Integrating the MR-Linac into Radiation Therapy Practice

Mikki Campbell MRT(T), MHE Winnie Li MRT(T), MSc

UTDRO Evening Journal Club MR-Linac: From Prototype to Clinical January 24, 2019



Objectives

- To review the benefits, challenges and clinical implications of the MR-Linac on radiation therapy practice
- To discuss what scope of practice changes will emerge from the implementation of the MR-Linac and the impact it will have on education and regulation



MRGRT - SWOT

Strength

- Improved image quality
- Beam-on images
- On-board functional imaging
- Avoid exposure to imaging dose

Weaknesses

- Health economics
- Fraction times
- Deformable registration accuracy
- Magnetic field
- Bore size
- Geometric deformation & MRL calibration

Opportunities

- Newly developed workflows
- Ultrahypofractionation
- Research

Threats

- Workflow & software development
- Intrafraction motion
- Suboptimal patient selection
- Staffing
- Evidence of clinical benefit

EDITORIAL

Magnetic Resonance Imaging—Guided Radiation Therapy: A Short Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats Analysis

Marcel van Herk, PhD, */† Alan McWilliam, PhD, */† Michael Dubec, MSc,† Corinne Faivre-Finn, PhD, */† and Ananya Choudhury, PhD*/†

MR-Linac Workflow

	Pre-E	Beam	Beam-On	Post-Beam
Imaging	MRI (3D, 4D)		Real-Time MRI (Cine, 3D)	
Planning		Adapt Re-plan		Accumulate Dose
Treatment			Radiation Delivery (gating, tracking)	

Courtesy Dr. Allen Li, MCW



Clinical & Technical Considerations

Simulation/ Planning

- MRI planning (sequence optimization)
 - MRI eligibility (initial)
- Patient positioning/ immobilization devices
- Motion management
- CT planning
 - Back-up plan for CBCT Linac
- Monaco templates for reference planning



Patient Positioning & Immobilization

- Position of the patient and size of accessories are limited by the size of the bore (arms up vs. arms down)
- All accessories must be MRI compatible and indexed
- Coil indexed

Monaco Planning Considerations

- 57 cm (W) x 22 cm (L) max field size (fixed collimator)
- Avoid gantry angles through couch/coil mechanics
- Avoid gantry angles through cryostat
- IMRT/ 3D Conformal Only (no VMAT)







Monaco Templates

Templates store beam geometries, calculation parameters, calculation settings, physician's intent, IMRT constraints, etc.

- Plans = more heterogenous

Beams	
\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}	🏹 🏹 🧮 🛛 D
Beam	Description
1	20
2	140
3	165
4	195
5	225
6	260
7	290
8	320
9	350
RT :	Sided

3eams					
τ, τ	T, T, T,				
Beam	Description				
1	20				
2	60				
3	100				
4	140				
5	180				
6	220				
7	260				
8	300				
9	340				
M	idline				

Beams	
$\mathbf{x} \neq$	\overline{T}_{μ} \overline{T}_{μ} \overline{T}_{μ}
Beam	Description
1	340
2	220
3	195
4	165
5	140
6	100
7	70
8	40
9	5
	Sided

Structure	Cost Function	Enabled	Status	Manual	Weight	Reference Dose (cGy)	Multicriterial	Isoconstraint	Isoeffect
PTV1 •	Target Penalty	•	On		1.00			6000.0	5922.5
	Quadratic Overdose		On		4.56	6100.0		120.0	117.8
	Target Penalty	Image: A start and a start	On		1.00			5000.0	5027.9
LENS_Rorig -	Serial	✓	On		0.01			975.0	830.3
LENS_Lorig •	Serial	Image: A start and a start	On		0.01			975.0	916.3
BRAINSTEMorig .	Serial		On		0.01			5300.0	3614.2
OPTICCHIASMorig -	Serial		On		0.02			5000.0	4884.3
OPTICNERVE_Rorig +	Serial		On		0.01			5000.0	4793.5
OPTICNERVE_Lorig +	Serial		On		0.01			4500.0	2415.1
Eye_Lorig +	Serial		On		0.01			2800.0	1445.9
Eye_Rorig +	Serial		On		0.02			3000.0	2141.1
External +	Quadratic Overdose		On		0.01	6000.0		15.0	9.1
	Quadratic Overdose		On		0.01	5600.0		20.0	18.3
	Quadratic Overdose	•	On		0.01	5200.0		50.0	23.5
	Quadratic Overdose	•	On		0.01	4500.0		50.0	24.6
	Quadratic Overdose	•	On		0.01	3500.0		40.0	22.9
	Quadratic Overdose		On		0.01	2000.0		105.0	62.0

Clinical & Technical Considerations

Treatment Delivery

- Anatomic sites
- Pre-beam, Beam-on & post-treatment imaging
- Daily MR eligibility
- ATP vs. ATS
- No laser system
- No MLC tracking, automatic gating, multistructure motion monitoring, dose accumulation
- Other Considerations:
 - Patient/ staff scheduling
 - Partial treatment workflow
 - Patient communication



Imaging Workflow





Protocols for Adaptation

Anatomical

Ex. Contour change, bladder filling, rectum filling, seminal vesicles outside PTV

Dosimetric

- Adaptive plan better than reference?
- Adaptive plan is different, but within limits?
- Adaptive plan is worse, not within limits?

Physics

- MU check
- Segment check
- Largest aperture



Training Considerations

- New treatment planning system
- MR safety, patient screening
- MR-based anatomy
 - Image assessment on MRI vs CBCT vs CT
- MR image quality, scan optimization & interpretation
- Daily/weekly QA requirements



Team Development - Sunnybrook

Clinical Specialist Radiation Therapist (CSRT)

Monaco Super User (experienced therapist with minimal Pinnacle experience)

Responsible for preparing the Monaco treatment planning platform for clinical use

Imaging Super User (RTT/RTMRI)

• Responsible for preparing the imaging platform for clinical use

MR-Linac Rotational Positions (x4)

- Responsible for all aspects of planning and treatment for patients scheduled to the MR-Linac
- Two of the staff selected were certified RTT/RTMRI



Team Development - PM

- Super Users with combination expertise:
 - Monaco
 - MR imaging
 - Clinical implementation
 - Treatment planning
 - Image guidance (online and adaptive)



MRL Workflow Models

- MRL workflows will be very different
- 3-4 RTs staffed on MRL (± RO, MP)
 RT(T) vs RT(MR) vs RT(T, MR)
- Pt in and out of room in 26 min is possible
 ~45-60 min typical/reported for actual patients
- Some sites looking into MD-independent workflows

MD vs RT vs computer for contours / plans / approval



Final Thoughts

- 1. How will the integration of MRI further expand radiation therapy practice?
- 2. With integrated MR-Linac systems and adaptive RT, what does this mean for our workflows and our patients?
- 3. What scope of practice changes will emerge?
- 4. What impact will integration have on entry level certification, on accreditation, on regulation?

