Uncertainty in dose per monitor unit estimates for passively scattered proton therapy: The role of compensator and patient scatter in prostate cases
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Abstract

Standard methods for determining dose per monitor unit values in a patient do not yet exist for proton therapy. Indeed, some aspects of D/MU estimation remain poorly understood, such as the conversion of absorbed dose in a water phantom to absorbed dose in a patient. This study focused on the water-to-patient absorbed dose conversion factor, FCSPS, which accounts for differences in scatter (from the range compensator and internal patient anatomy) between patient treatments and their corresponding calibration irradiation in a homogeneous water-phantom. We estimated FCSPS for 32 prostate fields using a pencil beam dose algorithm in the treatment planning system (TPS). The mean FCSPS value was 1.006; its standard deviation of the mean was ±0.001. The lower bound for uncertainty in FCSPS, μFCSPS, was estimated for a subset of fields through comparisons of TPS dose predictions with measurements and Monte Carlo (MC) simulations. Comparison of TPS predictions and measurements yielded μFCSPS of 0.4% - 0.8%. Comparison of TPS predictions and MC simulations yielded μFCSPS < 0.3%. For a prostate treatment, a comparison of FCPS values from TPS predictions with the historical value of 1.0 yielded μFCSPS < 3% and a mean μFCSPS of 0.6%. Regardless of estimation method, μFCSPS was approximately 1%, suggesting that uncertainty in FCSPS for proton treatments of prostate cancer is clinically acceptable.
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1. Introduction

Proton therapy is gradually becoming more available to the general patient population.1,2 Specifically, the number of proton treatment centers increased from 15 to 46 from 2000 to 2014.3 An analysis of cancers treated with proton therapy revealed that the most commonly treated diseases were uveal melanoma (35%) and prostate cancer (26%).4 Of these, treatments for prostate cancer are of particular interest because of its high incidence.5 In addition, recent studies report that relative to conventional photon radiotherapy, proton therapy for localized prostate cancer permits reduced dose to critical structures6-13 and successful dose escalation14-15. However, because proton therapy was previously limited to a few centers worldwide, there have been no large-scale randomized clinical trials of proton vs. photon radiotherapy for prostate cancer.16, 17 Thus, there is a strong impetus to standardize the dosimetry of proton radiotherapy so that patient treatment and outcome data can be directly
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compared. In this respect, advisory bodies have published proton dosimetry protocols for determining proton beam output, or absorbed dose per monitor unit (D/MU) values, in water under reference conditions (such as the American Association of Physicists in Medicine\textsuperscript{18}, European Clinical Heavy Particle Dosimetry Group (ECHED)\textsuperscript{19,20}, International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements\textsuperscript{1}, and the International Atomic Energy Agency\textsuperscript{21}). Still, in contrast to photon and electron therapy, to date, a protocol to harmonize methods for estimating absorbed dose from proton therapy in a patient is lacking.

Nonetheless, progress is being made toward a more complete understanding of the determination of absorbed dose in a patient receiving proton therapy.\textsuperscript{22-31} Specifically, progress includes the creation of a geometrical framework and an initial estimate of 1.0 for a water-to-patient absorbed dose conversion factor\textsuperscript{22} as well as validation of Monte Carlo (MC)-simulated D/MU data within 1 to 1.5\% of measured data\textsuperscript{25,27,29,31}. In addition, studies by Fontenot \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{26}, Akagi \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{24}, and Titt \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{28} indicate that absorption and scatter of the treatment beam in field-specific collimation devices, range compensators (RC), and patient anatomy have the potential to increase uncertainty in estimates of absorbed dose per monitor unit in the patient, (D/MU)\textsubscript{p}, by 1\% or more. In this respect, Akagi \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{24} demonstrated that the combined effects of scatter in the RC, scatter in the patient, and scatter from the patient-specific collimator could yield (D/MU)\textsubscript{p} values 2\% to 3\% higher or lower than those measured in a phantom. These results were confounded by field-size effects, which were subsequently addressed by Titt \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{28}. Finally, Fontenot \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{26} addressed uncertainty in D/MU measurements under patient-specific fields associated with the presence of the range compensator and they recommended measurement without the range compensator. Together, these works underscore the need for standard methods of determining (D/MU)\textsubscript{p} values, the potential complexities of doing so, and the need to better understand the total uncertainty in (D/MU)\textsubscript{p}.

The objective of this study was to estimate total uncertainty in (D/MU)\textsubscript{p} values for patients who receive proton therapy for prostate cancer. In particular, we used treatment planning system (TPS) calculations, measurements, MC simulations, and a comparison to the historical value of 1.0 to quantify the least understood factor in the water-to-patient absorbed dose conversion factor, F\textsubscript{caps}. the multiplicative factor that takes into account scatter from the RC and internal patient scatter, and its uncertainty.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 D/MU formalism

The formalism for calculating the beam output, or D/MU value, for proton therapy was based in part on previously reported methods.\textsuperscript{30,32} Our formalism includes D/MU estimates under reference conditions, field-specific treatment conditions, and D/MU estimates in the patient (Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Schematic diagram for the measurement formalism in the reference (a), treatment-field-specific (b), and patient (c) conditions. The parameters describing these conditions are the beam range, R; modulation, M; depth to calibration point, d; field size, FS; and source-to-calibration point distance, SCD, which is isocenter for the fields in this project. In (c) ‘RC’ specifies the field-specific range compensator.](www.protonjournal.org)

We first defined D/MU in a water phantom under reference conditions, shown in Figure 1a and denoted by (D/MU)\textsubscript{ref} \equiv 1 \text{ cGy MU}\textsuperscript{-1}. The reference condition comprises a collimated 10 cm × 10 cm field with a range of 28.5 cm (250 MeV proton beam), a 10-cm spread-out Bragg peak (SOBP), and a center of modulation at 23.5-cm depth in water that was located at isocenter. This range corresponds to the most penetrating beam available from the treatment unit at our institution with a medium field size. Note that a water equivalent phantom, e.g., a solid plastic phantom, may also be used. For simplicity and brevity, we shall consider these as being interchangeable.

We next defined D/MU value in a water phantom as before, except the proton beam parameters were taken from a treatment field (Figure 1b), as

\[
\left( \frac{D}{MU} \right)_w = \left( \frac{D}{MU} \right)_{w,ref} F_{w,ref} \tag{1}
\]
where $F_{\text{ref}}$ is a conversion factor that takes into account differences between the $D/MU$ values at the reference condition and the treatment-field-specific condition in water. $F_{\text{ref}}$ is defined as

$$F_{\text{ref}} = \prod F_i = F_{\text{CS}} \cdot F_{\text{MS}} \cdot F_{\text{SOB}} \cdot F_{\text{InvSq}} \cdot F_{\text{PS}} \cdot F_{\text{CSPS}}$$ (2)

where $F_i$ are as follows. $F_{\text{CS}}$ corrects for changes in beam output which result from differences in the proton beam energy spectrum relative to the reference condition; these changes are due to differences in the properties of the beam that is injected into the treatment head and due to scatter and absorption in the range modulator wheel. $F_{\text{MS}}$ corrects for changes in beam output due to the range shifter. $F_{\text{SOB}}$ corrects for changes in beam output due to differences in the SOBP relative to the reference field. $F_{\text{InvSq}}$ corrects for changes in beam output which result from differences in beam divergence relative to the reference condition; changes in beam divergence occur when there are changes in the distance from the effective source to the field specific point of measurement, or calibration point. (The calibration point for the reference condition was located at isocenter; the distance from the effective source to isocenter for our passively scattered beamlines was 270 cm.) $F_{\text{PS}}$ corrects beam output for differences in proton fluence due to changes in the uncollimated field size (i.e., the amount of lateral beam spreading), and $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ corrects beam output for differences in scatter from the reference aperture (10 cm x 10 cm) to the patient-specific aperture. 28

We defined the ($D/MU$) value in the patient (Figure 1c) according to

$$\left( \frac{D}{MU} \right)_p = \left( \frac{D}{MU} \right)_w \cdot F_{\text{pw}}$$ (3)

where, $F_{\text{pw}}$ is a conversion factor that accounts for differences in the $D/MU$ values between the field-specific calibration condition in water and the patient-specific treatment condition in tissue, or

$$F_{\text{pw}} = F_{\text{MS}} \cdot F_{\text{CSPS}}$$ (4)

$F_{\text{MS}}$ corrects for effect of differences in the proton mass stopping power in tissue relative to that in water. It can be determined using MC simulations or analytical calculations. 33, 34 The compensator scatter and patient scatter factor, $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, takes into account differences in the beam output due to differences in the scattering and attenuation within the patient and RC together relative to that of a water box phantom and no RC.

$F_{\text{CSPS}}$ was the focus of our study and we considered two methods for estimating it. In the first method, which we shall refer to as the treatment planning system method (TPS method), we define

$$F_{\text{CSPS}} = \frac{D^\text{w}_{\text{RC}}/\text{MU}}{D^\text{w}_{\text{no-RC}}/\text{MU}}$$ (5)

where $D^\text{w}_{\text{RC}}/\text{MU}$ is the absorbed dose per MU in the patient at the calibration point (described below) with the patient-specific RC present in the field, and $D^\text{w}_{\text{no-RC}}/\text{MU}$ is the absorbed dose per MU in water (or water equivalent material) at the calibration point without the RC in the field.

In the second method, named the treatment planning system and measurement method (TPS+M method), we approximated $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ as

$$F_{\text{CSPS}} \approx F_{\text{CS}} \cdot F_{\text{PS}}$$ (6)

where, $F_{\text{CS}}$ corrects beam output for compensator scatter and is given by

$$F_{\text{CS}} = \frac{D^\text{w}_{\text{RC}}/\text{MU}}{D^\text{w}_{\text{no-RC}}/\text{MU}}$$ (7)

and $F_{\text{PS}}$ corrects beam output for internal patient scatter and is given by

$$F_{\text{PS}} = \frac{D^\text{w}_{\text{RC}}/\text{MU}}{D^\text{w}_{\text{no-RC}}/\text{MU}}$$ (8)

$D^\text{w}_{\text{RC}}/\text{MU}$ in equation (7) is the absorbed dose per MU in water (or water equivalent material) at the calibration point with the RC in the field, and the other terms in equations (7) and (8) are as defined for equation (5). The calibration point is the location where the relative absorbed dose (in MU) is calibrated to the prescribed absolute absorbed dose (in Gy). It typically corresponds to a region in the patient or phantom that will receive uniform dose and is close to the center of the SOBP. Because the prostate treatment plans used in this work were isocentric, all treatment fields within a plan shared the same calibration point, i.e., isocenter (IEC 1989). As such, the calibration point for each individual treatment field occupied the same point in space, whether in water or in the patient.

### 2.2 Uncertainty budget

We used an uncertainty budget for ($D/MU$)$_p$ as an a priori guide in studying the numerical impact of uncertainty in various factors on uncertainty in ($D/MU$)$_p$. Specifically, we prepared a lookup table (see Table 1) to determine which intervals of uncertainty in ($D/MU$)$_w$, $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, and $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, respectively, would cause ≤ 5% uncertainty in ($D/MU$)$_p$. In it, we considered three methods for determining ($D/MU$)$_p$. The main difference between methods was the way in which ($D/MU$)$_w$ was determined, i.e., through use of a TPS, measurements, or MC simulations.

The relation is approximate because of subtle inter-relations between $F_{\text{PS}}$ and $F_{\text{CS}}$, which makes it difficult to determine either one independently of the other.

---
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When using a TPS to predict \((D/\text{MU})_w\), we have
\[
\left( \frac{D}{\text{MU}} \right)_p = \left( \frac{D}{\text{MU}} \right)_w^{\text{TPS}} \cdot F_{\text{MS}} \cdot F_{\text{CSPS}}
\]  
(9)

where, \((D/\text{MU})_w^{\text{TPS}}\) was estimated by the pencil beam algorithm (PBA) algorithm in TPS, \(F_{\text{CSPS}}\) is defined in equation (2), and \(F_{\text{MS}}\) is defined according to equation (4). \((D/\text{MU})_w^{\text{TPS}}\) and \(F_{\text{MS}}\) were obtained from interpolation of measured values, and \(F_{\text{CSPS}}\) was obtained using a TPS (Eclipse, Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto, CA). However, because the TPS did not calculate the contribution of lateral scatter from the edges of the field-specific collimator, we included \(F_{\text{CSPS}}\) (as a modifier of \((D/\text{MU})_w\)) in the estimation of \((D/\text{MU})_p\).

When using measurements of \((D/\text{MU})_w\) (with the patient-specific collimator in place), we have
\[
\left( \frac{D}{\text{MU}} \right)_p = \left( \frac{D}{\text{MU}} \right)_w^{\text{meas}} \cdot F_{\text{MS}} \cdot F_{\text{CSPS}}
\]  
(10)

where, \(F_{\text{CSPS}}\) does not appear because it is implicitly taken into account in \((D/\text{MU})_w^{\text{meas}}\).

Finally, when \((D/\text{MU})_w\) was estimated using MC simulations, we have
\[
\left( \frac{D}{\text{MU}} \right)_p = \left( \frac{D}{\text{MU}} \right)_w^{\text{MC}} \cdot F_{\text{CSPS}}\]  
(11)

where, \((D/\text{MU})_w^{\text{MC}}\) inherently includes consideration of each material in the proton beam path (and its mass stopping power) as well as lateral scatter from the field-specific collimator. Thus, \(F_{\text{CSPS}}\) is the only correction factor in the equation, provided \((D/\text{MU})_w^{\text{MC}}\) is determined in a water box phantom.

We used standard methods for error propagation to estimate the relative uncertainty in \((D/\text{MU})_p\) as,
\[
\mu \left( \frac{D}{\text{MU}} \right)_p = \sqrt{\left( \frac{\mu \left( \frac{D}{\text{MU}} \right)_w}{F_{\text{CSPS}}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\mu F_{\text{MS}}}{F_{\text{MS}}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}}{F_{\text{CSPS}}} \right)^2}
\]  
(12)

where, \(\mu\) was the symbol used to represent uncertainty. Each quantity in equations (9) through (11) has an associated uncertainty, and several of those uncertainties were variable or unknown. Thus, the estimation of relative uncertainty in \((D/\text{MU})_p\) (Table 1) was based on a combination of three methods, including standard propagation of errors, use of uncertainty values from the literature, and sensitivity testing to quantify the impact of contributing uncertainties that were not available from the literature or that were not determined in this work. The uncertainty factors \(\mu(D/\text{MU})_w\), \(\mu F_{\text{MS}}\), \(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}\), and \(\mu F_{\text{MS}}\) were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of ((D/\text{MU})_w) estimation</th>
<th>Field-specific collimator scatter, (\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})</th>
<th>Compensator &amp; patient scatter, (\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})</th>
<th>Mass stopping power, (\mu F_{\text{MS}})</th>
<th>Combined uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPS, i.e., ((D/\text{MU})_w^{\text{TPS}})</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured, i.e., ((D/\text{MU})_w^{\text{meas}})</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated with MC, i.e., ((D/\text{MU})_w^{\text{MC}})</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
found to be uncorrelated, and intervals of each factor were found that satisfied the 5% uncertainty criterion of \((D/MU)_p\). Values of \(\mu(D/MU)_w\) were restricted to the interval from 2.5% to 4.5%, \(\mu_{\text{ColS}}\) was set to 1.0%, as was \(\mu_{\text{MS}}\), and \(\mu_{\text{CSPS}}\) were restricted from 1.5% to 4.5%. In other words, the results of the a priori estimates of relative uncertainty in \((D/MU)_p\) (Table 1) were used to estimate plausible values of the uncertainty in \((D/MU)_p\) when various values of \(\mu(D/MU)_w\), \(\mu_{\text{ColS}}, \mu_{\text{MS}}, \) and \(\mu_{\text{CSPS}}\) were taken into account.

### 2.3 Parameter values used to populate the uncertainty budget

Table 2 lists the parameter values used in equation (12) to populate Table 1, their associated uncertainties, and the corresponding literature sources. We used a value of 1.02 for \((D/MU)_w\) because it is typical for a prostate patient treated at our institution. However, values of \(\mu(D/MU)_w\) potentially depend on how \(\mu(D/MU)_w\) is defined by individual facilities and the protocols they follow.\(^\text{1,21,37}\)

Therefore, an interval of \((D/MU)_w\) values was provided. This interval takes into account reported differences between the ICRU and IAEA protocols.\(^\text{38,39,40}\) Consequently, the interval of values used to estimate the relative uncertainty in \((D/MU)_w\) was ±2.5% to ±4.5%.

The value used for \(\mu_{\text{ColS}}, 1.02\), reflects the importance of the collimator in proton beam dosimetry.\(^\text{28}\) The uncertainty for \(\mu_{\text{ColS}}, \mu_{\text{ColS}},\) was estimated using an interval of ±1%, which accounted for deviations in the treatment field from a 10 cm x 10 cm collimated field size, variation in beam energies from 160 MeV to 250 MeV, and variation in the location of the calibration point relative to the center of the SOBP.

The value used for \(\mu_{\text{MS}}, 1.0\), is an estimate of the dosimetric effect that a medium other than water causes due to differences in the proton mass stopping powers. The uncertainty in \(\mu_{\text{MS}}, \mu_{\text{MS}},\) was estimated at 1% using mass stopping power ratios\(^\text{41}\) of water to muscle.

### Table 2: Estimated parameter values and their relative uncertainties for \((D/MU)_p\)

The constituent terms of equation (9) are listed with their respective values, uncertainties, and the references used to determine them. Information from Table 2 was applied to equation (12), and those results were used to populate Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimated value(interval)</th>
<th>Relative uncertainty</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((D/MU)_w)</td>
<td>1.02 (0.97 - 1.007)</td>
<td>±2.5% - ±4.5%</td>
<td>IAEA(^\text{21}), ICRU(^\text{37}), Newhauser et al.(^\text{39})</td>
<td>IAEA(^\text{21}) and ICRU(^\text{37}) reported 2.0% - 2.6% uncertainty in absorbed dose measurements under reference conditions, and Newhauser et al.(^\text{39}) reported 4.4%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_{\text{ColS}})</td>
<td>1.02 (1.01 – 1.03)</td>
<td>±1%</td>
<td>Titt et al.(^\text{28}), Sahoo et al.(^\text{30}), Akagi et al.(^\text{24})</td>
<td>Titt et al.(^\text{28}) reported a 2% effect for general dosimetric accuracy and a 2.5% - 3% effect for the collimator size, energy, and SOBP used in this study, so uncertainty of ±1% was used to account for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_{\text{MS}})</td>
<td>1.00 (1.00 – 1.02)</td>
<td>±1%</td>
<td>Siebers et al.(^\text{33}), Paganetti(^\text{24})</td>
<td>Siebers et al.(^\text{33}) reported a water-to-ICRU tissue mass stopping power factor of 1.01, which differed from water-to-cortical bone or -lung by approx. 10% or 2%, respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_{\text{CS}})</td>
<td>1.034 (1.034 – 1.036)</td>
<td>±0.20%</td>
<td>Akagi et al.(^\text{24})</td>
<td>Parameter values and uncertainties were measured in phantom, then manually corrected for collimator scatter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_{\text{CSPS}})</td>
<td>1.059 (1.021 – 1.097)</td>
<td>±3.6%</td>
<td>Akagi et al.(^\text{24})</td>
<td>Parameter values and uncertainties were measured in phantom, then manually corrected for collimator scatter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_{\text{CSPS}})</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>±±4%</td>
<td>Sahoo et al.(^\text{30})</td>
<td>Sahoo et al.(^\text{30}) reported 1.00±0.04 for (\mu_{\text{CSPS}}), where 1.00 is the average (\mu_{\text{CSPS}}) over 5 unspecified treatment locations and 0.04 is the standard deviation of the mean. The ratio of the mean to the standard deviation of the mean was used here to approximate relative uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Akagi et al.(^\text{24}), Sahoo et al.(^\text{30})</td>
<td>An average of (\mu_{\text{CSPS}}) values from the previous rows, i.e., values estimated from data reported by Akagi et al.(^\text{24}) and Sahoo et al.(^\text{30}).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The values for $F_{CS}$ and $F_{CSPS}$ were determined using data from the only publications which directly addressed patient and compensator scatter.24, 30 Akagi et al.24 used a water phantom to determine values for $F_{CS}$ and $F_{CSPS}$, and Sahoo et al.30 used a commercial TPS and its verification plan feature to report a mean $F_{CSPS}$ value of 1.00±0.04 for a sample of unspecified anatomical treatment locations. However, because neither study provided an estimate of $F_{CSPS}$ for prostate treatment fields, we used the arithmetic average of values from Akagi et al.24 and Sahoo et al.30, yielding the $F_{CSPS}$ value of 1.03 listed in Table 2. The uncertainty in our estimate of $F_{CSPS}$ in Table 2 was unknown, thus determining a value of $\mu(F_{CSPS})$ was a central focus of this work (section 2.5) as it is needed for the estimation of uncertainty in $(D/MU)_{p}$.

2.4 Estimation of $F_{CSPS}$ for prostate treatment fields

2.4.1 Estimation of $F_{CSPS}$ using the TPS method

The TPS method (eq. 5) was applied to each of 32 prostate treatment fields taken from a representative sample of patients ($n=16$, 2 treatment fields each) from our practice. Patients were selected using the consecutive sampling method42 to minimize selection bias and indexed as 1 through 16. Patients in this study (1) received passively scattered proton treatments for stage I or II prostatic adenocarcinoma and (2) a $D/MU$ calibration date within a year of this study’s inception. The first date in the calibration interval was selected arbitrarily, and the end date was based on the date on which the desired number of consecutive patients had been treated.

To calculate absorbed dose to water (or water equivalent material), i.e., $D_{w_{RC}}$ in equation 5, we used the verification plan feature of the TPS, utilizing the same beam energy, lateral scatterer, range shifter, range modulation, and collimation as in the patient's treatment plan but with the patient's CT anatomy replaced by a water-box-phantom. The procedure for creating verification plans was taken from Newhauser.33 Briefly, in all fields, the calibration point location remained fixed at isocenter (Figure 2) to minimize the dosimetric impact of differences in beam divergence. Also, as described by Newhauser22, the water-equivalent depth of the calibration point was made equal for a treatment plan and the corresponding verification plan by shifting the water phantom in the verification plan. By maintaining the same location and water-equivalent depth of the calibration point in the patient and water phantom, dosimetric differences due to differences in scatter in the patient and phantom were isolated, so their respective effects on dose delivered to the calibration point could be revealed.

Figure 2: Dose distributions (shown by color wash) differ between the patient and water. A right lateral prostate treatment field (A). The verification plan feature in the treatment planning system was used to apply the same treatment field to water with the range compensator not included (B) and included (C). Additionally, the position of the downstream face of the water phantom is shown relative to the patient’s downstream surface in the treatment field (A) and the verification fields for the case when the range compensator is not in the beam path (B) and the case when the range compensator is in the beam path (C). When the range compensator is not present, the $Z$-position of the downstream face of the water phantom is given by $Z_{B} = 270 - R - x_{p}$, where $x$ refers to the compensator thickness and $R$ refers to the water-equivalent range to the calibration point, $Z_{cal}$ (blue ‘X’) in the treatment field along the axis of measurement. Similarly, when the range compensator is present, the $Z$-position of the water phantom is given by $Z_{C} = 270 - R$. 
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Table 3: Summary of parameters for patients 17 and 18. Measurement point (MP) depth describes the water-equivalent depth of the calibration point from the phantom surface. This value is given both without the range compensator (no RC) in place and with it (RC). ‘Air gap’ describes the distance between the downstream face of the treatment snout to the upstream face of the phantom. The modulator wheel identification (ID), the spread-out Bragg peak (SOBP) width, the beam energy, and penetration range were specified for each field based on the treatment plan. The penetration range and modulated width of each field are reported in water-equivalent thickness (WET). RL: right lateral; LL: left lateral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>MP depth no RC, (RC) (cm WET)</th>
<th>Air gap (cm)</th>
<th>Modulator wheel ID</th>
<th>SOBP width (cm WET)</th>
<th>Beam energy (MeV)</th>
<th>Penetration range (cm WET)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL field</td>
<td>19.5, (19.4)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL field</td>
<td>19.2, (19.1)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL field</td>
<td>19.7, (19.6)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL field</td>
<td>19.5, (19.4)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2 Estimation of $F_{CSPS}$ using the TPS+M method

The TPS-plus-measurement (TPS+M) method used a combination of measurements of absorbed dose in a water phantom and TPS calculations to estimate $F_{CSPS}$ according to equation (6). This method was applied to four treatment fields from two patients. These patients met the same inclusion criteria as patients 1 to 16 except they were selected prospectively so that we were able to make the additional measurements required for this method. The corresponding patient indices were 17 and 18 (Table 3).

2.4.2.1 Estimation of $F_{CS}$ using measurements

Our measurements of $F_{CS}$, using equation (7), utilized a 0.015-cm$^3$ air-filled ionization chamber (PTW pinpoint chamber, model TN31041, serial number 0079; Freiburg, Germany), an electrometer (Scandronix Wellhofer Dose 1, serial number 0293; Schwarzenbruck, Germany) and a plastic phantom (polymerized methyl methacrylate; C$_{5}$H$_{8}$O$_{2}$, $\rho = 1.19$ g cm$^{-3}$; GE Plastics Inc., Pittsfield, MA). Measurements were taken twice for each field: once at the calibration point with the RC in place, $D_{RC}^{w}$, and once at the calibration point without the RC in place, $D_{no\ RC}^{w}$. In the measurement for $D_{no\ RC}^{w}$, the water-equivalent thickness of the phantom was increased to preserve a fixed location of the calibration point. Finally, $F_{CS}$ was estimated according to equation (7).

2.4.2.2. Estimation of $F_{PS}$ using the TPS

The second step in generating $F_{CSPS}$ values with the TPS+M method was to determine $F_{PS}$ using equation (8). Because in vivo measurements were not feasible, the PBA in the TPS was used to determine the ratio of absorbed dose at the calibration point in the patient, $D_{RC}^{w,cal}$, to that in a water phantom, $D_{RC}^{w,cal}$.

2.5. Uncertainties in $F_{CSPS}$

When $F_{CSPS}$ was determined using the TPS method, i.e., TPS dose estimates applied to equation (5), the corresponding uncertainty in $F_{CSPS}$ ($\mu F_{CSPS}$) was estimated by comparing values of absorbed dose in the patient generated by the TPS calculations and MC simulations. As a result, we estimated that

$$\mu F_{CSPS} \succeq \frac{D_{TPS} - D_{MC}}{D_{TPS}}$$

(13)

where, $D_{TPS}$ represents absorbed dose from the TPS method at the calibration point in the patient, and $D_{MC}$ represents absorbed dose from MC simulations at the calibration point in the patient.

In practice, we used differences in dose profiles to estimate $D_{TPS}$ and $D_{MC}$ for patients 17 and 18. These profiles were generated using the PBA in the TPS and the Monte Carlo Proton Radiotherapy Treatment Planning (MCPRTP) code. In general, Contemporary proton PBAs in the TPS system provide excellent accuracy, especially in homogeneous media, superior to that of broad beam algorithms in heterogeneous media. The improvement in accuracy comes mostly at the cost of greater computation times. Because of inherent approximations in the PBA, it may not provide sufficient accuracy in extremely heterogeneous media, at material and/or density interfaces, or in other complex situations. The MCPRTP used the Monte Carlo N-particle eXtended radiation transport code with parallel processing as a radiation dose calculation engine. Each component of the proton treatment unit was modeled in detail and patient’s CT images were converted to voxelized phantom in the MCNPX code. The accuracy of the Monte Carlo simulation model has been previously evaluated by Titt et al. More details of Monte Carlo simulations can be found in previous reports from our group.

$D_{MC}$ was considered to provide the best estimate of the true absorbed dose at the calibration point. This
differences in anatomy or treatment design that would have occurred otherwise.

2.5.2. Estimation of uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ from the TPS+M method

When $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ was determined using the TPS+M method, i.e., TPS dose estimates and measurements (section 2.4.2), the corresponding uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, $(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})_{\text{TPS-M}}$, was estimated using a statistical approach: differences between $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ values generated with the TPS+M and TPS methods were used to estimate upper and lower bounds of $(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})_M$. The lower bound of the absolute uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, $[\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}]_{\text{TPS-M}}$, was estimated according to

$$[\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}]_{\text{TPS-M}} = \frac{F_{\text{CSPS(TPS)}} - F_{\text{CSPS(TPS-M)}}}{2}$$

(14)

where, $F_{\text{CSPS(TPS)}}$ and $F_{\text{CSPS(TPS-M)}}$ are the mean $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ values from the TPS and TPS+M methods, respectively. The $F_{\text{CSPS(TPS)}}$ value was averaged over 32 fields (patients 1-16), and the $F_{\text{CSPS(TPS-M)}}$ value was averaged over 4 fields (patients 17 and 18). Mean values were used because it was assumed that most random variations in the data would be averaged out of the respective data sets, so the resulting difference would represent a clinically representative estimate of the differences between calculation methods, i.e., a lower bound for the true uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$.

The upper bound of uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, denoted by $[\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}]_{\text{TPS-M}}$, was estimated from the maximum absolute values of difference in paired $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ values, or

$$[\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}]_{\text{TPS-M}} = F_{\text{CSPS(TPS)}} - F_{\text{CSPS(TPS-M)}}$$

(15)

where, the subscripts $i$ indicate that the TPS and TPS+M calculations were performed for each individual field in the sample, i.e., patients 17 and 18 (see section 2.4.1). Because $[\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}]_{\text{TPS-M}}$ was calculated for each field individually, it represented the differences in the TPS and TPS+M calculation methods solely. With this approach, we avoided confounding factors such as inter-patient differences in anatomy or treatment design that would have occurred otherwise.

2.5.3. Estimation of uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ from historical methods

When the historical value of 1.0 was used for $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, the corresponding uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, $(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})_{\text{HIST}}$, was estimated according to,

$$(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})_{\text{HIST}} = |F_{\text{CSPS(HIST)}} - F_{\text{CSPS(TPS)}}|$$

(16)

where, $F_{\text{CSPS(HIST)}}$ is 1.0 and $F_{\text{CSPS(TPS)}}$ was determined with the TPS method. This estimation was done for patients 1 through 16.

3. Results

3.1. Estimation of $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ using the TPS method

Table 4 lists descriptive statistics that compare $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ values from the two data sets studied here (patients 1-16 and 17-19). The $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ values for the two data sets were not significantly different from one another.

3.2. Estimation of $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ using the TPS+M method

Table 4 reveals good agreement between values of $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ calculated with the TPS method and those calculated with the TPS+M method. The standard deviation in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ for the TPS method was smaller than the corresponding value from the TPS+M method. Also, there was a larger interval in values for the TPS+M method than for the TPS method. There are several possible explanations for this. One is that additional statistical uncertainty was introduced by the measurements. Another is that the measurements better indicate the true standard uncertainty, while the TPS method artificially smooths out some of the true variation.

3.3. Estimation of uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$

3.3.1. Uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ using the TPS method

Absorbed dose predictions from MC and pencil beam algorithms were compared for a prostate treatment in one of the patients (patient 17) following the methods of 2.5.1. Differences in estimates of absorbed dose between MC simulations and the TPS method resulted in a 10.5 cGy difference between profiles at isocenter for the right lateral field and a 4.7 cGy difference for the left lateral field. The absorbed doses from the right and left lateral fields for the treatment plan at isocenter, which were used to represent $D_w$ as an approximation, were 3550 cGy and 3570 cGy, respectively. Therefore, the $(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})_{\text{TPS}}$ was less than 0.3% for the individual fields. These estimates suggest that the contribution of $(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})$ to uncertainty in $(D/MU)_p$ for this particular patient was negligible.
Table 4: Statistics for $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ using the TPS and TPS+M (TPS plus measurement) methods. The mean $F_{\text{CSPS}}$, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ values are listed for three data sets. In the two center columns, $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ values were calculated with equation (5) using the TPS method. In the last column, $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ values were calculated with equation (6), using measurements for $F_\text{CS}$ and pencil beam predictions for $F_\text{P}$. Using the TPS+M method. The fields used to generate data in the two rightmost columns differed from those used in the second column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Calculation Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fields</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $F_{\text{CSPS}}$</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation of the mean</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum $F_{\text{CSPS}}$</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum $F_{\text{CSPS}}$</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Statistics for $\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}$ using differences between the TPS method, the TPS+M (TPS + measurements) method, MC (Monte Carlo) simulations, and the historical value of 1.0. Estimates of $\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}$ were determined from differences between calculation methods for absorbed dose at isocenter in typical prostate treatment fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPS* vs. TPS+M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fields</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}$</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation of the mean</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum $\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}$</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum $\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}$</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2. Uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ using the TPS+M method

Following the methods in section 2.5.2, we estimated the upper and lower bounds for uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$. The lower bound, $\left[\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}\right]_{\text{TPS+M}}$, was 0.004 and the upper bound, $\left[\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}\right]_{\text{TPS+M}}$, was 0.008.

3.3.3. Uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ using the historical estimate

Estimates of $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ done using the TPS method were compared to the historical value of 1.0 for $F_{\text{CSPS}}$. Descriptive statistics for this analysis are listed in Table 5. The $(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})_{\text{HIST}}$ was less than 0.029, and the mean $(\mu F_{\text{CSPS}})_{\text{HIST}}$ was 0.006.

4. Discussion

We estimated uncertainty in $(D/MU)_p$ for patients receiving proton therapy for cancer of the prostate. In particular, we compared estimates of uncertainty in $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ by means of measurements, MC simulations, and pencil beam dose calculations. Our results confirm that when $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ is included in the estimation of $(D/MU)_p$, the uncertainty in $(D/MU)_p$ is less than 5%, regardless of the method used to calculate $F_{\text{CSPS}}$.

Our findings on $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ are similar to those of Newhauser et al. In this study, the standard of care at our institution followed the approach described by Newhauser et al. in which $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ was taken as unity. Subsequently, Newhauser et al. reported that $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ for prostate treatment fields was near the historical value of 1.0 based on results of a phantom study. Likewise, Sahoo et al. reported that $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ spanned the interval 0.957 to 1.089 with a mean value of $1.00 \pm 0.04$. However, we note that Sahoo et al. did not specify which anatomical treatment sites these values were from. Therefore, it is difficult to make a direct comparison of those results with the findings from this work.

As noted in section 2.3, we found no directly comparable reports on $\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}$ in the literature for prostate treatment. Our findings on $\mu F_{\text{CSPS}}$ differ from those in the works most similar to ours, that is, reports from Akagi et al. and Sahoo et al. Akagi et al. reported a relative uncertainty of 3.6% in the measured value of $F_{\text{CSPS}}$; this value exceeds ours by approximately a factor of 10. However, the uncertainty reported by Akagi et al. took into account the errors in reproducing collimator scatter ($F_{\text{CS}}$) and inaccuracy in analytical modeling of patient anatomy which were not applicable to our study.

One of the clinical implications of this work is that accuracy of $(D/MU)_p$ values, in the special case of prostate treatment fields, does not depend strongly on accurate knowledge of the $F_{\text{CSPS}}$ factor. Thus, this work also provides...
an evidential basis and rationale for standardizing absolute proton dosimetry, which is a key requisite step to conduct multi-institutional clinical trials.

This study had several limitations. First, it considered normal patient anatomy, e.g., the effects of implanted fiducial markers, hip prostheses, and organ motion on (D/MU)R and its uncertainty were not included. However, these are not serious limitations because solutions for fiducial markers are known\(^{52,53,54,55}\), and although hip prostheses are relatively rare, there are MV/kV imaging solutions that are available to correct for their effects\(^{56}\). Second, we considered only the lateral opposed-pair treatment technique, while involvement of pelvic lymph nodes or treatment of other more complex treatment strategies\(^{87,58}\) would require a much different application of our present findings. Third, our findings are specific to the treatment planning and delivery systems in use at our institution for a passively scattered treatment; there may be additional differences between this study and other treatment techniques, such as intensity-modulated proton therapy. Nonetheless, the methods and results of this study may serve as a qualitative guide for similar studies of other proton therapy systems.

Given the complexities and uncertainties associated with estimation of absorbed dose in the patient, additional studies are needed to test whether the findings of this work will hold for other anatomical sites. In our laboratory, additional studies are now under way to address estimation of uncertainties in \((D/MU)_R\) in the thorax.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, our study investigated the water-to-patient absorbed dose conversion factor, \(F_{CS}^{PS}\), one of the least well-understood factors in proton output calculation, and found that mean \(F_{CS}^{PS}\) value was 1.006 and uncertainty in \(F_{CS}^{PS}\) was approximately 1%, suggesting that uncertainty in \(F_{CS}^{PS}\) for proton therapy of prostate cancer is clinically acceptable.
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