

**LEMBAR  
HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW  
KARYA ILMIAH : JURNAL ILMIAH**

- Judul Karya Ilmiah (Artikel) : Automated procedure for slice thickness verification of computed tomography images: Variations of slice thickness, position from iso-center, and reconstruction filter
- Jumlah Penulis : 4 Orang
- Status Pengusul : ~~Penulis pertama/ Penulis ke-3/ Penulis Korespondensi~~ \*\*
- Identitas Jurnal Ilmiah : a. Nama Jurnal : Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics  
 b. Nomor ISSN : 1526-9914  
 c. Volume, Nomor, Bulan, Tahun : Vol. 22 , No. 7, Juli 2021  
 d. Penerbit : American Association of Physicists in Medicine  
 e. DOI artikel (jika ada) : <https://doi.org/10.1002/acm2.13317>  
 f. Alamat web jurnal : <https://aapm.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/acm2.13317>  
 g. Terindeks di Scimagojr/Scopus ~~atau~~ ~~di....\*\*~~
- Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah (beri  pada kategori yang tepat) :  ~~Jurnal Ilmiah Internasional~~ / Internasional Bereputasi \*\*  
 Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi  
 Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional/Nasional Terindeks di DOAJ, CABI, COPERNICUS\*\*

Hasil Penilaian *Peer Review* :

Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Reviewer		Nilai Rata-rata
	Reviewer I	Reviewer II	
a. Kelengkapan unsur isi jurnal (10%)	4	4	4
b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)	12	12	12
c. Kecukupan dan kemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi (30%)	11	11	11
d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas penerbit (30%)	12	12	12
<b>Total = (100%)</b>			39
<b>Nilai untuk Pengusul : <math>(40\% \times 39) / 3 = 5,2</math></b>			

Semarang, 26 Mei 2022

Reviewer 1

Reviewer 2



Prof. Dr. Drs. Wahyu Setia Budi, M. S.  
 NIP. 195806151985031002  
 Bidang ilmu/Unit kerja : Fisika/Fakultas Sains dan Matematika



Prof. Dr. Kusworo Adi, S.Si., M.T.  
 NIP. 197203171998021001  
 Bidang ilmu/Unit kerja : Fisika/Fakultas Sains dan Matematika

**LEMBAR  
HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW  
KARYA ILMIAH : JURNAL ILMIAH**

Judul Jurnal Ilmiah (Artikel) : Automated procedure for slice thickness verification of computed tomography images: Variations of slice thickness, position from iso-center, and reconstruction filter

Nama/ Jumlah Penulis : 4 Orang

Status Pengusul : penulis ke-3

Identitas Jurnal Ilmiah :

- a. Nama Jurnal : Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics
- b. Nomor ISSN : 1526-9914
- c. Vol, No., Bln Thn : Vol. 22 , No. 7, Juli 2021
- d. Penerbit : American Association of Physicists in Medicine
- e. DOI artikel (jika ada) : <https://doi.org/10.1002/acm2.13317>
- f. Alamat web jurnal : <https://aapm.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/acm2.13317>

Alamat Artikel : <https://aapm.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/acm2.13317>

Turnitin : 14%

g. Terindex : Scopus (Q2 SJR = 0,66 H-index = 52)

Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah :  Jurnal Ilmiah Internasional/Internasional Bereputasi  
 (beri ✓ pada kategori yang tepat)  Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi  
 Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Tidak Terakreditasi

Hasil Penilaian Peer Review :

Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Maksimal Jurnal Ilmiah			Nilai Akhir Yang Diperoleh
	Internasional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nasional Terakreditasi <input type="checkbox"/>	Nasional Tidak Terakreditasi <input type="checkbox"/>	
a. Kelengkapan unsur isi jurnal (10%)	4			4
b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)	12			12
c. Kecukupan dan kemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi (30%)	12			11
d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan/jurnal (30%)	12			12
<b>Total = (100%)</b>	<b>40</b>			<b>39</b>
<b>Nilai Pengusul =</b>				$0,9 \times 40/3 = 5,3$

Catatan Penilaian artikel oleh Reviewer :

1. Kesesuaian dan kelengkapan unsur isi jurnal:

..... Sesuai dan lengkap

2. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan:

..... Baik dan mendalam terutama ketika diskusi dan pembahasan

3. Kecukupan dan kemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi:

..... Baik

4. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan:

..... lengkap kualitas baik

Semarang, 26 Mei 2022

Reviewer 1

Prof. Dr. Drs. Wahyu Setia Budi, M. S.

NIP. 195806151985031002

Unit Kerja : Fisika

Bidang Ilmu: Fakultas Sains dan Matematika

**LEMBAR  
HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW  
KARYA ILMIAH : JURNAL ILMIAH**

Judul Jurnal Ilmiah (Artikel) : Automated procedure for slice thickness verification of computed tomography images: Variations of slice thickness, position from iso-center, and reconstruction filter

Nama/ Jumlah Penulis : 4 Orang

Status Pengusul : penulis ke-3

Identitas Jurnal Ilmiah :

- a. Nama Jurnal : Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics
- b. Nomor ISSN : 1526-9914
- c. Vol, No., Bln Thn : Vol. 22 , No. 7, Juli 2021
- d. Penerbit : American Association of Physicists in Medicine
- e. DOI artikel (jika ada) : <https://doi.org/10.1002/acm2.13317>
- f. Alamat web jurnal : <https://aapm.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/acm2.13317>
- Alamat Artikel : <https://aapm.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/acm2.13317>
- g. Terindex : Scopus

Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah (beri ✓ pada kategori yang tepat) :

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jurnal Ilmiah Internasional/Internasional Bereputasi
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Tidak Terakreditasi

Hasil Penilaian *Peer Review* :

Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Maksimal Jurnal Ilmiah			Nilai Akhir Yang Diperoleh
	Internasional <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nasional Terakreditasi <input type="checkbox"/>	Nasional Tidak Terakreditasi <input type="checkbox"/>	
a. Kelengkapan unsur isi jurnal (10%)	4			4
b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)	12			12
c. Kecukupan dan kemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi (30%)	12			11
d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan/jurnal (30%)	12			12
<b>Total = (100%)</b>	<b>40</b>			<b>39</b>
<b>Nilai Pengusul = 40% x 1/3 x 39 = 5,2</b>				

**Catatan Penilaian artikel oleh Reviewer :**

- 1. Kesesuaian dan kelengkapan unsur isi jurnal:**  
Kesesuaian isi jurnal sangat sesuai dan lengkap seperti yang terlihat pada abstrak, pendahuluan, prosedur eksperimen, hasil dan pembahasan, sampai pada kesimpulan dan daftar pustaka yang digunakan.
- 2. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan:**  
Paper ini membahas tentang prosedur untuk mengotomatisasi verifikasi ketebalan irisan pada performance phantom AAPM CT dan validasinya untuk variasi ketebalan irisan, posisi dari isocenter, dan filter rekonstruksi, yang dikembangkan menggunakan MATLAB R2015b. Hasil otomatisasi ini sebanding dengan hasil dari pendekatan manual. Prosedur otomatisasi ini akurat untuk memperoleh ketebalan irisan.
- 3. Kecukupan dan kemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi:**  
Data-data hasil yang diperoleh dalam penelitian ini sangat baik dengan didukung metodologi riset sangat yang tepat selain itu didukung dengan referensi terkini dengan jumlah referensi kurang dari 5 tahun sejumlah 13.
- 4. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan:**  
Paper ini diterbitkan dalam jurnal berkualitas Q2 dengan SJR 0,68 oleh American Association of Physicists in Medicine dengan unsur-unsur yang lengkap serta kualitas yang sangat baik.

Semarang, 6 Juni 2022

Reviewer 2

Prof. Dr. Kusworo Adi, S.Si., M.T.

NIP. 197203171998021001

Unit Kerja : Fisika

Bidang Ilmu: Fakultas Sains dan Matematika



1 of 1

[Export](#) [Download](#) [Print](#) [E-mail](#) [Save to PDF](#) [Add to List](#) [More... >](#)[Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics](#) • [Open Access](#) • Volume 22, Issue 7, Pages 313 - 321 • July 2021**Document type**Article • [Gold Open Access](#) • [Green Open Access](#)**Source type**

Journal

**ISSN**

15269914

**DOI**

10.1002/acm2.13317

[View more](#)

# Automated procedure for slice thickness verification of computed tomography images: Variations of slice thickness, position from iso-center, and reconstruction filter

[Lasiyah, Nani<sup>a</sup>](#); [Anam, Choirul<sup>a</sup>](#) ; [Hidayanto, Eko<sup>a</sup>](#); [Dougherty, Geoff<sup>b</sup>](#) [Save all to author list](#)<sup>a</sup> Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences and Mathematics, Diponegoro University, Semarang, Indonesia<sup>b</sup> Department of Applied Physics and Medical Imaging, California State University Channel Islands, Camarillo, CA, United States1 66th percentile  
Citation in Scopus0.62  
FWCI [View all metrics >](#) [View PDF](#) [Full text options](#) **Abstract**[Author keywords](#)[Indexed keywords](#)[SciVal Topics](#)[Metrics](#)[Funding details](#)**Abstract**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study is to automate the slice thickness verification on the AAPM CT performance phantom and validate it for variations of slice thickness, position from iso-center, and reconstruction filter. **Methods:** An automatic procedure for slice thickness verification on AAPM CT performance phantom was developed using MATLAB R2015b. The stair object image within the phantom was segmented, and the middle stair object was located. Its angle was determined using the Hough transformation, and the image was rotated accordingly. The profile through this object was obtained, and its full-width of half maximum (FWHM) was automatically measured. The FWHM indicated the slice thickness of the image. The automated procedure was applied with variations in

**Cited by 1 document**

Root canal length estimated by cone-beam computed tomography at different slice thicknesses, dedicated endodontic software, or measured by an electronic apex locator

Pham, V.-K. , Pham, T.-L.-K. (2022) *Scientific Reports*[View details of this citation](#)

Inform me when this document is cited in Scopus:

[Set citation alert >](#)**Related documents**

Impact of CT parameters on the physical quantities related to image quality for two MDCT scanners using the ACR accreditation phantom: A phantom study

Alikhani, B. , Jamali, L. , Raatschen, H.-J. (2017) *Radiography*

An Automated Measurement of Image Slice Thickness of Computed Tomography

Sofiyatun, S. , Anam, C. , Zahro, U.M. (2021) *Atom Indonesia*

Automated MTF measurement in CT images with a simple wire phantom

Anam, C. , Fujibuchi, T. , Haryanto, F. (2019) *Polish Journal of Medical Physics and Engineering*[View all related documents based on references](#)

Find more related documents in Scopus based on:

[Authors >](#) [Keywords >](#)

July 2021 | Volume 22, Issue 7

# JOURNAL OF APPLIED CLINICAL MEDICAL PHYSICS

The *Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics* is an official journal of the AAPM,  
the International Organization for Medical Physics (IOMP), and  
the Canadian Organization of Medical Physicists (COMP).



WILEY

## Editorial Team

### Editor-in-Chief

Michael D Mills, University of Louisville Brown Cancer Center, Radiation Oncology Suite 400, 529 South Jackson Street, Louisville, KY 40202, [United States](#)

### Deputy Editors-in-Chief

Per H Halvorsen, Lahey Health and Medical Center, Burlington, MA, United States  
Timothy D Solberg, Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD, United States

#### Associate Editors—Radiation Oncology Physics

Hossein Afsharpour, Trillium Health Partners, Mississauga, ON, [Canada](#)  
Nzhde Agazaryan, UCLA School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, United States  
Munir Ahmad, University College Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan  
Salahuddin Ahmad, University of Oklahoma HSC, OK, United States  
Nathan Anderson, Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, United States  
Bulent Aydogan, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, United States  
Daniel Bailey, Northside Hospital Cancer Institute, Atlanta, GA, United States  
Charles Bloch, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, United States  
Courtney R Buckey, Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ, United States  
Jing Cai, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong  
Ashley Cetnar, James Cancer Hospital, Columbus, OH, United States  
Quan Chen, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, United States  
Shifeng Chen, University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD, United States  
Ting Chen, New York University, New York, NY, United States  
Luca Cozzi, Ospedale San Giovanni, Porto Valtravaglia, Italy  
Ryan Foster, Atrium Health System, Concord, NC, United States  
Christopher Furweger, The European Cyberknife Center, Germany  
Song Gao, Health Science Center of PKU, Beijing, China  
AnneLise Giebel, California Protons Cancer Therapy Center, San Diego, CA, United States  
Kent Gifford, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Bingqi Guo, Cleveland Clinical Learner College of Medicine, Cleveland, OH, United States  
Samantha Hedrick, Provision Proton, Knoxville, TN, United States  
Antonio Herreros, Hospital Clinic de Barcelona, Spain  
Yanle Hu, Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ, United States  
Donglai Huo, University of Colorado, CO, United States  
Xun Jia, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, United States  
Xiance Jin, 1st Affiliated Hospital of Wenzhou, China  
Rao Khan, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, United States  
Stephen Kry, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Rajat Kudchadker, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Lalith Kumaraswamy, Novant Health, Winston-Salem, NC, United States  
Heng Li, Johns Hopkins, Washington, DC, United States  
Haibo Lin, New York Proton Center, New York, NY, United States  
Liyong Lin, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States  
Holly Lincoln, Yale New Haven Hospital, Waterford, CT, United States  
Wei Liu, Mayo Clinic Arizona, Phoenix, AZ, United States  
Wu Liu, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, United States  
Bo Lu, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States  
Wei Luo, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, United States  
Weiguo Lu, University of Texas, Dallas, TX, United States  
Harish Malhotra, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Roswell Park, NY, United States  
Weiguo Lu, University of Texas, Dallas, TX, United States  
Pietro Mancosu, Humanitas Cancer Center, Porto Valtravaglia, [Italy](#)  
Quinn Matthews, BC Cancer Agency - Centre for the North, Prince George, BC, Canada

Geoff Nelson, Huntsman Cancer Hospital at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, United States  
Jennifer O'Daniel, Duke University, Duke, NC, United States  
Cheng Peng, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, United States  
Matthew Podgorsak, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo, NY, United States  
Marija Popovic, McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Canada  
Richard Popple, The University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, United States  
Sharon Qi, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, United States  
Sarah Quirk, Tom Baker Cancer Centre, Canada  
Prema Rassiah-Szegedi, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, United States  
Susan Richardson, Swedish Medical Center-Tumor Institute, Seattle, WA, United States  
Yi Rong, University of California Davis, Sacramento, CA, United States  
Narayan Sahoo, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Chengyu Shi, New York Proton Center, New York City, NY, United States  
Eric Slessinger, Slessinger Enterprises LLC, Bayside, NY, United States  
Joel St.-Aubin, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, United States  
Fan-Chi F Su, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, United States  
Zhong Su, University of Florida University of Florida, Jacksonville, FL, United States  
Baozhou Sun, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, United States  
Martin W. Szegedi, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, United States  
Frank Verhaegen, Maastricht University, Netherlands  
Jose Eduardo Villarreal-Barajas, Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust, UK  
Brian Wang, Yale University, New Haven, CT, United States  
Iris Wang, Roswell Park Cancer Center, Roswell Park, NY, United States  
Jing Wang, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, United States  
Xiaochun Wang, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Ning Wen, Henry Ford Health System, Detroit, MI, United States  
Qiuwen Wu, Duke University, Durham, NC, United States  
Guanghua Yan, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States  
Jinzhong Yang, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Jun Yang, Alliance Oncology, Drexel University, Havertown, PA, United States  
Ruijie Yang, Peking University Third Hospital, Beijing, China  
Xiaofeng Yang, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, United States  
Lingshu Yin, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, United States  
Amy Shu-Jung Yu, Stanford University, United States  
Grace Zeng, Trillium Health Partners, University of Toronto, Mississauga, ON, Canada  
Geoffrey Zhang, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL, United States  
Miao Zhang, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, United States  
Qinghui Zhang, St. Vincent Medical Center, New York, NY, United States  
Xiaodong Zhang, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States

Yin Zhang, Rutgers Cancer Institute, New Brunswick, NJ, United States  
Yongbin Zhang, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, United States  
Bo Zhao, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, Uniondale, NY, United States  
Dandan Zheng, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, United States  
Su-Min Zhou, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, United States  
Dengsong Zhu, Saint Thomas Hospital, Murfreesboro, TN, United States

#### Associate Editors – Medical Imaging

Trevor Andrews, Washington University St Louis, St Louis, MO, United States  
Minsong Cao, UCLA School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, United States  
Idris Elbakri, CancerCare Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada  
Frank Goerner, Queen's Medical Center, Honolulu, HI, United States  
Dimitre Hristov, Stanford University Cancer Center, Stanford, CA, United States  
Donglai Huo, University of Colorado, Denver, CO, United States  
Ho-Ling Anthony Liu, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Xinming Liu, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Osama Mawlawi, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Kwan-Hoong Ng, University of Malaysia, Malaysia  
Mi-Ae Park, Harvard Medical School, United States  
John Rong, UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States  
Tzu-Chin Shih, China Medical University, Beigang Township, [Taiwan](#)  
Brian Taylor, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, United States  
Chang-Ying Yang, British Columbia Cancer Agency, Kelowna, BC, Canada  
Yingli Yang, UCLA School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, United States  
Jie Zhang, University of Kentucky College of Medicine

#### Associate Editor – Radiation Measurements

Salahuddin Ahmad, University of Oklahoma HSC, OK, United States

#### Associate Editors – Radiation Protection and Regulations

Sarah Hughes, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, United States  
James Rodgers, MedStar RadAmerica Cyberknife Program, Baltimore, MD, United States

#### Associate Editors – Management and Professional Topics

Per Halvorsen, Lahey Health and Medical Center, Burlington, MA, United States  
Douglas Pfeiffer, Boulder Community Health, Boulder, CO, United States

#### Associate Editor – Non-Ionizing Topics

Timothy C. Zhu, University of Pennsylvania, PA, United States

#### Associate Editor – Other Topics

Timothy D Solberg, Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD, United States

# Impact of prostate focused alignment on planned pelvic lymph node dose

Joshua Kilian-Meneghin | Tianjun Ma | Lalith Kumaraswamy 

Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer  
Center, Buffalo, NY, USA

Author to whom correspondence should  
be addressed. Joshua Kilian-Meneghin  
E-mail: jkilianm@buffalo.edu

## Abstract

**Purpose:** Prostate patients with positive lymph node margins receive an initial course of 45 Gy to the planning target volume (PTV) comprised of prostate, seminal vesicles, and lymph nodes with a 1-cm margin. The prostate is localized via implanted fiducial markers before each fraction is delivered using portal-imaging. However, the pelvic lymph nodes are affixed to the bony anatomy and are not mobile in concert with the prostate. The aim of this study was to determine whether a significant difference in pelvic lymph node coverage exists between planned and delivered external beam therapy treatments for these patients.

**Methods:** The recorded prostate motions were gathered for 19 patients; conjointly the pelvic lymph node motions were determined by manual registration of the bony anatomy in the kV-images. The difference between the prostate and the bony anatomy coordinates was input into Eclipse as field shifts to represent the deviation in planned vs delivered pelvic lymph node coverage.

**Results:** Structure volume at V(100) was recorded for each patient for two structures: summed pelvic lymph nodes (LN CTV) and pelvic lymph nodes +1 cm margin (LN PTV) to express their contribution to the PTV. For the LN PTV, the average difference between the planned coverage and calculated delivered coverage was 3.5%, with a paired *t*-test value of  $P = 0.005$ . Based upon bony anatomy registration, 26% of patients received less than 95% dose coverage using V(100) criteria for LN PTV. Dose value differences between the two plans at minimum were  $6.96 \pm 6.23$  Gy, at mean were  $0.54 \pm 0.40$  Gy, and at maximum were  $0.10 \pm 0.29$  Gy. For the LN CTV, the average difference between the planned coverage and calculated delivered coverage was 1%, with a paired *t*-test value of  $P = 0.53$ .

**Conclusions:** The results indicate a significant difference exists between the planned coverage and calculated delivered coverage for the LN PTV. There was no significant difference found for the LN CTV. We conclude that lymph node motion must be considered with the prostate motion when aligning patients before each fraction.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2021 The Authors. *Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics* published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc. on behalf of American Association of Physicists in Medicine

# A novel method to determine linac mechanical isocenter position and size and examples of specific QA applications

Jacek M. Chojnowski<sup>1,2</sup> | Jonathan R. Sykes<sup>2,3</sup> | David I. Thwaites<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mid North Coast Cancer Institute, Coffs Harbour Health Campus, Coffs Harbour, NSW, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Medical Physics, School of Physics, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

<sup>3</sup>Department of Radiation Oncology, Blacktown Cancer & Haematology Centre, Blacktown, NSW, Australia

Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. Jacek Chojnowski

E-mail: jacek.chojnowski@health.nsw.gov.au

## Abstract

The most important geometric characteristic of stereotactic treatment is the accuracy of positioning the target at the treatment isocenter and the accuracy of directing the radiation beam at the treatment isocenter. Commonly, the radiation isocenter is used as the reference for the treatment isocenter, but its method of localization is not strictly defined, and it depends on the linac-specific beam steering parameters. A novel method is presented for determining the linac mechanical isocenter position and size based on the localization of the collimator axis of rotation at arbitrary gantry angle. The collimator axis of rotation position is determined from the radiation beam center position corrected for the focal spot offset. The focal spot offset is determined using the image center shift method with a custom-design rigid phantom with two sets of ball-bearings. Three specific quality assurance (QA) applications and assessment methods are also presented to demonstrate the functionality of linac mechanical isocenter position and size determination in clinical practice. The first is a mechanical and radiation isocenters coincidence test suitable for quick congruence assessment of these two isocenters for a selected energy, usually required after a nonroutine linac repair and/or energy adjustment. The second is a stereotactic beam isocentricity assessment suitable for pretreatment stereotactic QA. The third is a comprehensive linac geometrical performance test suitable for routine linac QA. The uncertainties of the method for determining mechanical isocenter position and size were measured to be 0.05 mm and 0.04 mm, respectively, using four available photon energies, and were significantly smaller than those of determining the radiation isocenter position and size, which were 0.36 mm and 0.12 mm respectively. It is therefore recommended that the mechanical isocenter position and size be used as the reference linac treatment isocenter and a linac mechanical characteristic parameter respectively.

## KEY WORDS

mechanical isocenter, quality assurance, radiation isocenter, WL test

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2021 The Authors. *Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics* published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc. on behalf of American Association of Physicists in Medicine