PROSTATE AND NORMAL TISSUE CONSTRAINTS TO OPTIMIZE PROSTATE HDR BRACHYTHERAPY



Alvaro Martinez, MD, FACR Professor Of Radiation Oncology Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine Senior VP of Scientific and Clinical Strategy 21C and Michigan Healthcare Professionals

Leeds 3-24-12

HDR, LDR, CYBERK, VMAT

A FOOL WITH A GREAT TOOL IS STILL A FOOL!!!!

BACKGROUND - INNOVATION

- IT WAS A TEMPLATE BASE TECHNIQUE
- IT WAS A TECHNIQUE OF IMAGE GUIDANCE, "TRUS" BASED FROM NEEDLE INSERTION, GUIDANCE WITH ON-LINE 3D INVERSE PLANNING AT BEAUMONT
- AT OTHER CENTERS, TRUS GUIDANCE WITH CT-PLANNING.
- TRUS WITH REAL-TIME 3D PLANNING SAVES TIME AND IMPROVES HDR DELIVERY PRECISION.

REAL TIME Needle guidance and dosimetry



2D

3D

Developed in-house 1991

BACKGROUND - INNOVATION

- IN 1991 WE BEGAN THE DOSE ESCALATED BOOST TRIAL FOR HIGH RISK WITH TRUS GUIDANCE AND REAL-TIME 3D PLANNING.
- IN 1995, WE BEGAN THE HDR PROSTATE MONOTHERAPY PROGRAM AT BEAUMONT FOR PATIENTS WITH LOW / INTERMEDIATE RISK
- BOTH WERE HIC APPROVED PROTOCOLS
 FROM MULTIFRACION TO A SINGLE ONE

IS THE LQM APPROPRIATE FOR PREDICTING EQUIVALENCE AT ALL DOSE LEVELS??

- IN THE RADIOBIOLOGY WORLD, THERE IS CONTROVERSY IF THE LQM IS A GOOD EQUIVALENCE PREDICTOR WHEN VERY LARGE SINGLE DOSES ARE DELIVERED.
- MOST PEOPLE BELIEVES IT DECREASES THE EFFICACY AS THE DOSE INCREASES.
- I WILL USE MY LARGE EXPERIENCE TO DEMONSTRATE CLINICALLY THAT IT IS GOOD ENOUGH AND THE BEST WE HAVE

Interdigitated Pelvic EBRT + HDR boost protocol @ WBH

EBRT total dose 46 Gy in 23 fractions of 2 Gy/fraction Technique – pelvis 4 field 3D CRT, including pelvic nodes HDR boost 11.5 Gy on day 5 and day 15 of EBRT w/o interruption



BED OF EBRT+ HDR BOOST

	DOSE LEVEL	# PTS	MEAN FU YEARS	$\alpha/\beta = 10$	* - Gy α/β = 1.2
	5.50 Gy x 3	26	10.8	67.1	215
low	6.00 Gy x 3	21	9.9	70.0	231
	6.50 Gy x 3	32	10.2	72.6	248
	8.25 Gy x 2	44	8.7	72.0	253
high	8.75 Gy x <mark>2</mark>	44	8.4	74.2	268
	9.50 Gy x <mark>2</mark>	111	8.1	78.0	292
	10.50 Gy x <mark>2</mark>	124	6.3	82.9	327
	11.50 Gy x <mark>2</mark>	69	6.0	87.0	366

*** BIOLOGICAL EQUIVALENT DOSE TO EXTERNAL BEAM**

Dosimetry Constraints for HDR Boost

- Prostate
 - V₁₀₀ > 97%
 - V₁₂₅ < 65%
 - V₁₅₀ < 30%
- Urethra
 - V₁₀₀ < 90%
 - V₁₁₅ < 10%
- Rectum
 - $V_{75} < 1\%$



Software evolution: geometric, point-dose → inverse, DVH



5 WEEK EBRT + HDR BOOST

DOSE ESCALATION IMPROVES CANCER-RELATED EVENTS AT 10 YEARS FOR INTERMEDIATE- AND HIGH-RISK PROSTATE CANCER PATIENTS TREATED WITH HYPOFRACTIONATED HIGH-DOSE-RATE BOOST AND EXTERNAL BEAM RADIOTHERAPY

Alvaro A. Martinez, M.D., F.A.C.R.,* Jose Gonzalez, M.D.,* Hong Ye, M.S.,* Mihai Ghilezan, M.D., Ph.D.,* Sugandh Shetty, M.D.,* Kenneth Kernen, M.D.,† Gary Gustafson, M.D.,* Daniel Krauss, M.D.,* Frank Vicini, M.D.,* and Larry Kestin, M.D.*

*Radiation Oncology Department and [†]Urology Department, William Beaumont Hospital, Royal Oak, Michigan



Martinez et al. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2011;79:363-370

OUTCOMES FOR 472 PATIENTS

Dose group	No. of cases $(n = 472)$	BF (nadir +2)	BF(nadir +5 in 24 month, then nadir +2)	Locoregional failure	Distant metastasis failure	Clinical failure	Clinical DFS	Prostate cancer- related events
Low dose	167	43.1%	41.2%	14.3%	12.4%	23.4%	55.2%	39.4%
High dose	305	18.9%	15.5%	2.8%	5.7%	7.7%	71.9%	18.9%
p value		< 0.001	<0.001	0.001	0.028	< 0.001	0.014	0.001
All cases	472	29.4%	26.6%	7.8%	8.3%	14.3%	64.8%	27.5%



BIOCHEMICAL CONTROL 472 Pts



VB School of MEDICINE

CLINICAL FAILURE 472 Pts



DISEASE FREE SURVIVAL 472 Pts



School of MEDICINE

METASTASIS FREE SURVIVAL 472 Pts



64 Yr male with an increasing **PSA** from 5.2 TO 14.1 ng/ml in one year. Digital Exam palpable nodule on the lt, **TRUS hypoechoic nodule on the lt. Volume** of 72cc. MR confirms nodule, +ECE Biopsy: Gleason 9 (4+5) in 12/18 cores with up to 80% core involvement and + **PNI. AUA Score of 15 PMH: in good general healh. Treatment HDR BOOST+2 yr ADT**

T3a prostate adenoca Gleason 9 High-resolution 3T-MRI



axial



coronal



sagittal









PROSTATE BASE 1





REFERENCE PLANE





Apex Nodule 2





Apex Nodule 3





Apex Nodule 4





64 Yr male with an increasing PSA from 5.2 TO **14.1** ng/ml in one year. **Digital Exam palpable nodule on the It, TRUS** hypoechoic nodule on the lt. Volume of 72cc. MR confirms nodule, +ECE Biopsy: Gleason 9 (4+5) in 12/18 cores with up to 80% core involvement and + PNI. AUA Score of 15 **PMH: in good general healh. Treatment HDR BOOST+ 2 yr ADT** At 6.4 yr, undetectable PSA, (-)DRE

77 Yr male with an increasing PSA from 6.2 TO 9.4 ng/ml in one year. Antibiotics given and minimal PSA change. **Digital Exam palpable nodule on the Rt** into SV, TRUS hypoechoic nodule on the **Rt. Into SV, volume of 66cc. Biopsy:** Gleason 7 (4+3) in 6/18 cores with up to 80% core involvement bilateral and + PNI. p+ SV's. AUA score of 18 PMH: in good general healh. **Treatment HDR BOOST**



MULTIPLANAR SEMINAL VESICAL HDR PROSTATE IMPLANT







DOSIMETRY AT THE LEVEL OF THE SEMINAL VESICLES





BED BASED ON α/β RATIOS

	1.5	3.0	5.0
4 X 9.5 Gy= 38	267	133	110
<mark>2</mark> x 12 Gy= 24	208	103	82
<mark>2</mark> x 13.5 Gy= 27	264	130	101
1 x 19 Gy	260	139	91
45 x 1.8 Gy =81 Gy MPD-IMRT	174	122	96



MONOTHERAPY HDR CONSTRAINTS

PROSTATE

V100 > 95% V125 < 55% V150 < 25% **URETHRA** V115 < 1% V110 < 3% V90 <u><</u> 90% RECTUM <75% TO 1cc

WBH - Real-time TRUS Final Dosimetry T2a Gleason 6 Lt, 7 Rt, PSA 9.2 Urethra 75.0% 90.0% 100.0 % Prostate 125.0 % 150.0% 200.0 % 100% isodose Most transition zone received 125% green, wider margin on Rt School of MEDICIN



PROSTATE IG-HDR BRACHYTHERAPY



SPATIAL RELATIONSHIP OF THE NVB AND HDR NEEDLES





PURPOSE

- USING THE CTCAE v 3.0, TO PRESENT THE COMPARISON OF
 - ACUTE GU & GI TOXICITIES OF THE 3 BRACHYTHERAPY DOSE SCHEDULES
 - CHRONIC GU & GI TOXICITIES OF 38 Gy (9.5 Gy X 4) & 24 Gy (12 Gy X 2)
 - PSA CONTROL AND OS FOR THESE 2 BRACHYTHERAPY DOSES SCHEDULES



FOLLOW UP BY HDR SCHEDULE Stage \leq T2b, Gleason \leq 7, PSA \leq 15

	All Patients	9.5 Gy x 4	12 Gy x 2	13.5 Gy x 2
# of patients	484	320	72	92
F/U mean range	5.1 0.6-11.3	<mark>6.9</mark> 0.9-11	4.6 0.8-6.4	2.4 0.6-3.9





CTCAE v 3.0

Chronic Gastro-Intestinal Toxicity

	9.5 0	ay x 4	12 Gy x 2		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 1	Grade 2	
Diarrhea	4 (1.3%)	0	1 (1.4%)	0	
Rectal Bleeding	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	0	0	
Proctitis	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	0	0	
Rectal Pain / Tenesmus	1 (0.3%)	0	0	0	
Rectal Fistula	0	0	0	0	
Anal Fissure	0	0	0	0	

No grade 3 or 4 was found.



CTCAE v 3.0 Chronic Genito-Urinary Toxicity

	9.5 Gy x 4			12 Gy x 2		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
Dysuria	13 (4.2%)	9 (2.9%)	1 (0.3%)	4 (5.7%)	1 (1.4%)	0
Frequency/Urgency	42 (13.5%)	10 (3.2%)	0	14 (20%)	3 (4.3%)	0
Retention	13 (4.2%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.6%)	6 (8.6%)	0	0
Incontinence	8 (2.6%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (1.4%)	0	0
Hematuria	3 (1.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0	2 (2.9%)	0	0
Urethral Stricture	2 (0.6%)	0	4 (1.3%)	0	0	0

No grade 4 was found.

OUTCOMES



WB School of MEDICINE

CONCLUSIONS CHRONIC TOXICITIES 9.5Gy X 4 & 12 Gy X 2, n=392

- NO SD IN CHRONIC GU OR GI TOXICITIES AMONG THE ABOVE 2 HDR SCHEDULES
- GI ,DIARRHEA WAS THE MOST COMMON WITH 1.3% AND 1.4% G1. NO G3-G4 WERE SEEN
- GU WITH FREQ/URG THE MOST COMMONLY SEEN WITH 13.5% G1, 3.2% G2 AND 20% G1, 4.3% G2 RESPECTIVELY. UP TO 1% G3 FOR BOTH AND NO G4 SEEN.
- THE ABOVE 2 HDR SCHEDULES WERE VERY WELL TOLERATED



CONCLUSIONS : BC AND OS 9.5Gy X 4 & 12 Gy X 2, n=392

- NO SD IN BC OR OS AMONG THE ABOVE 2 HDR SCHEDULES
- FOR PATIENTES WITH LOW AND INTERMEDIATE RISK DISEASE, BC OF 90% AND OVERAL SURVIVAL OF 97% AT 5 YEARS ARE VERY GOOD





MONO & BOOST HDR CONSTRAINTS

PROSTATE

V100 ≥ 95% V125 < 55% V150 < 25%

V115 < 1%

V110 < 3%

V90 < 90%

V 100 ≥ 97%
V 125 <65%
V150 <30%
URETHRA
V115 < 10%
V100 < 90%</pre>

RECTUM

<75% TO 1cc

<75% TO 1%

Establishments Attitude (RO)

Whenever a new discovery is reported to the scientific world, they say first, "Its probably not true."

Thereafter when the truth of the proposition has been demonstrated beyond question, they say, "Yes, it may be true, but it is not important."

Finally, when sufficient time has elapsed to fully evidence its importance, they say, "Yes, surely it is important, but it is no longer new."

- Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592)



"ANY SIDE EFFECTS FROM YOUR PROSTATE RADIATION TREATMENTS?"

HDR 2463 Patients THE LQM IS CLINICALLY AS GOOD AS IT GETS

THANKS TO OUR UROLOGIST & PATIENTS