario-based robustness tool [7, 8] in the TPS was used for optimization (9 scenarios: nominal plan, $\pm 3\text{mm}$ in three directions and $\pm 3\%$ range shift) to account for proton therapy specific uncertainties. Unlike the 66Gy IMRT plan, both 66GyE IMPT and SFUD plans were within clinical OAR constraints for all cases. More detailed information on the robust planning can be found in the supplementary material.

Deformable Image Registration

For dose comparison and accumulation over the varying patient anatomies, two Deformable Image Registration (DIR) techniques were applied using in-house software.

The first one creates a 4D-Deformation Vector Field (DVF) that maps each phase of the 4DCT to its mid-position (4D-DVF) to generate the MidP-pCT. This DIR is based on an Iterative Multiscale Motion Estimation (IMME) technique using image phase, and the validation was done by Wolthaus et al [21].

The second method uses the 3D-DVF to map the MidP-pCT to each 3D-MCCBCT (3D-DVF), as the 3D-MCCBCT represents the mid-position during treatment with strongly reduced respiratory induced blurring [19]. It uses a cubic b-spline algorithm as the representation of the DVF, driven by a correlation ratio [22]. Rigidity and volume constraints [23, 24] were used as regularization terms. A gradient descent based multi-resolution optimization [25] was performed with a final control point spacing of 1cm. The DIR was started after a local rigid body registration of the bony anatomy (vertebrae). The shift and rotation applied to the bony anatomy match was not included in the DVF, i.e. the obtained DVF contains only the anatomical variables. The rigid component was assumed to be minimized by a couch correction. The DIR precision was previously validated for CBCT-to-CT registration in lung cancer patients [26], where an accuracy about $1.5 \pm 1\text{mm}$ in vector length was found. The generation of the mod-

103 ified CT (mCT) uses the inverse of this DVF, and was validated by Veiga et al [27].
104 Note that this method maps the Hounsfield unit (HU) of pCT, i.e. the tissue densities
105 are assumed to be stable.

106 *Dose evaluation*

107 For dose evaluation, biologically equivalent doses were used as in our daily clinical
108 practice. We used the Linear Quadratic (LQ) model to convert the physical doses to the
109 biologically equivalent doses as given in fractions of 2Gy (EQD₂) [28], using specific
110 α/β ratios for the different tissues. The recalculated dose on every scan was converted
111 to the biologically equivalent dose before summation.

112 To estimate the effects of realistic anatomical variations on the delivered dose, the
113 accumulated dose distribution over the entire treatment course of five weeks was com-
114 pared with the planned dose distribution for both IMPT and SFUD plans.

115 Target coverage was evaluated using the difference in the minimum dose to 99%
116 of the volume ΔD_{99} ($\alpha/\beta = 10\text{GyE}$) between the planned dose and recalculated dose.
117 We have set a difference $\leq 2\text{GyE}$ to be acceptable. Although any threshold is somewhat
118 arbitrary, 2GyE equals the standard dose of one fraction dose, and thus represents a
119 clinically relevant unit.

120 OAR doses were evaluated for each patient individually, including the maximum
121 dose to 1% of the volume D_1 and mean dose D_{mean} for the heart ($\alpha/\beta = 3\text{GyE}$) and
122 mediastinal structures [29] ($\alpha/\beta = 3\text{GyE}$), D_{mean} for the lungs-GTV ($\alpha/\beta = 3\text{GyE}$
123 [30]), D_1 for the spinal cord ($\alpha/\beta = 2\text{GyE}$) and the percentage volume receiving 50Gy
124 (V_{50}) for the esophagus ($\alpha/\beta = 10\text{GyE}$).

125 The time between the pCT and the first treatment day can be up to two weeks.
126 To distinguish early and late changes, and to evaluate the effects of shorter treatment
127 schedules, we accumulated the recalculated dose also over the first week and first two
128 weeks of the treatment.

129 Three dose evaluation methods were analyzed: (1) only respiratory motion, (2)

only day-to-day anatomy variations and (3) day-to-day anatomy variation combined with respiratory motion (summarized in Figure A2). Note that only regular respiration is evaluated given the amplitudes reported in Table S1.

1. Respiratory motion

The 4D-pCT, consisting of the ten phases of the respiratory cycle, represents the geometrical variations due to respiratory motion. To evaluate the effect of the respiratory motion, dose was recalculated on these ten phases. To compare with the planned dose, the dose distribution of each phase was deformed back to the MidP-pCT with the 4D-DVF, and accumulated.

2. Daily anatomy variations

Daily 3D-MCCBCT scans were acquired to capture day-to-day variations (e.g. posture changes and baseline shifts) and progressive anatomical changes, without respiratory motion [19] and without setup errors. Daily setup errors were corrected by imaging and patient re-alignment. Due to limitations with the CBCT field of view and lack of HU calibration, a mCT was generated with the anatomy of the 3D-MCCBCT using the 3D-DVF and the MidP-pCT. The effect of interfractional variations during the course of treatment is evaluated by recalculating the dose on the mCT. As an example, the pCT and a mCT with dose distributions are displayed in Figure A3. Subsequently, the dose distributions were deformed back to the MidP-pCT by applying the inverse of the 3D-DVF. The accumulation of these daily fraction doses represents an estimation of the total treatment dose, corrected for the number of treatment days without available CBCT images present.

3. Daily anatomy variations including respiratory motion

Our plans were optimized to be robust against respiratory motion and day-to-day variation. An overestimation of the robustness of the plans is likely to happen by evaluating these separately. Here we have combined these two components. It has been

found previously that the respiratory motion is more irregular intra- than interfraction-
ally [31] and that the tumor trajectory shape is very stable [32]. Therefore, assuming
a stable interfraction respiratory pattern is a reasonable first order approximation. For
the construction of the 4D-mCT, the 4D-DVF of each phase was applied to the daily
mCT. Next, the dose was recalculated on the daily 4D-mCT. For each phase, the dose
was mapped back to the daily mCT, and accumulated. These daily fraction dose distri-
butions were thereafter deformed back to the MidP-pCT for further accumulation.

To establish the dose accuracy of this methodology we performed a limited valida-
tion comparing dose recalculated on a CBCT and a repeat CT acquired on the same
day (see supplementary materials). An average dose difference of -0.1 with range
[-0.8–0.3] GyE was found between these two scans.

Results

Data from sixteen patients (Table S1) was used. Patient 1 was treated for 2 weeks
only, thus end of treatment was after two weeks in this case. Patient 3 was withdrawn
due to failure of deformable registration. Patient 15 had no SFUD plan as a result of
limitation of the beam size. No significant difference ($p > 0.05$, t-test) between IMPT
and SFUD plans (Figures 1 and 3) was found in terms of robustness against anatomical
variations.

Target coverage

The median of the ΔD_{99} was close to zero in all three cases (Figure 1). The size of
the 25-75 percentile box and min-max whiskers for evaluation 1, i.e. only respiratory
motion, are considerably smaller than for the other two evaluations. Eight patients had
a ΔD_{99} of more than 2GyE in at least one of the targets at end of treatment, with a
maximum of 12GyE (Figure 2). The ΔD_{99} of the dose accumulated over the first week
and the first two weeks are closer to each other than to that of the dose accumulated
over the whole course of treatment.

182 *Organs-at-risk*

183 Compared to the effects on the targets, the differences in the accumulated dose and
184 planned dose were small in the OARs (Figure3). The largest difference was found in
185 the mediastinal structures, where an increase of 4.7Gy in the D_1 was observed for an
186 IMPT plan in evaluation 2. The respiratory motion has only a small influence on the
187 dose distribution, as is the case for the target coverage.

188 **Discussion**

189 Daily anatomical variations, occurring over the course of treatment, can cause con-
190 siderable dose differences in the planned dose distribution. We built an infrastructure
191 that allows evaluation of the effect of daily anatomical variations and the accumulated
192 effects of respiratory motion on spot scanning proton delivery. To our knowledge, this
193 is the first study published on this topic using 4DCT and daily CBCTs.

194 During the course of treatment, anatomical changes should not lead to unacceptable
195 underdosage of the targets or an unacceptable overdosage of the OARs. The IGTV con-
196 cept applied here leads to plans that are fairly robust against respiratory motion alone.
197 We observed a much larger effect on the accumulated dose due to day-to-day varia-
198 tions, as the anatomy of lung cancer patients changes significantly over a time span
199 of five weeks. According to Kwint et al [15], 55% of the ITACs occurred in the first
200 week. Our results show that eight out of fifteen patients have ITACs in the first week,
201 which was scored during their IMRT treatment according to our clinical protocol for
202 photons [15], see Table S1. Although half of the patients had code red (dangerous)
203 or orange (risky), none had an adaptive plan. The scoring mainly concentrates on the
204 influence of the ITACs on the GTV position, therefore it is not always predictive to our
205 outcome. For example, patient 8 had code green (safe), but the GTV had an under-
206 dosage of about 5GyE due to changing bone position. Another frequently occurring
207 ITAC is atelectasis. Since protons are more sensitive to density variation than photons,

208 dose variations in the targets will be larger when atelectasis changes along the path of
209 the proton beams. Considering that robust planning will not be able to cope with such
210 large density variations, adaptive planning is required in these cases.

211 The patients selected for this study were treated with IMRT to a lower dose than
212 our standard of 66Gy due to OAR constraints. Proton plans of 66GyE on the other
213 hand, met all OAR dose constraints but were susceptible to anatomical changes. As
214 IMRT plans are typically more robust against anatomical changes, it is currently un-
215 clear which patients would have benefited from proton therapy over photon therapy.
216 Our results show that adaptive radiotherapy and/or advanced planning strategies ca-
217 pable of producing plans that are robust against anatomical changes will be needed
218 to provide the full benefit of scanning beam proton therapy for advanced lung cancer
219 patients.

220 Other studies reported similar observations of effects of interfractional anatomical
221 changes on proton delivery for lung cancer patients, mainly with passive scattering,
222 using only one repeat CT or weekly CTs, and excluding respiratory motion [3, 16, 18].
223 Here, they all disregarded the possibility of underdosage of the targets over the whole
224 course of treatment. One case reported on interfractional variations using daily CTs
225 and dose accumulation over the whole course of treatment [33], but using the less
226 complicated prostate patient group, concluding that their IMPT plans are robust to
227 interfractional variations.

228 We disregarded the interplay effect between interfraction motion and spot delivery
229 time [12, 13] for simplicity. The use of repainting strategies [34] can reduce this ef-
230 fect. Besides, this effect was reported to be much smaller than the effect of anatomical
231 variations [35], and by using IGTV, the targets were adequately covered by the proton
232 beam [36]. The boxplots in our results indeed show that the effect of the respiratory
233 motion on the dose distribution is minimal. However, we did not take into account the
234 irregularity of breathing and the density changes in lung, which could make the IGTV

235 concept less robust [37]. While we expect that these two effects will have little influ-
236 ence on the dose compared to the very large interfractional variation, further studies
237 should be performed including the interplay effect and irregular respiratory motion to
238 confirm these expectations.

239 In the planning strategy, plans were generated by robust optimization instead using
240 PTV-based plans, as Liu et al. [5] found that robustness and OARs sparing improved
241 by using robust optimization. The results could differ quantitatively when using PTV-
242 based plans, but qualitatively anatomical changes are still expected to affect the dose
243 distribution unacceptably. Note that the plans were robust against setup error (3mm)
244 which was eliminated for using a simulated online correction protocol. So this study
245 essentially tested if plans designed to be robust against setup and range uncertainties
246 were also robust against anatomical changes, and the results suggest that this is not the
247 case.

248 We attempted to create robust IMPT and SFUD plans using the same number of
249 beams (two), and the same IMPT and SFUD beam setup for a patient to make com-
250 parison easier. For the robust optimization an additional target margin was used, as the
251 target coverage objectives were not reached when using GTV alone (see supplementary
252 material). Using more beams could result in less dose in normal tissue, while using a
253 different beam setup could also create a more robust plan. The same applies for the
254 used SFUD parameters which were not rigorously optimized. We also did not push the
255 objectives to their limits for the optimization. So despite the fact that we used robust
256 optimization, we could very likely have achieved a "better" plan.

257 Concerning DIR, deforming CTs to CBCT anatomy is only an approximation of
258 the anatomy of the patient. Unfortunately, no CBCT and CT were acquired simultane-
259 ously to test the accuracy of our entire methodology. However, an accuracy of about
260 $1.5\text{mm} \pm 1\text{mm}$ in vector length was found by Abdoli et al. [26], which is small relative
261 to the day-to-day geometric uncertainties. They also concluded that this method is less

262 accurate in patients with large deformations, especially in case of atelectasis. The DIR
 263 has difficulties in creating/removing a large volume of tissue as required when atelec-
 264 tasis occurs/disappears, and the tissue-to-tissue correspondence will not be possible.
 265 Due to this, the dose differences in patients with large differences in the amount of at-
 266 electasis might be underestimated, since the difference between the mCT and the pCT
 267 will be smaller than it actually is. In the extreme case, such as for Patient 3, the atelec-
 268 tasis was totally resolved from the first CBCT, while it was largely present in the pCT.
 269 The mCTs deviate visibly from the CBCTs and were therefore not representative of
 270 the patient's anatomy on the treatment days. The dosimetric impact of the registration
 271 error was estimated on one patient where a repeat CT was available. Another limitation
 272 of this method is the HU accuracy. It uses the HU of the pCT and does not anticipate
 273 changes in densities [38], which is reasonable for most soft tissues, but not fully cor-
 274 rect for lung or tumor tissues over the course of treatment. As a result, the deformed
 275 CT will slightly underestimate anatomical changes. The same applies for the 4D-mCT,
 276 where the lung density changes during breathing. On the other hand, by using the pCT
 277 to create the mCTs, we excluded potential effects of contrast in the analyses.

278 Another assumption is that the tumor shrinkage is elastic [39], which is not the case
 279 for all tumor types.

280 Although the method based on daily CBCT and deformable registration has its
 281 limitations, the results do give an approximation of the effect of interfractional and res-
 282 piratory variations on the dose distributions for a group of potential proton therapy pa-
 283 tients. Further studies should be carried out to support our preliminary findings. Using
 284 the available tools in the current planning strategy, anatomical changes can cause con-
 285 siderable dose differences between the planned dose and the delivered dose. As setup
 286 errors can be minimized by image guidance, the focus of these robustness tools should
 287 be broadened towards robustness against respiratory motion, and especially anatom-
 288 ical variations. For some cases, adaptive radiotherapy is inevitable, but an advanced

289 planning strategy including the knowledge of the anatomical uncertainties will also be
290 needed to improve plan robustness against interfractional variations.

291 **Acknowledgment**

292 The authors acknowledge Angela Tijhuis for help with treatment planning and
293 Philips Healthcare for technical support.

294 [1] Nichols RC, Huh SH, Hoppe BS, et al. Protons safely allow coverage of high-risk
295 nodes for patients with regionally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Technol*
296 *Cancer Res Treat* 2011;10:317–22.

297 [2] Nichols RC, Huh SN, Henderson RH, et al. Proton Radiation Therapy Offers
298 Reduced Normal Lung and Bone Marrow Exposure for Patients Receiving Dose-
299 Escalated Radiation Therapy for Unresectable Stage III Non-Small-Cell Lung
300 Cancer: A Dosimetric Study. *Clin Lung Cancer* 2011;12:252–257.

301 [3] Hui Z, Zhang X, Starkschall G, et al. Effects of interfractional motion and
302 anatomic changes on proton therapy dose distribution in lung cancer. *Int J Radiat*
303 *Oncol Biol Phys* 2008;72:1385–95.

304 [4] Pflugfelder D, Wilkens JJ, Oelfke U. Worst case optimization: a method to ac-
305 count for uncertainties in the optimization of intensity modulated proton therapy.
306 *Phys Med Biol* 2008;53:1689–700.

307 [5] Liu W, Zhang X, Li Y, Mohan R. Robust optimization of intensity modulated
308 proton therapy. *Med Phys* 2012;39:1079–91.

309 [6] Fredriksson A, Forsgren A, Hårdemark B. Minimax optimization for handling
310 range and setup uncertainties in proton therapy. *Med Phys* 2011;38:1672.

- 311 [7] Unkelbach J, Chan TCY, Bortfeld T. Accounting for range uncertainties in the op-
312 timization of intensity modulated proton therapy. *Phys Med Biol* 2007;52:2755–
313 73.
- 314 [8] Unkelbach J, Bortfeld T, Martin BC, Soukup M. Reducing the sensitivity of IMPT
315 treatment plans to setup errors and range uncertainties via probabilistic treatment
316 planning. *Med Phys* 2009;36:149.
- 317 [9] Engelsman M, Rietzel E, Kooy HM. Four-dimensional proton treatment planning
318 for lung tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2006;64:1589–95.
- 319 [10] Kang Y, Zhang X, Chang JY, et al. 4D Proton treatment planning strategy for
320 mobile lung tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2007;67:906–14.
- 321 [11] Knopf AC, Hong TS, Lomax A. Scanned proton radiotherapy for mobile targets-
322 the effectiveness of re-scanning in the context of different treatment planning ap-
323 proaches and for different motion characteristics. *Phys Med Biol* 2011;56:7257–
324 71.
- 325 [12] Munck af Rosenschöld P, Aznar MC, Nygaard DE, et al. A treatment planning
326 study of the potential of geometrical tracking for intensity modulated proton ther-
327 apy of lung cancer. *Acta Oncol* 2010;49:1141–8.
- 328 [13] Grassberger C, Dowdell S, Lomax A, et al. Motion Interplay as a Function of Pa-
329 tient Parameters and Spot Size in Spot Scanning Proton Therapy for Lung Cancer.
330 *Int J Radiat Oncol* 2013;86:380–386.
- 331 [14] Chang JY, Dong L, Starkschall G, et al. Image-Guided Radiation Therapy for
332 Non-small Cell Lung Cancer. *J Thorac Oncol* 2008;3:177–186.
- 333 [15] Kwint M, Conijn S, Schaake E, et al. Intra thoracic anatomical changes
334 in lung cancer patients during the course of radiotherapy. *Radiother Oncol*
335 2014;113:392–397.

- 336 [16] Shi W, Nichols Jr RC, Flampouri S, et al. CLINICIAN ' S PERSPECTIVE Tu-
337 mour Shrinkage during Proton-based Chemoradiation for Non – small-cell Lung
338 Cancer May Necessitate Adaptive Replanning during Treatment. Hong Kong J
339 Radiol 2011;14:190–4.
- 340 [17] Shi W, Nichols Jr RC, Flampouri S, et al. Proton-based chemoradiation for syn-
341 chronous bilateral non-small-cell lung cancers: A case report. Thorac Cancer
342 2013;4:198–202.
- 343 [18] Koay EJ, Lege D, Mohan R, Komaki R, Cox JD, Chang JY. Adaptive/nonadaptive
344 proton radiation planning and outcomes in a phase II trial for locally advanced
345 non-small cell lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2012;84:1093–100.
- 346 [19] Rit S, Wolthaus JWH, van Herk M, Sonke JJ. On-the-fly motion-compensated
347 cone-beam CT using an a priori model of the respiratory motion. Med Phys
348 2009;36:2283.
- 349 [20] Paganetti H, Niemierko A, Ancukiewicz M, et al. Relative biological effec-
350 tiveness (RBE) values for proton beam therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys
351 2002;53:407–21.
- 352 [21] Wolthaus JWH, Sonke JJ, van Herk M, Damen EMF. Reconstruction of a time-
353 averaged midposition CT scan for radiotherapy planning of lung cancer patients
354 using deformable registration. Med Phys 2008;35:3998.
- 355 [22] van Kranen S, Mencarelli A, van Beek S, Rasch C, van Herk M, Sonke JJ. Adap-
356 tive radiotherapy with an average anatomy model: evaluation and quantification
357 of residual deformations in head and neck cancer patients. Radiother Oncol
358 2013;109:463–8.
- 359 [23] Staring M, Klein S, Pluim JPW. A rigidity penalty term for nonrigid registration.
360 Med Phys 2007;34:4098.

- 361 [24] Loeckx D, Slagmolen P, Maes F, Vandermeulen D, Suetens P. Nonrigid Image
362 Registration Using Conditional Mutual Information. *Med Imaging, IEEE Trans*
363 2010;29:19–29.
- 364 [25] Mattes D, Haynor DR, Vesselle H, Lewellen TK, Eubank W. PET-CT image
365 registration in the chest using free-form deformations. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging*
366 2003;22:120–8.
- 367 [26] Abdoli M, van Kranen SR, Sonke JJ. Validation of a Deformable Image Reg-
368 istration for Adaptive Radiotherapy of Lung Cancer. In: *Radiother. Oncol. 3rd*
369 *ESTRO FORUM*. Elsevier Inc; 2015, p. 5491.
- 370 [27] Veiga C, Lourenço AM, Mouinuddin S, et al. Toward adaptive radiotherapy for
371 head and neck patients: Uncertainties in dose warping due to the choice of de-
372 formable registration algorithm. *Med Phys* 2015;42:760–9.
- 373 [28] Joiner M, Bentzen MS. Fractionation: The Linear Quadratic Approach. In: Joiner
374 M, Van der Kogel A, editors. *Basic Clin. Radiobiol.*; chap. 8; 4th ed. London:
375 Hodder Arnold; 2009, p. 102–119.
- 376 [29] van Elmpt W, De Ruyscher D, van der Salm A, et al. The PET-boost randomised
377 phase II dose-escalation trial in non-small cell lung cancer. *Radiother Oncol*
378 2012;104:67–71.
- 379 [30] Borst GR, Ishikawa M, Nijkamp J, et al. Radiation pneumonitis after hypofrac-
380 tionated radiotherapy: evaluation of the LQ(L) model and different dose parame-
381 ters. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2010;77:1596–603.
- 382 [31] Rit S, van Herk M, Zijp L, Sonke JJ. Quantification of the variability of diaphragm
383 motion and implications for treatment margin construction. *Int J Radiat Oncol*
384 *Biol Phys* 2012;82:399–407.

- 385 [32] Sonke JJ, Lebesque J, van Herk M. Variability of four-dimensional computed
386 tomography patient models. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008;70:590–8.
- 387 [33] Wang Y, Efstathiou Ja, Sharp GC, Lu HM, Frank Ciernik I, Trofimov AV. Evalu-
388 ation of the dosimetric impact of interfractional anatomical variations on prostate
389 proton therapy using daily in-room CT images. *Med Phys* 2011;38:4623.
- 390 [34] Zenklusen SM, Pedroni E, Meer D. A study on repainting strategies for treating
391 moderately moving targets with proton pencil beam scanning at the new Gantry
392 2 at PSI. *Phys Med Biol* 2010;55:5103–5121.
- 393 [35] Li Y, Kardar L, Li X, et al. On the interplay effects with proton scanning beams
394 in stage III lung cancer. *Med Phys* 2014;41:021721.
- 395 [36] Chang JY, Zhang X, Wang X, et al. Significant reduction of normal tissue dose
396 by proton radiotherapy compared with three-dimensional conformal or intensity-
397 modulated radiation therapy in Stage I or Stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. *Int*
398 *J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2006;65:1087–96.
- 399 [37] Koybasi O, Mishra P, St James S, Lewis JH, Seco J. Simulation of dosimetric
400 consequences of 4D-CT-based motion margin estimation for proton radiotherapy
401 using patient tumor motion data. *Phys Med Biol* 2014;59:853–67.
- 402 [38] Bertelsen A, Schytte T, Bentzen SrM, Hansen O, Nielsen M, Brink C. Radiation
403 dose response of normal lung assessed by Cone Beam CT - a potential tool for
404 biologically adaptive radiation therapy. *Radiother Oncol* 2011;100:351–5.
- 405 [39] Sonke JJ, Belderbos J. Adaptive radiotherapy for lung cancer. *Semin Radiat*
406 *Oncol* 2010;20:94–106.
- 407 [40] Feuvret L, Noël G, Mazon JJ, Bey P. Conformity index: a review. *Int J Radiat*
408 *Oncol Biol Phys* 2006;64:333–42.

409 [41] Wang X, Zhang X, Dong L, et al. Effectiveness of noncoplanar IMRT planning us-
410 ing a parallelized multiresolution beam angle optimization method for paranasal
411 sinus carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2005;63:594–601.

Figure 1: Boxplots of the difference in minimum dose ΔD_{99} between the planned dose (IMPT and SFUD) and the three different recalculated treatment doses (respiratory motion, daily anatomy variations and daily anatomy variations including respiratory motion) for both the primary tumor (GTV, top) and involved lymph nodes (GTV_{LN}, bottom). Patient 3 and Patient 15 were withdrawn from both plots. Patient 5 had no GTV and not included in the GTV analyses, while Patient 16 had no GTV_{LN} and thus excluded in the GTV_{LN} analyses.

Figure 2: Barplots of the difference in minimum dose ΔD_{99} between the planned dose and the recalculated treatment dose accumulated over the first week, first two weeks and the whole course of treatment, for the day-to-day variations including respiratory motion in the worst target (primary tumor (GTV) or one of the involved lymph nodes (GTV_{LN})) of 15 patients for both IMPT and SFUD plans. Patient 1 had a treatment of only two weeks. Patient 3 was withdrawn from the analyses. Patient 15 only has an IMPT plan. In the supplementary material, figures A4 and A5 show respectively the barplots of GTV and worst GTV_{LN}.

Figure 3: Boxplots of the difference in the mean lung dose D_{mean} and the D_1 of the spinal cord and the mediastinum between the planned dose and the three recalculated treatment doses (respiratory motion, daily anatomy variations and daily anatomy variations including respiratory motion) for IMPT and SFUD plans of the 14 patients. Patient 3 and Patient 15 were withdrawn from the analyses.

412 **Supplementary material**

413 Patient characteristics for the selected patients in this study can be found in table
414 S1. A schematic summary of the three different evaluation methods used in this study
415 is shown in figure A2. Figure A3 displays two examples of the planned dose on the
416 pCT and the recalculated dose on the mCT. Figure 2 can be split in two: (1) GTV
417 (Figure A4) and (2) worst GTV_{LN} (Figure A5).

418 *Dosimetric accuracy of modified CT*

419 CBCT to CT registration was used to generate a modified CT with a reported
420 accuracy of about 1.5 ± 1 mm [26]. To estimate the dosimetric accuracy of this approach,
421 we performed a side by side comparison between a 4D MC-CBCT and a 4D repeat CT
422 (rCT), both acquired on the same day. As none of the patients in our study received
423 a rCT, we selected a NSCLC patient (Patient A) treated in 2015 with IMRT. A large
424 tumor shift was observed during the course of treatment, thus a rCT was acquired to
425 create an adaptive plan.

426 An IMPT plan was made on its initial MidP pCT using the same method as de-
427 scribed in this study. We used the 3D-DVF to map the MidP pCT to the 3D MC-CBCT
428 to generate the mCT, and the 4D-DVF to construct the 4D mCT. Unfortunately, the
429 field of view of this acquired CBCT does not cover the external of the patient. There-
430 fore, the repeat CT was used to cover the missing parts of the mCT, as dosimetric
431 effects due to anatomical changes outside the field of view are out of the scope of this
432 paper. Figure A1 shows the scans of patient A.

433 Dose was recalculated on each phase of the 4D mCT using the IMPT plan and
434 deformed back to the mid-position before dose accumulation. The same dose recalcu-
435 lation and dose accumulation steps were performed for the 4D rCT. For comparison
436 purposes, the accumulated dose distributions were deformed to the pCT, and evaluated
437 with the same dose parameters as reported in this study using the pCT contours. The
438 results are shown in Table S2. The average dose difference was -0.1 with range [-0.8

439 - 0.3] GyE. The differences are induced by the limitations of our simulation model as
440 well as anatomical differences between the CBCT and the repeat CT (Figure A1I)

441 Note that there are some limitations in this procedure. Although the repeat 4DCT
442 and the CBCT are performed on the same day, there is an hour gap between the two
443 scans at different scanners. Therefore the 4DCT and the CBCT are similar to each
444 other, but are not identical (Figure A1(H)). The field of view of the CBCT in this
445 case is more centered in the patient than normally. In most cases, the field of view of
446 the CBCT is more centered in the ipsilateral lung, therefore, unlike for Patient A, the
447 external of that side is included in the scan. Further studies with more data are needed
448 to provide a more accurate estimation of the dosimetric accuracy of the error due to the
449 registration error.

450 *Robust treatment planning*

451 The TPS utilized a weighted scenario-based robustness tool as described earlier.
452 This robust optimization was performed using default settings of the TPS, where the
453 scenarios were weighted as follows: 25% for range, 25% for setup in 3 directions and
454 50% for nominal. The weight is a multiplier of the objective function of each scenario
455 and the optimizer minimizes the weighted sum of the composite objective functions.
456 As this tool is based on the weighted sum of costs from the different scenarios, full
457 coverage of all scenarios could not be attained by optimizing on the GTVs without
458 an additional help structure. To reach the target coverage objectives, we performed
459 the optimization on the Planning Target Volumes (PTVs) that were already clinically
460 used for IMRT planning. The PTV of the primary tumor is defined as the GTV plus a
461 margin ($0.25 \times \text{peak-to-peak amplitude} + 12\text{mm}$), whereas the lymph node (GTV_{LN})
462 was expanded by 12mm to PTV_{LN} . Note that the PTV is only used as a supporting
463 structure to ensure sufficient GTV coverage and no other attempt was made to find a
464 different supporting structure since the GTV was covered. To evaluate the robustness
465 of each plan, we used the additional 8 scenarios utilized by the robust optimization,

466 i.e., 6 plans where the isocenter of the beams are shifted in three directions ($\pm$ anterior-
 467 posterior, $\pm$ left-right and $\pm$ cranial-caudal) and 2 plans where a range correction of
 468 $\pm 3\%$ is applied. The D_{99} of the targets, i.e., GTVs and GTV_{LN} , should be at least
 469 95% of the prescribed dose to be clinically acceptable. We increased the shifts of the
 470 isocenter by 1mm from 3mm until we found $D_{99} < 62.7\text{GyE}$ in at least one of the
 471 targets in one direction or range correction, as this would not be clinically acceptable
 472 anymore. Note that we did not increase the range correction. Figure A6 illustrates the
 473 robustness of the different plans using this approach. For example, the SFUD plan of
 474 Patient 10 is robust up to 8mm shift, while the SFUD plan of Patient 13 is robust up to
 475 4mm. However, Figure 2 shows that Patient 10 has more target undercoverage than
 476 Patient 13. Therefore, the plans do not appear to be overly robust despite using the
 477 PTV to optimize. Between the IMPT and SFUD plans in terms of plan robustness, no
 478 statistically significant difference ($p = 0.57$, t-test) was found.

479 Due to the help structure used in plan optimization, it is difficult to define a proper
 480 conformity index [40] to analyze the dose conformity. Instead we evaluated the volume
 481 receiving more than 95% of the prescribed dose. To compare IMPT and SFUD plans,
 482 we calculated the ratio of this volume of these plans (Table S3):

$$HDR = \frac{V_{IMPT}}{V_{SFUD}} \quad (1)$$

483 This ratio indicates which plan achieved a robust plan with less high dose volume using
 484 the same objectives and constraints. Although for 10 patients out of 16, the SFUD plans
 485 needed a larger high dose volume than the IMPT plans ($HDR < 1$) to achieve a robust
 486 plan, no statistically significant difference ($p=0.096$, Wilcoxon signed ranks test) was
 487 found.

488 To compare the beam homogeneity between the IMPT and SFUD plans, we have
 489 calculated a heterogeneity index (HI) [41] per beam (see Table S3). The HI is defined
 490 as follows:

$$HI = \frac{|D_5 - D_{95}|}{D_{\text{mean}}} \quad (2)$$

491 where D_5 is the minimum dose to 5% of the target volume, D_{95} is the minimum dose
 492 to 95% of the target volume and D_{mean} is the mean dose. The smaller the HI, the more
 493 homogeneous the beam is. The SFUD beams yielded significantly more homogeneous
 494 dose than the IMPT beams, with $p < 0.001$ (t-test).

Table S1: Patient characteristics, including stage, volume of the primary tumor, volume of the total involved lymph nodes, number of involved lymph nodes (LN), peak-to-peak amplitude of the primary tumor, days between the CT scan (t_{CT}) and first treatment day (t_1), number of available CBCTs of each patient, and the intra-thoracic anatomical changes (ITACs) over course of treatment [15]. The ITACs are classified in four color codes: red (dangerous), orange (risky), yellow (cautious) and green (safe). Note that this classification was developed for photons and would be different in the context of protons. The primary tumor of Patient 5 was not visible anymore after induction chemotherapy and was therefore not treated. In this particular case, the peak-to-peak amplitude was derived from two lymph nodes. Patient A is included for the dose error estimation due to the registration error. The values in the parentheses are the values found for the repeat CT.

patient	stage	GTV vol (cc)	GTV _{LN} vol (cc)	# LN	LR	peak-peak ampl (cm)		$t_1 - t_{CT}$ (days)	# CBCT	intra-thoracic anatomical changes		code
						CC	AP			type		
1	IIIB	127.7	32.4	6	0.1	1.2	0.5	11	7	atelectasis development		orange
2	IIIA	72.7	42.8	2	0.1	1.0	0.4	11	23	atelectasis development & changing bone position		green
3	IIIB	309.7	22.3	2	0.1	0.8	0.1	8	23	atelectasis totally resolved		orange
4	IIIB	254.3	82.9	4	0.1	1.0	0	6	17	noticable tumor regression		orange
5	IIIB	-	44.2	8	0.1	1.1	0.2	13	18	very small anatomy changes		green
6	IIIB	12.3	233.1	3	0.1	0.1	0.2	5	23	tumor regression		orange
7	IIIB	18.8	89.1	11	0.3	1.8	0.3	12	22	shift mediastinum		green
8	IIIB	88.1	4.9	1	1.2	1.5	0.5	8	21	atelectasis development		orange
9	IIIB/IV	23.9	67.9	8	0.1	0.7	0.1	15	21	changing bone position		green
10	IIIA	60.4	21.7	3	0.1	0.7	0.2	13	17	changing body contour		orange
11	IIIA	129.0	13.5	2	0.3	0.6	0.2	9	17	very small anatomy changes		green
12	IIIA	42.1	29.3	3	0.2	1.7	0.3	11	17	very small anatomy changes		green
13	IIIB	4.2	98.4	6	0.1	0.2	0.3	13	17	minor tumor regression		green
14	IIIB	145.0	69.1	4	0.1	0.9	0.2	7	16	changing body contour and bone position		yellow
15	IIIB	500.7	65.7	9	0.2	2.0	0.4	12	19	moving atelectasis and tumor regression		orange
16	IIIA	212.8	-	0	0.3	0.1	0.2	5	17	disappearance of atelectasis		red
A	IIA	13.9 (15.1)	10.9 (9.1)	1	0.2 (0.2)	0.5 (1.0)	0.3 (0.6)	11	24	tumor shift		orange

Table S2: Dose evaluation of the planned dose, the recalculated dose on the 4D mCT and the recalculated dose on the 4D rCT for Patient A

	GTV	GTV _{LN}	Lungs-GTV	Heart		Spinal cord	Esophagus
	D ₉₉ (GyE)	D ₉₉ (GyE)	D _{mean} (GyE)	D ₁ (GyE)	D _{mean} (GyE)	D ₁ (GyE)	V ₅₀ (%)
pCT	64.6	64.3	6	13.5	0.4	0.1	0
4D mCT	39.5	63.3	5.7	22.3	0.7	0.2	0
4D rCT	39.4	63.5	5.4	23.1	0.7	0.3	0

Figure A1: The four scans of Patient A: planning CT (A), repeat CT (B), CBCT (D) and mCT (E). And overlays of scans for better visualization: planning CT (purple) and repeat CT (green) (C), mCT (purple) and CBCT (green) (F), planning CT (purple) and CBCT (green) (G), repeat CT (purple) and mCT (green) (H), and repeat CT (purple) and CBCT (green) (I)

Figure A2: Summary of the three different evaluation methods to evaluate the effects of respiratory and anatomical variations: only respiratory motion (4D MidP-CT), daily anatomy variations without respiratory motion (mMidP-CT) and daily anatomy variations including respiratory motion (4D mMidP-CT). 4D-DVF represents the deformation vector field mapping each phase of the 4D CT to its mid-position (MidP). 3D-DVF deforms the planning CT to the daily anatomy of the CBCT. TPS is the optimization in the treatment planning system, whereas "dose calc" refers to dose recalculation in the same system.

Figure A3: Planning CT (A) and the modified CT (B) of the last fraction of Patient 6 (top) and Patient 7 (bottom) with the planned dose (D) and the recalculated dose (E) on the modified CT. Daily CBCT (C) is used to deform the planning CT to the modified CT.

Figure A5: Barplots of the difference in minimum dose ΔD_{99} in the worst GTV_{LN} between the planned dose and the recalculated treatment dose accumulated over the first week, first two weeks and the whole course of treatment, for the day-to-day variations including respiratory motion of 15 patients for both IMPT and SFUD plans. Patient 1 was treated only for two weeks. Patient 15 only had an IMPT plan.

Figure A6: Robustness evaluation of the IMPT and SFUD plans for 16 patients, showing the shift that is needed to have an undercoverage ($D_{99} < 62, 7\text{GyE}$) in a target. The isocenter of the beams were shifted from the nominal plan in three directions or a range correction was applied. For each plan of a patient, only one case is shown, i.e. worst target (either GTV or GTV_{LN}) and worst direction (a shift or range correction). The isocenter was shifted from 3mm to 11mm, while only a range correction of $\pm 3\%$ was applied.

Table S3: High Dose Ratio (HDR) and beam Heterogeneity Index (HI) of the different plans. Patient 15 is disregarded, because of the absence of the SFUD plan

patient	HDR	HI			
		IMPT		SFUD	
		beam1	beam2	beam1	beam2
1	1.03	1.32 (0.28)	1.35 (0.37)	1.04 (0.01)	1.05 (0.02)
2	0.97	1.21 (0.18)	1.24 (0.20)	1.05 (0.01)	1.07 (0.01)
3	1.00	1.55 (0.75)	1.35 (0.41)	1.08 (0.07)	1.05 (0.04)
4	1.09	2.07 (0.83)	1.70 (0.47)	1.06 (0.01)	1.04 (0.01)
5	0.92	1.25 (0.17)	1.32 (0.25)	1.04 (0.02)	1.06 (0.02)
6	0.97	1.45 (0.21)	1.57 (0.24)	1.05 (0.02)	1.05 (0.02)
7	0.97	1.29 (0.10)	1.40 (0.32)	1.05 (0.03)	1.08 (0.02)
8	0.98	3.57 (3.32)	1.57 (0.63)	1.07 (0.03)	1.07 (0.02)
9	0.93	1.82 (0.77)	1.23 (0.21)	1.07 (0.03)	1.03 (0.01)
10	0.98	1.29 (0.15)	1.28 (0.17)	1.04 (0.02)	1.05 (0.02)
11	0.97	1.37 (0.35)	1.30 (0.31)	1.06 (0.01)	1.05 (0.02)
12	1.02	1.90 (0.82)	1.38 (0.25)	1.06 (0.01)	1.05 (0.01)
13	0.91	1.22 (0.08)	1.23 (0.09)	1.05 (0.02)	1.06 (0.02)
14	1.00	2.26 (0.81)	2.37 (0.43)	1.07 (0.04)	1.07 (0.01)
16	0.99	1.59 (-)	1.87 (-)	1.06 (-)	1.07 (-)
mean		1.676	1.477	1.056	1.056
sd		0.619	0.309	0.003	0.003