







MEDANTA RADIOSURGERY







# Spine SBRT An Overview



Dr Deepak Gupta Senior Consultant Radiation Oncology, Medanta The Medicity Email:-deepakonco@gmail.com, deepak.gupta@medanta.org

- Case
- 64 year old male diagnosed case of carcinoma Prostate Post op , Post RT 2013
- Presented with occasional pain in back
- Rising PSA
- PSMA PETCT WB(J,2023)-D12 vertebrae PSMA avid lesion. No

other side of metabolic uptake.



### D12 pedicle lesion on PSMA PET







- Background
- Rationale
- Determining eligibility (Patient selection)
- Required imaging
- Simulation
- Target delineation
- Planning, dose selection
- OAR tolerances
- Plan evaluation
- Delivery and IGRT
- Toxicity
- Pattern of failure

# Background

- Metastases are diagnosed in ~40% of cancer patients and are the most common spine tumors.
  - Autopsy studies suggest 30-90% of cancer pts may have metastasis in the spine
- Most common presenting symptom is pain followed by upper/lower extremity weakness, numbness or incontinence of bladder or bowel.
- When left untreated -Vertebral body fracture, radiculopathy and complication of metastatic epidural spinal cord compression (MESCC).

# Rationale

- Pre SBRT
  - Role of Radiation
    - Pain Control Only
    - No dose escalation



• High doses to target

• Avoidance of critical structure





e

# Points for Clinician to Focus On

- Clinical symptoms & signs
- Performance Status
- Systemic Disease
- Spine Stability
- Neurological compression
- Histology
- Spinal disease extent
- Challenges of procedure



# NOMS Assessment

- Neurologic
  - Myelopathy
  - Functional Radiculopathy
  - Degree of epidural spinal cord compression
- Oncologic
  - Tumor Histology
  - Radiation or Chemosensitivity
- Mechanical Instability
- Systemic Disease and Medical Co-morbidity



Surgery + SRS Laufer I,e

Laufer I, et al/ Oncologist. 2013;18.

# American Spinal Injury Association international classification system

- Objective grading of neurologic function
- Effective communication between radiation oncologists and surgeons

Category	Description	
A	Complete: no motor or sensory function preserved	
В	Sensory incomplete: sensory but not motor function preserved below neurologic level	
С	Motor incomplete: motor function preserved below neurologic level and more than one- half of muscles below level have grade <3	Surger
D	Motor incomplete: motor function preserved below neurologic level and more than one- half of muscles below level have grade ≥3	
E	Normal neurologic function	RT

# Neurological Compression

**BILSKY GRADING for degree of epidural spinal cord compression** 



- 1a : Epidural impingement without deformation of the thecal sac
- 1b : Deformation of thecal sac without spinal cord abutment
- 1c : Deformation of thecal sac with spinal cord abutment, but no compression

Grade 2 : Spinal cord compression, but with visible CSF around the cord Grade 3 : Spinal cord compression, without visible CSF around the cord

BilskyMH et al. J NeurosurgSpine. 2010.



Separation surgery should be performed before Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy (SBRT) in Bilsky's high grade epidural vertebral metastases:



VS





Fig: Post separation Surgery MRI showing Bilsky 1c epidural compression



Fig: Post separation Surgery showing spacer in situ



Better Spinal Cord Sparing with same dose and coverage

Dest	Pre-Sv Npinal Cord Denas (Cly)	Post Sa Spind Coril Dunion (Oy)	Difference (Gy)	% Reduction
Case 30 Gy in 1 fractions	32 Oy	28.1 Gy	3.99.GY	12.18%
Case 24 Gy in 2 fractions	24.5 Oy	17.45 Qy	7.05 Gy	28,7%





# Spinal Disease Extent

- Disease burden : single, multiple, disseminated
  - If metastasis involves multiple bony structures with no canal compromise or associated bone fracture, these patients can be managed without surgery, provided the spine stability is not compromised.
  - If metstasis involves 1-3 vertebrae without collapse or compression, SRS / SBRT preferred
- Which vertebra(e) affected ? (Spinal cord or Theca)
- Which part(s) of vertebra affected ?
- Degree of Cord / Thecal compression



# **Prognostic Scoring Systems**



### Who should get spine SBRT? ASTRO International Bone Mets Consensus Guidelines

### **INCLUSION CRITERIA**

- Radiographic-
  - 1. spinal / paraspinal metastasis by MRI,
  - 2. no more than 2 consecutive or 3 noncontiguous spine segments involved.

### • Patient—

- 1. Age >=18yrs,
- 2. KPS>=40-50,
- 3. medically inoperable or refusing Sx

### • Tumor-

- 1. Histologic proof of malignancy,
- 2. biopsy of spine lesion if first suspected malignancy
- 3. oligometastatic or bone only metastatic disease
- Previous t/t-
  - 1. Previous EBRT < 45Gy,
  - 2. failure of previous surgery to that spinal level,
  - 3. presence of gross residual after surgery

### **EXCLUSION CRITERIA**

- Radiographic-
  - 1. spine MRI could not be completed for any reason
  - 2. Epidural compression of cord or cauda equina,
  - 3. Spinal cord compression >25%,
  - 4. unstable spine requiring surgical stabilisation
  - 5. Tumor location within 5mm of spinal cord or cauda.

### • Patient-

- 1. Active connective tissue disease,
- 2. worsening or progressive neurologic deficit,
- 3. inability to lie flat,
- 4. patient in hospice or with life expectancy < 3months
- Tumor-
  - 1. Radiosensitive histology,
  - 2. extraspinal disease not elligible for further treatment
- Previous t/t-
  - 1. EBRT within 90 days,
  - 2. chemotherapy within 30 days



# Simulation

- Immobilisation:-
  - Prerequisite
    - Accurate and reproducible
    - Reduce/minimise patient voluntary and involuntary motion.
    - Reduce/minimise/target motion
    - Long treatment patient should be comfortable
    - Compatible with IGRT

Translational accuracy of <1 mm and a rotational accuracy of <2<sup>0</sup>

### Thermoplastic mask for lesion above T4



### Body Fix for vertebra T4 and below



Int J Radiation Oncol Biol Phys, Vol. 84, No. 2, pp. 520-526, 2012

# Imaging

- CT scan with slice thickness 1-1.5mm.
- Intravenous Contrast.
- Scanning preferably should be done in treatment position- MRI/PET.
- In patients with metal artifact from hardware obscuring critical neural structures, CT myelogram should be obtained.
- In rare situations, the metal artifact may be so significant that neither CT myelogram nor MRI is

reliable and, in these cases, SBRT should be avoided.

# Imaging

- MRI sequences
  - T1W and T2W axial non-contrast sequences.
  - T2W axial especially helpful in paraspinal disease extension and delineation of the spinal cord or thecal sac.
  - Slice thickness of 1–2 mm and no skip acquisition.
  - Gadolinium contrast (Controversial) Paraspinal disease, epidural disease or both



Figure 1: (A) Axial-T1, (B) Axial-T2, (C) Post-contrast T1 weighted images showing metastatic bone marrow infiltration in the right portion and peduncle of fifth lumber vertebra.

Lesion:- Hypointense to fatty bone marrow on T1 Hyperintense - Gadolinium enhanced or T2

# Volume delineation

- GTV (Tumour alone) Use diagnostic MRI (T1c, T2) and PET.
- Fusion:-
  - Area of interest
  - Rigid image registration.
- In Post OP case uses preop MRI and also involve operation surgeon.
- Problems with delineation of target due to artifacts → May include
   addl MVCT images (if available)/MRI/Myelogram
- CTV Exist in spine SBRT (As per guidelines)





# Volume delineation

1





Modified Weinstein-Boriani-Biagini

# Contouring guidelines



2012

Clinical Investigation: Central Nervous System Tumor

International Spine Radiosurgery Consortium Consensus Guidelines for Target Volume Definition in Spinal

#### Stereotactic Radiosurgery

Brett W. Cox, MD, \*,1 Daniel E. Spratt, M Mark H. Bilsky, MD,<sup>‡</sup> Eric Lis, MD,<sup>§</sup> Samu Peter C. Gerszten, MD, MPH,\*\* Eric Chan Arjun Sahgal, MD,<sup>88</sup> Joe Deasy, PhD,<sup>†</sup> Jol Stefan Mindea, MD, ¶¶ and Yoshiya Yama

2017

International Journal of Radiation Oncology

www.redjournal.org

biology • physics

Clinical Investigation

**Consensus Contouring Guidelines for Postoperative Stereotactic Body Radiation** Therapy for Metastatic Solid Tumor Malignancies to the Spine

Kristin J. Redmond, MD, MPH, \* Scott Robertson, PhD, \* Simon S. Lo, MD, FACR,<sup>†</sup> Scott G. Soltys, MD,<sup>‡</sup> Samuel Ryu, MD Todd McNutt, PhD,\* Samuel T. Chao, MD, Yoshiya Yamada, M Original Article Amol Ghia, MD,<sup>#</sup> Eric L. Chang, MD,\*\* Jason Sheehan, MD, Ph and Arjun Sahgal, MD, FRCPC

International Journal of Radiation Oncolog biology • physics	у	
www.redjournal.org	2020	
-	Radiotherapy and Oncology 145 (2020) 21-29	
	Contents lists available at ScienceDirect	Radiotherapy
	Radiotherapy and Oncology	
FLSEVIER	journal homepage: www.thegreenjournal.com	

International consensus recommendations for target volume delineation specific to sacral metastases and spinal stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT)



Emma M. Dunne<sup>a,\*</sup>, Arjun Sahgal<sup>b</sup>, Simon S. Lo<sup>c</sup>, Alanah Bergman<sup>a</sup>, Robert Kosztyla<sup>a</sup>, Nicolas Dea<sup>d</sup>, Eric L. Chang<sup>e</sup>, Ung-Kyu Chang<sup>f</sup>, Samuel T. Chao<sup>g</sup>, Salman Faruqi<sup>h</sup>, Amol J. Ghia<sup>i</sup>, Kristin J. Redmond<sup>j</sup>, Scott G. Soltys k, Mitchell C. Liu<sup>a</sup>

### Guidelines for bony CTV delineation



GTV involves unibiteral lamina CTV -Include process, and a

CTV-Include lumins, ipsilateral policie/transverse process, and spinous process GTV involves spinous process

CTV:-Include entire spinous process and bilateral laminae

# Postop SBRT - CTV

Target volume	Guidelines
GTV	<ul> <li>Gross tumor based on postoperative CT and MRI with attention to residual epidural or paraspinal disease</li> </ul>
CTV	<ul> <li>Include entire GTV</li> <li>Include the postoperative region and entire anatomic compartment corresponding to all preoperative MRI abnormalities suspicious for tumor involvement</li> <li>Surgical instrumentation and incision not included unless involved</li> <li>Judicious use of circumferential CTVs limited to cases of preoperative circumferential osseous and/or epidural involvement; however, can be considered for near-circumferential epidural disease involvement</li> <li>Modified at reconstructed dural space.</li> <li>5 mm margin beyond paraspinal extension and cranio-caudally for epidural Disease.</li> </ul>
PTV	Uniform CTV to PTV expansion of up to 2.5 mm Treating physician may modify expansion at the interface with critical organs at risk May subtract cord avoidance structure from PTV as a modified PTV for planning and dose reporting purposes Include entire GTV and CTV

# Postop SBRT - CTV

Postop SBRT: Case 1 (a)

Circumferential epidural ds preop Residual near circumferential epidural ds postop Preop bony inv.: Sectors 1-6



Postoperative axial CT Postoperative axial myelogram or T2 MRI

T6 level Preop bony inv.- body, B/L pedicles, B/L transverse processes, B/L laminae



TI post-MRI

Postop SBRT: Case 2 (a)

Anterior & Left lateral epidural ds preop Residual anterolateral epidural ds postop Preop bony inv.: Sectors 1,2





T11 level Preop bony inv.- body & left pedicle.







Postop SBRT: Case 2 (b)

Preop bony inv.: Sectors 1,5,6

Rt lateral and anterior epidural ds preop

Residual anterolateral epidural ds postop

Preoperative axial MRI Preoperative sagittal MRI

C2 level. Preop bony inv.: body, odontoid, right pedicle, right transverse process.



Postoperative axial CT

myelogram or T2 MRI

Postoperative axial

TI post-MRI

Postop SBRT: Case 3 (a) Posterior epidural ds preop

No residual epidural ds postop Preop bony inv.: Sectors 3,4,5





T3 level Preop bony inv.-spinous process, B/L laminae, & B/L transverse processes

Postoperative axial CT Postoperative axial myelogram or T2 MRI







Anterior, rt lateral and posterior epidural ds preop No residual epidural ds postop Preop bony inv.: Sectors 1,4,5,6

Preoperative axial MRI Preoperative sagittal MRI



C4 level Preoperative bony inv.- body, right pedicle, right transverse process, right lamina, and spinous process

#### myelogram or T2 MRI TI post-MRI

Postoperative axial CT



Postoperative axial.



Postop SBRT: Case 4

V body #, post vertebroplasty, no epidural ds preop No residual epidural ds postop Preop bony inv.: Sector 1



Preoperative bony inv.- body

T9 level



Postoperative axial CT



Postoperative axial

TI post-MRI





# Volume delineation: PTV

- Uniform expansion around the CTV (1.5-2.5 mm margin)
- Should contain entire GTV and CTV
- PTV margin adjacent to critical structures may be modified to allow spacing at discretion of treating physician unless GTV compromised
  - Never overlaps with cord/ cord avoidance structure
- **PTV\_prescribe** = **PTV Cord PRV**:
  - To allow for unavoidable underdosing of PTV in close proximity to spinal cord, while maintaining consistency in treatment prescription



PTV\_Prescribe volume may be generated or edited appropriately in treatment situations where GTV extends beyond this volume

## OARs

Adjacent OARs should be contoured 1 vertebral level above and below the PTV

- Spinal cord/ Cauda equina: fused T1/T2 MRI or CT myelogram
- Esophagus
- Ribs/Chest wall
- Skin
- Aorta
- Lungs/ Heart/ Kidneys/ Bowel as per site

# Spinal cord delineation

- Challenging, but critical for safe practice.
- Double edge sword:-
  - Contouring generously Under dosing tumor in epidural space.
  - Contouring inaccurately Higher dose to true spinal cord .
- Thin-slice T1 and T2 axial volumetric MR images fused to the treatment planning CT and/or a CT myelogram – closest way to contour what is "true cord".
- Caution:- Simple window levelling by itself can alter what is contoured as the "true" cord.
  - PRV: 1.5-2 mm margin around cord
  - Thecal sac (surrogate for cord/cauda) is equivalent to 1.5mm PRV margin to cord





# Extent of spinal cord contouring for SBRT Spine





- Spinal cord to be contoured 6mm above and 6mm below the target volume
- Rationale- distance of dose fall-off (90% to 50% isodose line) being 5 mm, and that the radiosurgical beam

arrangement is co-planar.

### HyTEC Organ-Specific Paper: Spinal Cord

### Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy for Spinal Metastases: Tumor Control Probability Analyses and Recommended Reporting Standards

1 Fraction		2 Fractions		3 Fractions		4 Frac	4 Fractions		tions
Dose (Gy)	LC (%)								
16 <sup>†</sup>	72 <sup>†</sup>	$20^{\dagger}$	66 <sup>†</sup>	24*	70*	$20^{\dagger}$	45 <sup>†</sup>	20*	41*
18*	82*	$22^{\dagger}$	$74^{\dagger}$	27*	78*	$28^{\dagger}$	73†	25*	57*
20*	90*	24*	82*	30*	85*	30*	78*	30*	72*
22*	94*	$28^{\dagger}$	$90^{\dagger}$	33 <sup>†</sup>	$90^{\dagger}$	33*	85*	35*	83*
24*	96*	30 <sup>‡</sup>	95 <sup>‡</sup>	36 <sup>‡</sup>	95 <sup>‡</sup>	$40^{\ddagger}$	95 <sup>‡</sup>	45 <sup>‡</sup>	95 <sup>‡</sup>
	Fracti	ons	80%	LC	90%	LC	95%	LC	
	1fxEI	D:	18	*	20	*	23	t	
	2fvEI	<b>.</b> .	22	t	28	-1	30	t.	
	ZIXEI	).	25		20		50	1-	
	3fxEI	D:	27	*	33		36	ŧ	
	4fxEI	D:	32	Ť	36		40	ţ.	
	5fxEI	D:	33	t	40	ŧ.	45	ŧ.	
								(1):112-1	L <b>2</b> 3.

Stereotactic body radiotherapy versus conventional external beam radiotherapy in patients with painful spinal metastases: an open-label, multicentre, randomised, controlled, phase 2/3 trial

Arjun Sahgal, Sten D Myrehaug, Shankar Siva, Giuseppina L Masucci, Pejman J Marafani, Michael Brundage, James Butler, Edward Chow, Michael G Fehlings, Mathew Foote, Zsalt Gabos, Jeffrey Greenspoon, Marc Kerba, Young Lee, Mitchell Liu, Stanley K Liu, Isabelle Thibault, Rebecca K Wong, Maaike Hum, Keyve Ding, Wendy R Parulekar, on behalf of the trial investigators\*

	Conventional external beam radiotherapy group (n=115)	Stereotactic body radiotherapy group (n=114)	p value	
1-month assessment		object where the second s		
Complete response	20 (17%)	30 (26%)	0.10*	
Partial response	33 (29%)	34 (30%)		
Stable pain	38 (33%)	26 (23%)	1	
Progressive pain	14 (12%)	9 (8%)	-	
Indeterminant	10(9%)	15 (13%)	÷	
Mean daily OME consumption, mg	44 (122)	27 (95)	0.26	
3-month assessment				
Complete response	16 (14%)	40 (35%)	0-0002*	
Partial response	29 (25%)	20(18%)		
Stable pain	34 (30%)	27 (24%)	-	
Progressive pain	14 (12%)	7(6%)	-	
Indeterminant	22 (19%)	20(18%)	-	
Mean daily OME consumption, mg	43 (106)	37 (97)	070	
Mean change in SINS from baseline	-0.49(1.61)	-0.94/1.69)	0.034	
6-month assessment				
Complete response	18 (16%)	37 (32%)	0.0036*	
Partial response	18 (26%)	10 (9%)		
Stable pain	32 (28%)	26 (23%)	-	
Progressive pain	8(7%)	5 (4%)	20	
Indeterminant	39(34%)	36(37%)	-	
Mean daily OME consumption, mg	36 (126)	36 (84)	100	
Mean change in SINS from baseline	-0.74(1.99)	-0.73(1.86)	0.88	

were based on International Consensus on Pallative Radiotherapy Endpoints. OME-sural morphine equivalent. SINS-Spinal instability in Neoplasia Score: \* Adjusted for stratification factors of histology (radioresistant ve radiosamilitive), and the the presence or absence of mass-type tumour (extraosseous or epidural disease extension, or both) on imaging.

- Stereotactic body radiotherapy is superior to conventional external beam radiotherapy in achieving complete pain relief at the treatment site.
- Stereotactic body radiotherapy significantly improved the complete response rate for pain compared with conventional external beam radiotherapy, and had a durable effect at the 6-month and final followup assessment.

### Dose-Escalated 2-Fraction Spine Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy: 28 Gy Versus 24 Gy in 2 Daily Fractions

K. Liang Zeng, MD,\* Ahmed Abugarib, MD,\*\*<sup>†</sup> Hany Soliman, MD,\* Sten Myrehaug, MD,\* Zain A. Husain, MD,\* Jay Detsky, MD, PhD,\* Mark Ruschin, PhD,\* Aliaksandr Karotki, PhD,\* Eshetu G. Atenafu, MSc,<sup>‡</sup> Jeremie Larouche, MD,<sup>†</sup> Mikki Campbell, BSc,\* Pejman Maralani, MD,<sup>‡</sup> Arjun Sahgal, MD,\* and Chia-Lin Tseng, MDCM\*

#### INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RADIATION ONCOLOGY • BIOLOGY • PHYSICS



**Conclusions:** Dose escalation to 28 Gy in 2 daily fractions was associated with improved local control without increasing the risk of VCF. The 2-year local control rates are consistent with those predicted by the Hypofractionated Treatment Effects in the Clinic spine tumor control probability model, and these data will inform a proposed dose escalation randomized trial. © 2022 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.



### Tolerance to SBRT-Thecal sac Dmax

Radiation Oncology hiology • physics

www.eefjournal.org

Clinical Investigation: Central Nervous System Tumor

#### Probabilities of Radiation Myelopathy Specific to Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy to Guide Safe Practice

Arjun Sahgal, MD, \*<sup>1</sup> Vivian Weinberg, PhD,<sup>1</sup> Lijun Ma, PhD,<sup>||||</sup> Eric Chang, MD,<sup>§</sup> Sam Chao, MD,<sup>||</sup> Alexander Muacevic, MD,<sup>¶</sup> Alessandra Gorgulho, MD,\*\* Scott Soltys, MD,<sup>|†</sup> Peter C. Gerszten, MD,<sup>‡‡</sup> Sam Ryu, MD,<sup>§§</sup> Lilyana Angelov, MD,<sup>||</sup> Iris Gibbs, MD,<sup>††</sup> C. Shun Wong, MD,<sup>†</sup> and David A. Larson, MD, PhD<sup>||||</sup>

\*Department of Radiation Oncology, Princess Margaret Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada; "Department of Radiation Oncology, Sumpbrook Health Sciences Centre, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada; "University of California San Francisco Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center Biostatistics Core, San Francisco, California; "Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Southern California and The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, University of Texas, Houston, Texas; "Department of Radiation Oncology and Neurosurgery, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio; "European Cyberknife Center Munich in affiliation with the University Hospitals of Munich, Munich, Germany; "Department of Neurosurgery, University of California at Las Angeles, Los Angeles, California; "Department of Radiation Oncology, Stanford University, Stanford, California; "Departments of Neurological Surgery and Radiation Oncology, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; "Department of Radiation Oncology, Henry Ford Hospital, Michigan; and "Department of Radiation Oncology, University of California at San Francisco, San Francisco, California

Received Jan 30, 2012, and in revised form Apr 27, 2012. Accepted for publication May 3, 2012

	1 fraction Pmax limit (Gy)	2 fractions Pmax limit (Gy)	3 fractions Pmax limit (Gy)	4 fractions Pmax limit (Gy)	5 fractions Pmax limit (Gy)
1% probability	9.2	12.5	14.8	16.7	18.2
2% probability	10.7	14.6	17.4	19.6	21.5
3% probability	11.5	15.7	18.8	21.2	23.1
4% probability	12.0	16.4	19.6	22.2	24.4
5% probability	12.4	17.0	20.3	23.0	Acti25.3.0 \/

#### Table 5 Predicted Pmax volume absolute doses in Gy for 1 to 5 SBRT that result in 1%-5% probability of radiation myelopathy (RM)

#### For 2% probality of RM: Theca Dmax EQD2 OF 30Gy-single fx; 35Gy upto 5Fx is supported as safe

10gy/1fx= 60BED= 30-35 EQD2

### Estimated Risk Level of Unified SBRT Dose Tolerance Limits for Spinal Cord

Jimm Grimm, PhD<sup>a</sup>, Arjun Sahgal, MD<sup>b</sup>, Scott G. Soltys, MD<sup>c</sup>, Gary Luxton, PhD<sup>c</sup>, Ashish Patel, MD<sup>d</sup>, Scott Herbert, MD<sup>e</sup>, Jinyu Xue, PhD<sup>d</sup>, Lijun Ma, PhD<sup>f</sup>, Ellen Yorke, PhD<sup>g</sup>, John R. Adler, MD<sup>c</sup>, and Iris C. Gibbs, MD<sup>c</sup>

	Low Risk Limits							High Risk Limi	ts	
	D50% Limit (Gy)	D10% Limit (Gy)	D1cc Limit (Gy)	D0.1cc Limit (Gy)	Dmax Limit (Gy)	D50% Limit (Gy)	D10% Limit (Gy)	D1cc Limit (Gy)	D0.1cc Limit (Gy)	Dmax Limit (Gy)
1 fx	1.8	7.0	7.0, 0.1%	8.5, 0.1%	13.0, 0.9%	7.0	10.0	8.0, 0.2%	10.0, 0.2%	14.0, 1.6%
2 fx	3.6	9.1	9.5, 0.1%	12.7, 0.1%	16.5, 0.6%	11.0	14.0	12.0, 0.4%	14.5, 0.3%	18.0, 1.1%
3 fx	5.4	11.1	11.1, 0.1%	16.3, 0.2%	20.0, 0.7%	15.0	18.0	16.0, 0.9%	18.0, 0.4%	22.0, 1.3%
4 fx	7.2	12.8	13.6, 0.2%	18.3, 0.2%	21.0, 0.5%	18.5	20.5	20.0, 2.2%	20.5, 0.4%	26.0, 1.8%
5 fx	9.0	13.5	13.5, 0.1%	20.0, 0.2%	22.0, 0.4%	21.0	23.0	21.5, 2.0%	22.5, 0.4%	30.0, 2.6%

### Tolerance to salvage SBRT- Spine

- Take into account previous radiation dose.
- Previous RT: 20/5, 30/10, 40/20,50/25
  - = 30-50 EQD2 (above/below this recommendations N/A)
- Recommendations based on thecal sac Dmax.



CLINICAL INVESTIGATION

**Central Nervous System Tumor** 

REIRRADIATION HUMAN SPINAL CORD TOLERANCE FOR STEREOTACTIC BODY RADIOTHERAPY

AREN SANKIAL, M.D., \* LEUN MA, PR.D., <sup>1</sup> VIVION WEINSTEID, PR.D., <sup>3</sup> IRIS C. GRBE, M.D., <sup>1</sup> SAM CHAO, M.D., <sup>1</sup> UNG-KYU CHANG, M.D., <sup>1</sup> MARIA WEINSTE-WARK, M.D., \*\* LETYANNA ANDELOS, M.D., <sup>3</sup> ERIC L. CHANG, M.D., <sup>11</sup> MOON-JUN SORN, M.D., <sup>21</sup> SCOTT G. SOLTYN, M.D., <sup>5</sup> DANIEL LETUORNEAR, PR.D., <sup>31</sup> SAM RYU, M.D., <sup>51</sup> PITTER C. GERSZTEN, M.D., <sup>31</sup> JACK FOWLER, PR.D., \*\*\* C. SHEN WORG, <sup>311</sup> AND DAVID A, LARSON,<sup>1</sup>

\*Department of Radiation Oncology, Sumphronik Health Sciences Centre, Princess Margant Hoopital, University of Dimens, Teentre, Canada, "Department of Radiation Oncology, University of California, San Francisco, and "University" of California, San Francisco, Hole Office Family, Campathennia Canada, Canada Canada, "Department of Radiation Oncology, Sunford University, Stanford, CA: "Department of Radiation Oncology and NeuroIntegration of Radiation Oncology, Thomas Affrains Control (Radiation Oncology, Thomas Affrains) Control (Radiation Oncology, Thomas Affrains), Compathenet of Radiation Oncology, Thomas Affrains Contention, Theorem, "Department of Radiation Oncology, Thomas Affrains Contention, Theorem, "Department of Radiation Oncology, M.D. Andenson Catazin Concology, Thomas Affrains Contention, Theorem, Theorem, Canada, "Department of Radiation Oncology, M.D. Andenson Catazin Concellogy, Florid, Philaded David, Philadel Content, University, Lend, Santh Kore, "Department of Radiation Oncology, M.D. Andenson Catazin Catazin Catada Context, University, Tend Hoopital, Department of NeuroInstead Philade Concellogy, Hendrick, MI, "Department of NeuroInstead Science, Context, "Department of Radiation Oncology, Hendrick, Margantent of Catadation Oncology, Hendrick, MI, "Department of NeuroInstead Science, Context, "Department of Radiation Oncology, Neurophysical Science, Context, University of Pensher, Versity of Tomana, Catada Catazin, "Margantent of Sciences, Prince Science, Context, University of Pensher, Versity, Prince, Science, Context, University, Pensher, Versity, Pensher, Science, Context, University of Tomana, Tomana, Neuro, "Official Science, Context, University, Catadation Oncology, Science, Context, University, Context, Context, Versity, Pensher, Catadatin, Context, Versity, Pensher, Versity, Pensher, Versity, Pensher, Versity, Pensher, Versity, Pensher, Versity, Pensher, Pe

- Total EQD2 of thecal sac Dmax upto 70Gy2/2 is SAFE as this was within 95% CI for norm group, and no overlap with RM group.
- Sbrt theca Dmax reirradiation BED upto EQD2 OF 25Gy2/2 is supported as safe

PRIOR CONVENTIONAL RADIOTHERAPY FRACTIONATIONS	PRIOR CONVENTIONAL RADIOTHERAPY nBED (Gy <sub>2/2</sub> )	1-fx SBRT (Gy)	2-fx SBRT (Gy)	3-fx SBRT (Gy)	4-fx SBRT (Gy)	5-fx SBRT (Gy)
20 Gy/5 fx	30	9	12.2	14.5	16.2	18
30 Gy/10 fx	37.5	9	12.2	14.5	16.2	18
40 Gy/20 fx	40	N/A	12.2	14.5	16.2	18
45 Gy/25 fx	43	N/A	12.2	14.5	16.2	18
50 Gv/25 fx	50	N/A	11	12.5	14	15.5

# Planning

- Principles:-
  - ✓ Sharp fall off outside PTV
  - ✓ Inhomogeneous dose inside PTV
  - ✓ Multiple non co-planner beam or arc are needed to create conformal dose distributions.

### Impact of Hardware

- Because of electron backscatter, the high density of titanium hardware may underestimate the radiation dose to structures in front of it by approximately 6%.
- Similarly, tissues behind the hardware may receive a dose approximately 7% lower than the anticipated dose due to photon attenuation .

# Planning Criteria

- Dmax Inside the PTV
- PD = 100%
- Prescription isodose: 80% to 90%.

### Dose Coverage

• Ideal PTV  $V_{100\%} \ge 95\%$  and  $V_{90\%} > 99\%$ 

### CONFIRMITY

- Defined by the conformity index --- $V_{100\%}$ /PTV volume.
- Ideal value  $\leq 1.2$

### HIGH DOSE SPILLAGE

• V<sub>105%</sub> should ideally be < 15% of PTV volume.





# Set verification and delivery

### • CBCT

- Pre-treatment
- Mid Treatment
- Post Treatment



### Cyberknife

- Real time tracking
- Imaging every 5 to 150 sec



# **Toxicity- Pain Flare**

- Defined as temporary worsening of bone pain at the treated site.
- Incidence higher as compare to conventional RT (68% Vs 28%).
- Mostly on day 1(Median time to pain flare was 5 days).
- Responds readily to steroids
- Higher KPS and cervical or lumbar spine locations were associated with higher incidence of pain flare.

# Toxicity -Radiation myelopathy

- Diagnosis of exclusion, based on neurologic signs and symptoms.
- Demyelination and necrosis of the spinal cord, typically confined to white matter, are the main histologic features
- Characteristic MRI changes in the cord include areas of low signals on T1-weighted images, high signals on T2, and focal contrast enhancement.



# Spinal Cord Radiation Injury

Туре	Timing after XRT	Clinical Findings	Pathogenesis	Outcome
Acute	During XRT	None		
Early-Delayed	2-37 Weeks	Lhermitte's	Demyelination	Recovery
Late Delayed	Months-Years			
Transverse myelopathy		Para/Quadriple gia Brown-Sequard Spastic paraparesis	Necrosis	Irreversible
Motor Neuron Dysfunction		Leg Weakness	Ventral roots	Irreversible
Hemorrhagic myelopathy	8-30 years	Acute paraparesis	Telangectasia	Reversible

From: Posner J, Neurologic Complications of Cancer, p 525

# Toxicity - Vertebral compression fracture

- VCF is defined as a collapse of the vertebral body (VB).
- Incidence is 14% to 39%.
- The median and mean time to VCF was 2.46 and
   6.33 months with two-thirds of VCFs developing within the first 4 months post-SBRT.
- The pathophysiology complex (M/c-

### Osteoradionecrosis)



Predictive factor

- Dose > 20 Gy/1fr
- Osteolytic tumor
- Preexisting fracture 36.1% Vs 8.3%
- Spinal Malalingment
- ≻Tumor Histology ? Lung/liver/renal.
- ➢paraspinal tumor extension, and single versus multiple





# Response Assessment: SPINO

#### Committee of RANO working group

- BP Pain assessment tools • Post RT 1 or 3 months --??? Attrition rates are around 20% per month. Timing. Confounding effects of additional treatments after SBRT. Challenges of collecting data due to questionnaire fatigue or shift ICPRE41\* Complete response Score of 0 at the treated site in in priorities. patients with baseline pain, and no increase in analgesic requirements (converted to OMED) or a discover line and line, the life is not the other Pain reduction of ≥2 at the treated Meaningful pain response. Partial response • site without increase in OMED, or the state of the state of the state of the analgesic reduction of ≥25% from baseline without pain increase LINICAL INVESTIGATIO Pain progression Pain score increase of ≥2 above UPDATE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONSENSUS ON PALLIATIVE RADIOTHERAPY baseline with stable OMED, or ENDPOINTS FOR FUTURE CLINICAL TRIALS IN BONE METASTASES analgesic increase of ≥25% in OMED Envotes Clere, M.B.B.S., \* Pertu Houses, M.D., \* Genera Metara, Pr.D.J.C., \* Looni Zono, B.Sc.J.C., \* with a stable pain score or 1 point Smean Linz, M.D., 1 Dona, Roos, M.D., 1 Cors, Hurs, M.D., 7 Yrenn on our Linnes, M.D., 1 above baseline WILLIAS HAPPELL, M.D., FAIR ENVIRENCES, M.B.B.S. \*\* ON REMAR OF THE DIVERSIONAL BONE Menagrasian Consumption Womanic Pagers • Multiple spinal lesions. Any response other than complete ndeterminate response or partial response and pain progression
- Adjustments in opioid and other analgesics.

# Response Assessment: SPINO

• Committee of RANO working group

Imaging-based local tumour response

• MRI preferred



- Images should be interpreted by a radiation oncologist and radiologist.
- Time of assessment: Spine MRI every 2–3 months after SBRT for the first 12– 18 months, and every 3–6 months thereafter.

# Response assessment: SPINO

Local control be defined as the absence of progression within the treated area on serial imaging (two or three consecutive MRI scans 6–8 weeks apart)\*





### Local progression may be defined as\*

- Gross unequivocal increase in tumour volume or linear dimension
- Any new or progressive tumour within the epidural space
- Neurological deterioration attributable to pre-existing epidural disease with equivocal increased epidural disease dimensions on MRI

### Thibault I et al. Lancet Oncol 2015;16:e595-603

# Response assessment: SPINO

Local control be defined as the absence of progression within the treated area on serial imaging (two or three consecutive MRI scans 6–8 weeks apart)\*



**CAUTION**: T1 and T2 signal changes, rather than being representative of true tumor progression, might be due to osteoradionecrosis, fibrosis or both, as well as non tumor-related vertebral compression fracture or secondary to radiation effects when seen in the paraspinal muscles.



epidural disease with equivocal increased epidural disease dimensions on MRI

# Pattern of failure

- The steep dose fall off necessary in proximity of the spinal cord may result in treatment failures.
- Two primary patterns of failure :
  - (1) Recurrence in the bone adjacent to the site of previous treatment
  - (2) Recurrence in the epidural space adjacent to the spinal cord.
- Epidural space failures are the commonest, which is attributed to an underdosing of this region to maintain spinal cord constraints.
- Emphasizes the necessity of combined surgical and radiosurgical treatment.

- 64 year old male diagnosed case of carcinoma Prostate Post op , Post RT 2013
- Presented with occasional pain in back
- Rising PSA
- PSMA PETCT WB(J,2023)-D12 vertebrae PSMA avid lesion. No other side of metabolic

### uptake.

1. Location, Junctional-D12- 32. Pain occasional lesion- 13. Bone lesion, Blastic- 04. Radiographic spinal alignment Normal- 05. No vertebral collapse- 06. Unilateral Posterolateral involvement- 1

Total SINS score- 5 Stable spine

Blisky Gr:- 1

ASIA - 0

RPA 1



### D12 pedicle lesion on PSMA PET







### Plan

	Dose Statistics Table	Dose Statistics Table Dx Vx Values		Plan Information Dose Po		
0	Name	Dose (Gy)	Dose (%)	Volume (cm³)	Volume (%)	
and - O	GTV	24.00	77.0	1.26	100.0	
	CTV	24.00	77.0	30.86	96.0	
01	PTV	24.00	77.0	36.78	91.1	
	Spinal cord	16.67	53.5	0.00	0.0	
4 m 0	Cord PRV	12.50	40.1	1.20	9.8	
	Bowei bag	11.45	36.7	0.00	0.0	
200	Stomach	10.29	33.0	0.00	0.0	
	Kidney Lt	8.60	27.6	16.27	10.0	
	Kidney Rt	6.80	21.8	14.73	10.0	
	Spleen	9.35	30.0	0.00	0.0	

ISODOSE – 80% Conformity Index – 1.18

GTV

CTV

PTV

## To conclude...

- SBRT : When ? Limited spinal disease, upfront or after decompressive surgery
- SBRT : When Not ? Unstable spine, compression
- SBRT : Why ? More effective palliation, tumour control
- SBRT : Why not ? Complications

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Thankyou!!

![](_page_51_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_3.jpeg)

Pre SBRT

Post SBRT 3 months

Post SBRT 1 year Post SBRT 18 months