



Evaluation of TL response and intrinsic efficiency of TL dosimeters irradiated using different phantoms in clinical electron beam dosimetry



A. Bravim^a, R.K. Sakuraba^{a,b}, J.C. Cruz^b, L.L. Campos^{a,*}

^a Instituto de Pesquisas Energéticas e Nucleares (IPEN-CNEN), Avenida Professor Lineu Prestes, Leticia Lucente Campos Rodrigues, 2242 São Paulo, SP, Brazil

^b Sociedade Beneficente Israelita Brasileira Hospital Albert Einstein (HIAE), Avenida Albert Einstein, 627/701 São Paulo, Brazil

HIGHLIGHTS

- TL dose response curves of the dosimeters for clinical electron beams.
- Evaluation of dosimeters for different phantoms.
- Sensitivity and intrinsic TL efficiency of the dosimeters for clinical electron beams.
- Effect of phantom materials in clinical electron beam dosimetry.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Available online 16 April 2014

Keywords:

Thermoluminescent dosimetry
Electron beams
Lithium fluoride
Calcium Sulphate
Phantoms

ABSTRACT

The TL response of LiF:Mg,Ti microdosimeters and CaSO₄:Dy dosimeters were studied for 12 MeV electron beams using PMMA, liquid water and solid water (SW) phantoms. The different phantom materials affect the electron spectrum incident on the detector and it can alter the response of dosimeters to different radiation types, so this fact should be considered in clinical dosimetry. The dosimeters were irradiated with doses ranging from 0.1 up to 5 Gy using a Varian Clinac 2100C linear accelerator of Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein – HIAE using a 10 × 10 cm² field size and 100 cm source-phantom surface distance, with the dosimeters positioned at the depth of maximum dose. The TL readings were carried out 24 h after irradiation using a Harshaw 3500 TL reader. This paper aims to compare the TL response relative to ⁶⁰Co of the dosimeters for different phantoms used in radiotherapy dosimetry. CaSO₄:Dy dosimeters presented higher TL sensitivity relative to ⁶⁰Co and intrinsic efficiency than microLiF:Mg,Ti dosimeters for all phantoms.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In radiotherapy treatments it is necessary to verify that the patient is receiving the correct dose prescribed. For radiation dosimetry in oncology, a quality assurance program is a set of policies and procedures to preserve the quality of patient maintenance (Khan, 2010). The main objective of radiotherapy dosimetry is to determine with great accuracy the dose absorbed to the tumor. The main objectives of clinical dosimetry are to promote the radiation protection of individuals (patients and staff) and establish a radiation beam quality control (Oberhofer and Scharmman, 1979).

The high energy electron beams have broad applications in medicine, especially in the treatment of various cancers. Several organizations recommended the verification of patient dose for quality improvement in radiotherapy and the International Committee of Radiation Units and Measurements (ICRU) established, in 1976 that “all procedures involved in planning and execution of radiotherapy may contribute to a significant uncertainty in the dose administered to the patient”. The recommended maximum value for the uncertainty in the dose is ±5%. Considering the uncertainties in treatment planning, patient setup, and equipment calibration, this is certainly a very rigorous requirement (ICRU, 1976; Khan, 2010).

Thermoluminescent dosimeters have a long history of ionizing radiation dosimetry in radiotherapy and, in this area, most measurements have been completed with lithium fluoride doped with

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +55 11 3133 9659; fax: +55 11 3133 9671.
E-mail address: lcrodri@ipen.br (L.L. Campos).

magnesium and titanium (LiF:Mg,Ti). However, another thermoluminescent material, calcium sulfate doped with dysprosium ($\text{CaSO}_4\text{:Dy}$), has been studied for application in the same area (Robar et al., 1996; Nunes and Campos, 2008; Bravim et al., 2011; Matsushima et al., 2012).

Up to now studies showed that the correction factors in electron beams of LiF TLDs depend on some factors including the electron energy spectrum incident on the dosimeter surface, the average electron energy incident on the phantom surface, the size and density of the TLD material, the phantom material and the depth of irradiation of the TLDs. Mobit et al. (1996) determined experimentally and theoretically (using Monte Carlo simulations) the energy correction factors of TLD-100 in megavoltage electron beams. For mono-energetic and broad spectrum didn't present significant difference in the energy correction factor comparing with Monte Carlo simulation and principally to low-energy electron beams using 5 mm thick TLD irradiated at a depth different of d_{max} the energy correction factor will increase (Mobit et al., 1996).

In routine dosimetry solid phantoms are normally used but in the majority protocols water is the reference material. There are some epoxy-resin materials manufactured commercially – Solid Water™, Virtual Water™, Plastic Water™ and WTe – McEwen and Niven characterized Virtual Water™ in megavoltage photon and electron beams and determined the fluence correction factor. This material can be considered water equivalent and presented a level of uncertainty that enables it to perform dosimetry in solid phantoms (McEwen and Niven, 2006). The different phantom materials used in radiotherapy dosimetry affect the electron spectrum incident on the detector and it can alter the response of dosimeters to different radiation types, so this fact should be considered in clinical dosimetry.

This paper aims to compare the TL response of LiF:Mg,Ti microdosimeters (TLD-100 from Harshaw) and $\text{CaSO}_4\text{:Dy}$ dosimeters (produced and marketed by Laboratory of Dosimetric Materials of the Instituto de Pesquisas Energéticas e Nucleares – IPEN/CNEN) for 12 MeV clinical electron beams for different phantoms used in radiotherapy dosimetry.

2. Materials and methods

Before irradiation, 15 dosimeters of each type were heat-treated: LiF:Mg,Ti-microdosimeters – 400 °C/1 h (McKeever et al., 1995) using a furnace Vulcan model 3-550 PD plus 100 °C/2 h using a furnace FANEN model 315; $\text{CaSO}_4\text{:Dy}$ – 300 °C/3 h (Campos and Lima, 1986) using a furnace Vulcan model 3-550 PD. The dosimeters were irradiated with absorbed dose in water of 1735 mGy using a ^{60}Co gamma radiation source of the Laboratory of Dosimetric Materials (LMD/IPEN-CNEN/SP) (656.4 MBq) in electronic equilibrium conditions (3 mm PMMA thickness plates) and separated into groups according to their sensitivity. The TL readings were performed using a TL reader Harshaw model QS 3500.

To obtain a dose response curve to ^{60}Co gamma radiation the dosimeters were irradiated in PMMA phantom with absorbed dose ranging from 5×10^{-4} to 10 Gy in the Laboratory of Instrument Calibration (LCI/IPEN-CNEN/SP) in electronic equilibrium conditions. To obtain a dose response curve to clinical electron beam (12 MeV) the groups of dosimeters were positioned in the different phantoms at the depth of maximum dose, 2.4 cm, and irradiated with nominal standard absorbed doses in water ranging from 0.1 up to 5 Gy using a Varian model Clinac 2100C linear accelerator of the Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein (HIAE) (Fig. 1). The depth of maximum dose used was the same for all phantoms considering that the variation of 1 mm in the depth maximum dose as function of the phantom material results in a difference in the absorbed dose smaller than 0.5% (Varian Medical System, 2011).



Fig. 1. Varian model Clinac 2100C linear accelerator of the Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein.

To ensure adequate electron backscatter, 5 cm of water equivalent material was used under the dosimeters. The PMMA and solid water phantoms consisted of $30 \times 30 \text{ cm}^2$ plates and the liquid water phantom was a PMMA cubic box with dimensions $40.0 \times 40.0 \times 40.0 \text{ cm}^3$ filled with distilled water. Fig. 2 shows the PMMA phantom and TLD electron beam irradiation setup. The radiation field size applied was $10 \times 10 \text{ cm}^2$ with a source-detector distance of 100 cm.

The TLDs were read out 24 h after the irradiation and each presented value is the average of five TL readings of $\text{CaSO}_4\text{:Dy}$ and microLiF:Mg,Ti dosimeters of the same group and the error bars are the standard deviation of the mean (1σ) and the TL responses relative for each phantom was obtained. The TL sensitivity is given by Eq. (1) and the relative response to ^{60}Co per unit dose obtained by Eq. (2). The repeatability (R), lower detection limit (LDL) and intrinsic efficiency (IE) were calculated with the Eq. (3)–(5) respectively:

$$\bar{S} = \frac{\bar{M}}{D} \quad (1)$$

$$\bar{S}_{12 \text{ MeV}/60\text{Co}} = \frac{\bar{S}_{12 \text{ MeV}}}{\bar{S}_{60\text{Co}}} \quad (2)$$



Fig. 2. PMMA phantom and TLDs electron beam irradiation setup.

Table 1TL sensitivity and repeatability of microLiF:Mg,Ti and CaSO₄:Dy for liquid water, solid water and PMMA phantoms.

	CaSO ₄ :Dy				μLiF:Mg,Ti			
	S _{12 MeV}		S _{60Co}		S _{12 MeV}		S _{60Co}	
	S _{12 MeV}	S _{60Co}	S _{12 MeV/60Co}	R ^a (%)	S _{12 MeV}	S _{60Co}	S _{12 MeV/60Co}	R ^a (%)
LW ^b	16.14 ± 0.25	18.35 ± 0.084	0.88 ± 0.01	±1.6	0.0615 ± 0.0003	0.0835 ± 0.004	0.74 ± 0.030	±1.5
SW ^c	15.45 ± 0.39		0.84 ± 0.02	±2.5	0.0558 ± 0.0003		0.67 ± 0.030	±0.67
PMMA	17.48 ± 0.53		0.95 ± 0.03	±3.1	0.0574 ± 0.0008		0.69 ± 0.040	±0.54

^a Repeatability.^b Liquid water.^c Solid water.

$$R(\%) = \frac{\sigma}{\bar{M}} \cdot 100 \quad (3)$$

$$LDL = \left(\overline{M(0)} + 3 \cdot \sigma \right) \cdot f_{cal} \quad (4)$$

$$IE = \frac{\bar{M}}{D \cdot m} \quad (5)$$

where: \bar{S} is the average TL sensitivity to 12 MeV electrons or ⁶⁰Co, \bar{M} is the average TL response (μC) of the dosimeters of each group to the absorbed dose D (Gy), $\bar{S}_{12 \text{ MeV}/60\text{Co}}$ is the average 12 MeV electrons TL sensitivity relative to ⁶⁰Co, $\bar{S}_{12 \text{ MeV}}$ is the average TL sensitivity of 12 MeV electrons and $\bar{S}_{60\text{Co}}$ is the average TL sensitivity of ⁶⁰Co, σ is the regular standard deviation, $\overline{M(0)}$ is the average response (μC) of non-irradiated dosimeters, f_{cal} is the calibration factor of dosimeters (Gy μC⁻¹) and m is the mass (mg) of the dosimeter.

3. Results

Table 1 presents the average 12 MeV electrons TL sensitivity (Eq. (1)), TL sensitivity relative to ⁶⁰Co response per unit dose (Eq. (2)) and the repeatability (Eq. (3)) of the CaSO₄:Dy and microLiF:Mg,Ti

dosimeters for liquid water, solid water and PMMA phantoms. CaSO₄:Dy presents average 12 MeV electrons TL sensitivity to ⁶⁰Co of 0.89 ± 0.56 (6.25%), ranging from 0.84 to solid water phantom and 0.95 to PMMA phantom; the microLiF:Mg,Ti presents average relative TL response of 0.70 ± 0.036 (5.15%), ranging from 0.67 to solid water phantom and 0.74 to liquid water phantom. For both materials the TL response was affected by the phantom material and in both cases the deviation is higher than ±5%.

The repeatability of 5 TL readings for different phantoms is ≤±3.1% for CaSO₄:Dy and ≤±1.5% for microLiF:Mg,Ti.

The average intrinsic efficiency to 12 MeV electrons calculated (Eq. (5)) to microLiF:Mg,Ti was 0.058 ± 0.003 μC Gy⁻¹ mg⁻¹ (±5.17%), ranging from 0.056 to solid water and 0.062 to liquid water. To CaSO₄:Dy dosimeters the average intrinsic efficiency was 0.98 ± 0.06 μC Gy⁻¹ mg⁻¹ (±6.12%), ranging from 0.93 to solid water to 1.05 to PMMA.

The lower detection limits were (3.32 ± 0.08) × 10⁻⁵ Gy for CaSO₄:Dy and (8.17 ± 0.09) × 10⁻⁴ Gy for microLiF:Mg,Ti for all phantoms studied.

Fig. 3 shows the dose–response curves of microLiF:Mg,Ti and CaSO₄:Dy to liquid water, solid water and PMMA phantoms. From LDL up to 5 Gy the dose–response curves presented a linear behavior for the three phantoms studied.

4. Discussions and conclusion

For the three phantoms studied, the dose–response curves to 12 MeV electrons presented a linear behavior for doses from LDL up to 5 Gy. All repeatability values are better than ±3.5%. CaSO₄:Dy dosimeters showed maximum variation of TL sensitivity relative to ⁶⁰Co of 11.6% between solid water and PMMA phantoms and microLiF:Mg,Ti dosimeters showed maximum variation of TL sensitivity relative to ⁶⁰Co of 9.5% to liquid water and solid water phantoms. According to the results obtained, the phantom material affected the electron spectrum incident on the detector and altered the response of the dosimeters to 12 MeV clinical electron beam using microLiF:Mg,Ti and CaSO₄:Dy as thermoluminescent detectors.

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to grant #2010/16437-0, São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), CNPq, CAPES and INCT – Metrology of Radiation in Medicine for the financial support and to the radiation therapy staff of the Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein for the electrons irradiations.

References

Bravim, A., Sakuraba, R.K., Cruz, J.C., Campos, L.L., 2011. Study of LiF:Mg,Ti and CaSO₄:Dy dosimeters TL response to electron beams of 6MeV applied to




Figure 3. Dose–response curves of microLiF:Mg,Ti and CaSO₄:Dy for liquid water, solid water and PMMA phantoms.

- radiotherapy using PMMA and solid water phantoms. *Radiat. Meas.* 46 (12), 1979–1981.
- Campos, L.L., Lima, M.F., 1986. Dosimetric properties of $\text{CaSO}_4\text{:Dy}$ + teflon pellets produced at IPEN. *Radiol. Prot. Dosimetry* 14 (4), 333.
- International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements – ICRU, 1976. Report 24: Determination of Absorbed Dose in a Patient Irradiated by Beams of X or Gamma Rays in Radiotherapy Procedures. Bethesda, Maryland.
- Khan, F.M., 2010. *The Physics of Radiation Therapy*, 4thed. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Matsushima, L.C., Veneziani, G.R., Sakuraba, R.K., Cruz, J.C., 2012. Dosimetric study of thermoluminescent detectors in clinical photon beams using liquid water and PMMA phantoms. *App. Radiat. Isot.* 70 (7), 1363–1366.
- McEwen, M.R., Niven, D., 2006. Characterization of the phantom material Virtual Water™ in high-energy photon and electron beams. *Med. Phys.* 33, 876.
- McKeever, S.W.S., Moscovitch, M., Townsend, P.D., 1995. *Thermoluminescence Dosimetry Materials: Properties and Uses*. Nuclear Technology Publishing, Ashford, Kent.
- Mobit, P.N., Nahum, A.E., Mayles, P., 1996. The energy correction factor of LiF thermoluminescent dosimeters in megavoltage electron beams: Monte Carlo simulations and experiments. *Phys. Med. Biol.* 41, 979–993.
- Nunes, M.G., Campos, L.L., 2008. Study of $\text{CaSO}_4\text{:Dy}$ and LiF:Mg,Ti detectors TL response to electron radiation using a SW Solid Water phantom. *Radiat. Meas.* 49, 459–462.
- Oberhofer, M., Scharmann, A., 1979. *Applied Thermoluminescence Dosimetry*. Ispra, Itália.
- Robar, V., Zankowski, C., Olivares, M.P., Podgorsak, E.B., 1996. Thermoluminescence dosimetry in electron beams: Energy dependence. *Med. Phys.* 23 (5), 667–673.
- Varian Medical System, 2011. *Varian Eclipse 11.0 – Treatment Planning for External Beam*. ISO 13485.