

Mid-PhD Defense

Paul Dubois

TheraPanacea
MICS, CentraleSupélec
Institut du Cancer de Montpellier

21st June 2023

Outline

Introduction

Cancer treatments

Radiotherapy

Multi-Leaf Collimator

VMAT scheme

IMRT scheme

Step-and-shot

Sliding-windows

Radiotherapy workflow

Problem Statement

Optimization workflow

Fluence discretization

FMO problem

Formulation

Optimization

Early results

Optimizers Review

Meta-Optimization

Dose Distances

Future work

Others

Courses

Doctoral training

References

Cancer treatments

Surgery



- +: Safe (little damage to healthy tissues)
- : Tumor needs to be localized & accessible

Chemotherapy



- : Heavy medicine on all the body
- +: Tumor does **not** need to be localized

Cancer treatments

Surgery



+: Safe

-: Tumor needs to be localized

Radiotherapy



+: Relatively safe (most tissues are spared)

-: Tumor needs to be (relatively) localized

Chemotherapy



Medicine on all the body

does not need to be localized

Multi-Leaf Collimator



V-Mat irradiation technique




Figure: Typical V-Mat dose slice.

IMRT irradiation technique





Figure: Typical 5 beams IMRT dose slice.

Automatic Dose Optimization for Radiotherapy



Problem Formulation

IMRT

Bixel values:

$$x_{i,j}^{\theta} \geq 0, \text{ for } \theta \in \Theta \text{ and } 1 \leq i,j \leq 20^1$$

usually concatenated to a single bixels-value vector x .

Dose calculation:

$$\mathbf{y} = L\mathbf{x} \text{ with } L \text{ (pre-calculated) dose-influence (DI) matrix}$$

¹20x20 is a typical bixel discretization

Problem Formulation

IMRT (bis)

Objective for *maximum* constraint c on structure s , dose d :

$$f_c(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (\mathbf{y}_v - d)_+^2$$

(reverse sign for minimal constraint).

Final objective:

$$f(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} w_c f_c(\mathbf{y})$$

with w_c the weight of constraint c .

Problem Optimization

Optimizer review




Figure: Typical prostate case.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18014>

Problem Optimization

Optimizer review (bis)




Figure: Typical prostate case.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18014>

Meta-Optimization

Usual optimization

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}, w) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{x} > 0$$

... and fine-tune w until the dose is clinically acceptable.

Meta optimization

$$\min_w \left\{ \min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}, w) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{x} > 0 \right\}$$

... still need to fine-tune the parameters (learning rate, momentum, etc...) of the meta-optimizer.

Dose Distances




Figure: Example of two doses that have the same clinical effect (measured from the DVHs), but very different voxel-wise dose values.

References