



Proton minibeam radiation therapy: a new approach in radiotherapy

Yolanda Prezado Laboratoire Imagerie et Modelisation pour la Neurobiologie et la Cancérologie (IMNC)-CNRS



#### 1. Introduction

 2. Synchrotron Radiation Therapy.
 -Spatial fractionation of the dose: Minibeam radiation Therapy

3. Proton minibeam radiation therapy : a new approach

4. Perspectives



Despite the important development of RT in the last decades

There are radioresistant tumors, like gliomas, for which there is no effective treatment

The treatment of pediatric cancers is very limited due to serious complications in the development of the child



The management of tumors close to an organ at risk, like the spinal cord, is also very restricted

There is still a non negligible risk of secondary cancers in some treatments

MAJOR LIMITATION of RT: high morbidity of the nearby healthy tissues

# **Radiation Therapy**



## Physical dose

#### **Biological dose**

#### **Biological effect**

Type of radiation γ, α, β, p, <sup>12</sup>C
Energy of the beam
Delivery mode:

dose rate
spatial/temporal fractionation-field sizes
etc.

# The importance of field size: dose-volume effects

#### The smaller the field size, the higher the tolerance of the healthy tissues





#### Zeman et al., Science (1959)

#### Hopewell et al., Radioth. Oncol. (2000)

≻ The stem-cell depletion hypothesis → for each organ it exits a limiting critical volume, which can be repopulated by a single surviving stem cell and for which damage can be repaired by repopulation (Yaes & Kalend, 1988; Yaes et al, 1988).

# Spatial fractionation of the dose



# Spatially fractionated RT synchrotron tecnhiques

#### Microbeam Radiation Therapy (MRT)



#### Minibeam Radiation Therapy (MBRT)



Preclinical studies

□ Dose-volume effects → exponential increase of healthy tissue tolerances

□ Spatial fractionation→gain in healthy tissue recovery → increase of healthy tissue tolerances

100 %

Tumor Control Probability

Normal Tissue Complication Probability

Dose

#### MBRT: a promising RT technique

1. Extremely high resistance of healthy rat brain to MBRT

Doses as high as 100 Gy in one session are still tolerated by the rat brain in comparison with 30 Gy in hospital RT.

*Y. Prezado et al., paper in preparation* 

#### 2. Increase of lifespan of glioma bearing rats after MBRT



A factor 3 increase in mean survival time

Y. Prezado et al. Enhancement of lifespan of glioma bearing rats after MBRT, J. Synchr. Radiat. 2012

3. It can be potentially transferred outside synchrotron sources with a cost-effective equipment (Project Physics for Cancer)

# Differential effect tumor/healthy tissues

□ It is possible to ablate gliomas without killing all tumoral cells. Spatial fractionation of the dose might involve other mechanisms than a direct ionizing radiation effects on tumoral cells like :

- poor regenerative capacity of tumoral vessels after radiation exposure
- abscopal effects

□Valley doses : the main responsible of healthy tissue sparing



To guarantee the repair mechanisms the valley dose should remain below the tolerances for each type of tissue for broad beam irradiation

Peak-to-Valley Dose Ratio

R = <u>Valley dose</u>

high for tissue sparing

# **Radiation Therapy**



## Physical dose

#### **Biological dose**

#### **Biological effect**

Type of radiation γ, α, β, p, <sup>12</sup>C
Energy of the beam
Delivery mode:

dose rate
spatial/temporal fractionation-field sizes
etc.

# Proton-minibeam radiation therapy: a proof of concept

Spatial fractionation of the dose



Selective energy deposition of protons



**Monte Carlo simulations (GATE)** 

-Water cylinder (16 cm diameter/ 16 cm height)

-Proton-minibeams: -700 µm wide

-1400, 2800, 3500 µm center-to-center (c-t-c) distance

-Beam energy: 105 MeV and 1 GeV (PNPI Saint Petersbourg)

-Tumor center at 8 cm.

-Covering an area of 2 x 2 cm<sup>2</sup>

-Mechanical collimation: 5 cm thick brass block (105 MeV) 70 cm thick lead block (1 GeV)

Magnetic shaping of the beam by using several sets of quadrupoles magnets

-Realistic beam divergence (3 mrad) and spot size 3 mm FWHM.

Figure of merit: Peak-to-valley dose ratio (PVDR) & penumbras

For healthy tissue sparing → high PVDR narrow penumbras

# Dose distributions: percentage depth dose curves105 MeV pMBRT1 GeV pMBRT



#### **Dose distributions: lateral dose profiles**

3 cm depth

#### 5 cm depth



# Lateral dose profiles: PVDR

#### 105 MeV pMBRT, c-t-c 3.5 mm

| Depth (cm) | Magnetic coll.  | Mechanical coll. | X-rays MBRT    |
|------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1          | 162 ± 8         | $15.6 \pm 0.8$   | $10.1 \pm 0.5$ |
| 3          | 53 ± 3          | $14.8 \pm 0.7$   | $8.4 \pm 0.4$  |
| 5          | $11 \pm 0.6$    | $6.5 \pm 0.3$    | $7.4 \pm 0.4$  |
| 7          | $1.9 \pm 0.1$   | $1.55 \pm 0.08$  | $7.1 \pm 0.4$  |
| 8.2        | $1.22 \pm 0.06$ | $1.07 \pm 0.05$  | $6.8 \pm 0.3$  |

PVDR promising results. Biological experiments warranted.

*Y. Prezado and G. Fois, Proton-minibeam radiation therapy: a proof of concept, Med. Phys. 2013* 

# Lateral dose profiles: PVDR

#### 1 GeV pMBRT, c-t-c 3.5 mm

| Depth (cm) | Magnetic coll. | Mechanical coll. | X-rays MBRT    |
|------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1          | 41 ± 2         | $23.3 \pm 1.1$   | $10.1 \pm 0.5$ |
| 3          | 27.0 ± 1.3     | $16.7 \pm 0.8$   | $8.4 \pm 0.4$  |
| 5          | 26.4 ± 1.2     | $16.6 \pm 0.8$   | 7.4 ± 0.4      |
| 7          | $23.8 \pm 1.1$ | $16.3 \pm 0.8$   | $7.1 \pm 0.4$  |
| 8.2        | $22.8 \pm 0.9$ | $15.2 \pm 0.7$   | $6.8 \pm 0.3$  |

PVDR promising results. Biological experiments warranted.

*Y. Prezado and G. Fois, Proton-minibeam radiation therapy: a proof of concept, Med. Phys. 2013* 

# **Interlaced minibeams (1 GeV)**



## **Penumbra values**

| Depth | Penumbra 105 MeV (µm) |              | Penumbra 1 GeV (µm) |              | GK             |
|-------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------|
| (cm)  | Magnetic              | Mechanical   | Magnetic            | Mechanical   | (µm)           |
| 1     | $492 \pm 25$          | $212 \pm 11$ | $459 \pm 23$        | $261 \pm 13$ | $3444 \pm 172$ |
| 3     | $588 \pm 29$          | $484 \pm 24$ | $461 \pm 23$        | $301 \pm 15$ | $3596 \pm 179$ |
| 5     | $920 \pm 46$          | $905 \pm 45$ | $480 \pm 24$        | $310 \pm 15$ | $3640 \pm 180$ |
| 7     | $1343\pm67$           | $1228\pm61$  | $519 \pm 26$        | $340 \pm 17$ | $3648 \pm 180$ |
| 8.2   | $1705\pm85$           | $1628\pm81$  | $585 \pm 29$        | $385 \pm 19$ | $3670 \pm 183$ |
| 13    | NA                    | NA           | $658 \pm 33$        | $509 \pm 25$ | $3872 \pm 194$ |
| 15    | NA                    | NA           | $756 \pm 38$        | $635 \pm 32$ | $4077 \pm 204$ |

#### Significantly narrower than in Gammaknife radiosurgery

# Conclusions

Promising dose distributions for healthy tissue sparing

-1 GeV beams→ very low penumbras→ideal for radiosurgery -105 MeV→ not need for interlacing -Magnetic shaping → higher penumbras than mechanical collimator but lower neutron yield

**Biological experiments warranted** 

Perspectives: technical implementation at CPO (Orsay)

**Challenge: small field dosimetry for protons** 

# Thanks for you attention

prezado@imnc.in2p3.fr