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**Purpose**: To compute an optimized brachytherapy treatment plan under a given treatment time budget, to greatly reduce treatment time of rotating shield brachytherapy (RSBT) for cervical cancer without compromising plan quality, and to directly optimize D90 to further improve plan quality.

**Methods**: In the RSBT treatment planning system, we use single shield with 45° emission angle and radiation source 169Yb. We introduce a time budget constraint in the treatment planning and model the problem as a quadratic optimization which is solved by CPLEX. We investigate the tradeoff between treatment time and plan quality. We further introduce another novel second stage planning to achieve the following goals: (1) directly optimize D90; (2) explicitly constrain the scaling factor to be 1. The first model provides guidance for defining a hottest 90% region in high-risk clinical target volume (HR-CTV) and hottest 2 cm3 regions in organ at risks (OAR), and the second planning will directly maximize D90 under the tolerance constraints for OARs and treatment time constraint.

**Results**: We validate our algorithms via experiments on 5 patient cases. The results show that on average, when we reduce the delivery time from 45.85 min to 37.10 min and 28.14 min, the D90 will decrease from 88.12 Gy to 86.10 Gy and 81.98 Gy correspondingly. The results also show that on average, the second planning can further improve the D90 from 88.12 Gy to 90.47 Gy.

**Conclusion**: This work shows that significant reduction in treatment time is possible without compromising the quality of treatment plan. By introducing a second stage planning, the D90 can be further improved.
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**Innovation**: The novelties of this study include: 1) we consider explicitly the delivery time budget and find an optimized treatment plan under this budget (first stage planning); 2) We further introduce a second stage planning which is based on the first stage planning. When the first stage planning does not find best treatment plan, the second stage planning can find one closer to the best treatment plan. When the first model finds the best treatment plan, the second stage model can serve as a double-checking role.

**Key Results**: The experiments are conducted on 5 patient cases. The tradeoff between delivery time reduction and plan quality is shown in Figure 1-2 for the case 2 and case 5 respectively. In Figure 3, we demonstrate the D90 improvements for each case with 5 different trials (the D90 obtained in second stage planning minus the D90 obtained in the first stage planning). We present the dose map and DVH dose escalation under different time budgets for case 1 using the first stage planning in Figure 4-7. We present the dose map and DVH dose escalation for case 2 using first stage planning and second stage planning in Figure 8-11. We present the quantitative results averaged over 5 cases in Table 1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chart, line chart  Description automatically generated | Chart, line chart  Description automatically generated | Chart, line chart  Description automatically generated |
| Figure 1: Dose variation and delivery time variation using first stage model. | Figure 2: Dose variation and delivery time variation using first stage model. | Figure 3: D90 improvement using second stage model. Compared with D90 obtained using first stage model. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Graphical user interface  Description automatically generated | Graphical user interface  Description automatically generated | A picture containing graphical user interface  Description automatically generated | A picture containing chart  Description automatically generated |
| Figure 4: Dose map of case 1 with delivery time 39.13 min, first stage model used. | Figure 6: Dose map of case 1 with delivery time 17.66 min, first stage model used. | Figure 8: Dose map of case 2, first stage model used. | Figure 9: Dose map of case 2, second stage model used. |
| Chart  Description automatically generated | Chart  Description automatically generated | Chart  Description automatically generated | Chart, line chart  Description automatically generated |
| Figure 5: DVH dose escalation of case 1 with delivery time 39.13 min, first stage model used | Figure 7: DVH dose escalation of case 1 with delivery time 17.66 min, first stage model used. | Figure 10: DVH dose escalation of case 2, first stage model used. | Figure 11: DVH dose escalation of case 2, second stage model used. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Treatment time (min) | 45.85±13.49 | 37.10±10.66 | 28.14±7.91 | 19.02±4.99 | 10.16±2.00 |
| D90 (Gy) | 88.12±8.19 | 86.10±6.18 | 81.98±6.79 | 75.20±8.75 | 64.14±10.50 |
| D100 (Gy) | 67.13±7.14 | 64.46±6.04 | 60.52±5.39 | 56.58±5.99 | 52.41±6.41 |
| D2cc bladder (Gy) | 81.48±5.87 | 81.29±5.81 | 80.66±5.23 | 80.38±5.69 | 79.45±8.93 |
| D2cc rectum (Gy) | 70.28±6.69 | 71.67±5.86 | 72.90±4.69 | 73.91±2.44 | 73.27±3.86 |
| D2cc sigmoid (Gy) | 67.47±5.83 | 65.99±6.85 | 63.86±7.68 | 61.23±9.15 | 58.30±9.02 |
| Table 1: Average performance over 5 patient cases. Different trials have different delivery time budget. | | | | | |