

Dosimetry in Medical Physics

Report of Results

Sven Jandura & Edward Wang

November 30, 2018

Contents

| | | |
|----------|----------------------------------|----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Experimental Setup | 1 |
| 2.1 | Overview | 1 |
| 2.2 | Radiation Source | 2 |
| 2.3 | Scintillation Detector | 3 |
| 3 | Monte Carlo Simulations | 4 |
| 4 | Experimental Results | 4 |
| 5 | Summary | 4 |

1 Introduction

Brachytherapy is a common treatment for skin, breast, and prostate cancer, as well as for other tumors at various body parts. In the therapy, a radiation source is placed next to the tumor. The radiation then kills adjacent cancer cells [Gerbaulet et al., 2002].

To ensure the safety and effectiveness of the treatment, the spacial distribution of the radiation dose has to be known. This can either be obtained by a simulation using Monte-Carlo-Methods, or by measuring the dose distribution in a medium similar to human tissue. In this experiment, we employ both methods. We use a Strontium-90 radiation source, as commonly employed in Brachytherapy [Dedes and Landry, 2017]. We measured the dose distribution in water at different distances and angles to the source. The simulation is done using the software *FLUKA*.

2 Experimental Setup

2.1 Overview

The *Absorbed Dose*, the quantity we measure in the experiment, describes how much energy is deposited by radiation per unit mass. It is measured in Gray ($1 \text{ Gy} = 1 \text{ J/kg}$).




Figure 1: Experimental Setup

Related quantities are the *Equivalent Dose*, which is the absorbed dose weighted with a factor depending on the type of radiation, and the *Effective Dose*, which is the equivalent dose weighted with a factor depending on the type of tissue irradiated, and thus describing the effect of the radiation on the human body.

In the experiment, we place the ^{90}Sr -Radiation source at a fixed point in a water tank. An OptidosTM scintillation detector system is used to measure the radiation dose. It consists of a scintillation detector mounted on a three axis stepper motor, which allows translation in all three spacial directions. The detector is connected to a photomultiplier, which is in turn connected to a PC. The stepper motor are connected to the same PC. Both can be be controlled from a LabView program. The setup is shown in figure 1.

2.2 Radiation Source

We use a ^{90}Sr -Radiation source. ^{90}Sr decays to ^{90}Y via β -decay with a half life time of 28.79 ± 6 a, which the decays to ^{90}Zr again via β -decay with a half life time of 64 ± 21 h. ^{90}Zr is a stable isotop [Dedes and Landry, 2017]. Our radiation source is disk-shaped with a diameter of 3mm.

Answer to Question 1: The activity of the radiation source was measured at 9:47 a.m. on 11th May of 2002 (t_0) to be $A(t_0) = 33.3 \pm 10\%$ MBq. (1 Bq means one radioactive decay per second). We assume, that at the time of this measurement, there where no ^{90}Y present.¹ Then at the time of the experiment t_{start} at 9 a.m. on November 12th 2018 ($t_{start} - t_0 = 16.50$ a) the activity due to ^{90}Sr is:

$$A_{Sr}(t_{start}) = 2^{-(t_{start}-t_0)/t_{1/2}} A(t_0)$$

Since the half life time of ^{90}Y is a lot shorter than the half life time of ^{90}Sr , the concentration of ^{90}Y is always is a quasistationary equilibrium, that is, the number of ^{90}Y atoms that are created by the decay of ^{90}Sr per unit of time always equals the number of ^{90}Y atoms that decay to ^{90}Zr per unit of time. Hence, the total activity is twice the activity due to ^{90}Sr :

$$A(t_{start}) = 2^{1-(t_{start}-t_0)/t_{1/2}} A(t_0) = 44 \pm 8 \text{ MBq}$$

¹This assumption is likely wrong, since it requires the time between the production or filtration of ^{90}Sr and the calibration of the source to be a lot shorter then 64 hours. If we instead assume, that ^{90}Y was at its equilibrium concentration during the calibration, the result of this and the following question have to be divided by two.

The activity is higher than at the time of calibration, since we now have β -decay due to ^{90}Sr and ^{90}Y .

Answer to Question 2: Since the activity satisfies

$$A(t) = -\frac{dN}{dt} = -\frac{d}{dt}N(t_0)2^{-(t-t_0)/t_{1/2}} = \frac{\log(2)}{t_{1/2}}N(t)$$

we have

$$N(t_0) = \frac{t_{1/2}A(t_0)}{\log(2)} = (1.0 \pm 0.3)10^{17}$$

So there where 10^{17} ^{90}Sr atoms in the source at calibration time.

Answer to Question 3: Assume there are N_0 ^{90}Sr atoms at calibration time. Then at t_{start} , there are $N_{\text{Sr}}(t_{\text{start}}) = 2^{-(t_{\text{start}}-t_0)/t_{1/2,\text{Sr}}}N_0 = (0.67 \pm 0.08)N_0$ ^{90}Sr atoms. There are $\frac{\log(2)}{t_{1/2,\text{Sr}}}N_{\text{Sr}}(t_{\text{start}})$ ^{90}Y atoms produced per unit time. Since the half life of ^{90}Y is a lot smaller then the half life time of ^{90}Sr , the concentration of ^{90}Y is in a quasistationary state, so there are also $\frac{\log(2)}{t_{1/2,\text{Sr}}}N_{\text{Sr}}(t_{\text{start}})$ ^{90}Y atoms decaying per unit time. Hence $A_Y(t_{\text{start}}) = \frac{\log(2)}{t_{1/2,\text{Sr}}}N_{\text{Sr}}(t_{\text{start}})$, so $N_Y(t_{\text{start}}) = \frac{t_{1/2,\text{Y}}}{t_{1/2,\text{Sr}}}N_{\text{Sr}}(t_{\text{start}}) = (1.7 \pm 0.7)10^{-4}N_0$. The remaining atoms are ^{90}Zr , so $N_{\text{Zr}}(t_{\text{start}}) = N_0 - N_{\text{Sr}}(t_{\text{start}}) = (0.33 \pm 0.8)N_0$.

2.3 Scintillation Detector

In the experiment, we use an organic scintillation detector. The dose deposited in the detector is comparable to the dose deposited in water or in human tissue. Thus, it is suitable to determine the dose distribution in water. The Volume in which the radiation dose is measured is 0.8mm^3 . The detector contains aromatic carbohydrate molecules. Ionizing radiation excites these molecules, which shortly after that ($10^{-9} - 10^{-7}\text{s}$) to their ground state, emitting a photon in the process. These photons are guided through and optical waveguide to a photomultiplier, where the number of photons per unit time is measured. We used the OptidosTM scintillation detector system, which provides the detector and the photomultiplier.

The Optidos system was calibrated prior to the measurement in the following way: On October 13th 2015, a calibration was performed by the manufacturer. Right after this calibration, the dose deposited from the radiation source in a fixed position during a 60s interval was measured. The reading of the detector was $k_{p,0} = 1171.0 \frac{\text{Gy}}{\text{min}}$. Our experiment was conducted 3.08 years after this calibration. We measured the radiation dose from the same source in the same position. If the sensitivity of the detector would have stayed the same since the calibration, we would expect a reading of $k_p = 2^{-3.08a/t_{1/2,\text{Sr}}}k_{p,0} = 1094.8 \frac{\text{Gy}}{\text{min}}$ (Answer to Question 4). We measure $k_m = ???$ **Edward, hast du diesen Messwert?, sonst schreiben wir ihn halt nicht rein**, The dose in water can then be calculated as

$$D_W = 1.03 \frac{k_p}{k_m} M$$

where M is the reading on the detector. The prefactor 1.03 corrects for the type of radiation source, in our case a ^{90}Sr source.

Additionally to this calibration, the background radiation dose in the room was measured. However, it was below the measurement accuracy of the detector.

3 Monte Carlo Simulations

We use a Monte Carlo Simulation to calculate the dose distribution for our setup. In the simulation, a single particle leaving the radiation source is considered. Its energy and momentum are randomly sampled from the energy- and momentum distribution. The energy is distributed by a well known electron energy spectrum for β -decay, the direction of the momentum is distributed uniformly. Then the path of the particle and possible interactions with the surrounding material are calculated. If those interactions produce secondary particles, their energy and momentum is sampled from the appropriate distribution. The procedure is stopped, if the initial energy is completely deposited or all particles have left the simulation area. The dose deposited at each position is recorded. To obtain a dose distribution, this procedure is repeated for a large number of particles and the dose distribution is averaged over those runs.

In our experiment, we use the software *FLUKA* for the simulation, and the GUI *FLAIR* for FLUKA. In FLUKA, we simulated the dose distribution, taking into account the full geometry of the radiation source, including its shielding, and the geometry of the water tank, but not the scintillation detector. This is justified, since in the actual scintillator the deposited dose is approximately the same as it would be in water. This is not true for other parts of the detector, however, we minimize the influence of those parts by pointing the detector towards the source.

We simulated $???$ particles. This simulation took approximately $???$ hours.

4 Experimental Results

Messungen und Simulationen sowie deren Vergleich, und wie gefittet wurde, hier einfügen

5 Summary

Summary hier einfügen

References

- [Dedes and Landry, 2017] Dedes, G. and Landry, G. (2017). Dosimetry in medical physics.
- [Gerbaulet et al., 2002] Gerbaulet, A., Pötter, R., Mazeron, J.-J., Meertens, H., and Limbergen, E. V. (2002). *The GEC ESTRO handbook of brachytherapy*. European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology.