

The American College of Radiology, with more than 30,000 members, is the principal organization of radiologists, radiation oncologists, and clinical medical physicists in the United States. The College is a nonprofit professional society whose primary purposes are to advance the science of radiology, improve radiologic services to the patient, study the socioeconomic aspects of the practice of radiology, and encourage continuing education for radiologists, radiation oncologists, medical physicists, and persons practicing in allied professional fields.

The American College of Radiology will periodically define new practice guidelines and technical standards for radiologic practice to help advance the science of radiology and to improve the quality of service to patients throughout the United States. Existing practice guidelines and technical standards will be reviewed for revision or renewal, as appropriate, on their fifth anniversary or sooner, if indicated.

Each practice guideline and technical standard, representing a policy statement by the College, has undergone a thorough consensus process in which it has been subjected to extensive review, requiring the approval of the Commission on Quality and Safety as well as the ACR Board of Chancellors, the ACR Council Steering Committee, and the ACR Council. The practice guidelines and technical standards recognize that the safe and effective use of diagnostic and therapeutic radiology requires specific training, skills, and techniques, as described in each document. Reproduction or modification of the published practice guideline and technical standard by those entities not providing these services is not authorized.

2002 (Res. 17)  
Revised 2007 (Res. 17)  
Effective 10/01/07

## **PRACTICE GUIDELINE FOR INTENSITY-MODULATED RADIATION THERAPY (IMRT)**

---

### **PREAMBLE**

These guidelines are an educational tool designed to assist practitioners in providing appropriate radiologic care for patients. They are not inflexible rules or requirements of practice and are not intended, nor should they be used, to establish a legal standard of care. For these reasons and those set forth below, the American College of Radiology cautions against the use of these guidelines in litigation in which the clinical decisions of a practitioner are called into question.

The ultimate judgment regarding the propriety of any specific procedure or course of action must be made by the physician or medical physicist in light of all the circumstances presented. Thus, an approach that differs from the guidelines, standing alone, does not necessarily imply that the approach was below the standard of care. To the contrary, a conscientious practitioner may responsibly adopt a course of action different from that set forth in the guidelines when, in the reasonable judgment of the practitioner, such course of action is indicated by the condition of the patient, limitations on available resources, or advances in knowledge or technology subsequent to publication of the guidelines. However, a practitioner who employs an approach substantially different from these guidelines is advised to document in the patient record information sufficient to explain the approach taken.

The practice of medicine involves not only the science, but also the art of dealing with the prevention, diagnosis, alleviation, and treatment of disease. The variety and complexity of human conditions make it impossible to always reach the most appropriate diagnosis or to predict with certainty a particular response to treatment.

Therefore, it should be recognized that adherence to these guidelines will not assure an accurate diagnosis or a successful outcome. All that should be expected is that the practitioner will follow a reasonable course of action based on current knowledge, available resources, and the needs of the patient to deliver effective and safe medical care. The sole purpose of these guidelines is to assist practitioners in achieving this objective.

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

This guideline was revised collaboratively by the American College of Radiology (ACR) and the American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology (ASTRO).

In order to achieve optimal patient care outcomes, a major goal of radiation therapy is the delivery of the desired dose distribution of ionizing radiation to target tissue while limiting the radiation dose to the surrounding normal tissues to an acceptable level. Through the modulation of radiation dose intensities across treatment fields, intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) makes possible conformal radiation dose distributions to the target while reducing exposure of adjacent nontarget structures, beyond the capabilities of traditional two-dimensional or three-dimensional conformal treatment techniques.

The process of care for IMRT consists of multiple steps for treatment planning and delivery of radiation. Inverse planning should be used for IMRT. In this process delineation of both the target volume and surrounding tissues at risk is required to decrease the dose to volumes

of nontarget structures while achieving prescription doses to the target volume. An optimized treatment plan is developed that respects the target dose requirements as well as the dose constraints of the surrounding dose-limiting structures. IMRT treatment delivery demands careful field-by-field, day-by-day reproduction of the treatment plan within the patient. Throughout this complex process, quality assurance (QA) is necessary to achieve the preferred dose distribution with the accuracy and reproducibility that distinguishes such precision treatment.

This guideline focuses on multileaf collimator (MLC)-based IMRT techniques, with photons, such as multiple static segment (step-and-shoot) treatment, dynamic segment (sliding-window) treatment, intensity-modulated arc treatment, and binary-collimator tomotherapy; it does not address compensator based or “solid phase” beam modulation.

IMRT demands levels of precision and accuracy that surpass the requirements of conventional radiotherapy treatment planning and delivery techniques. The IMRT process requires a coordinated team effort between the radiation oncologist, the medical physicist, the medical dosimetrist, and the radiation therapist. This guideline describes a QA program for IMRT treatment planning and delivery that includes (a) systematic testing of the hardware and software used in the IMRT treatment-planning and delivery process, (b) review of each patient’s treatment plan, and (c) review of the physical implementation of the treatment plan.

This guideline supplements the [ACR Practice Guideline for Radiation Oncology](#) and the [ACR Technical Standard for the Performance of Radiation Oncology Physics for External Beam Therapy](#).

## II. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the [ACR Practice Guideline for Radiation Oncology](#) where qualifications, credentialing, professional relationships, and development are outlined.

### A. Radiation Oncologist

The responsibilities of the radiation oncologist shall be clearly defined and should include the following:

1. Participate in and approve the immobilization/repositioning system in consultation with other members of the team.
2. Define the goals and requirements of the treatment plan, including the specific dose constraints for the target(s) and nearby critical structure(s).

3. Delineate tumor and specify and approve target volumes, preferably using appropriate methodology of the International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements (ICRU).
4. Contour critical normal structures not clearly discernible on cross-section.
5. Review and approve all critical structures contoured.
6. Perform final evaluation and approve the final IMRT plan for implementation.
7. Participate in peer review of contours and IMRT treatment plans in conjunction with other members of the team.
8. Continue management of the patient throughout the course of radiation therapy, including the ongoing acquisition, review, and verification of all treatment-related imaging.

### B. Qualified Medical Physicist

The responsibilities of the Qualified Medical Physicist shall be clearly defined and should include the following:

1. Perform acceptance testing, commissioning, and implementation of the IMRT treatment-planning system and all subsequent upgrades, including the systems interface with the treatment delivery software and hardware.
2. Understand the limitations and appropriate use of the radiation therapy treatment planning (RTP) system, including the characteristics of the dose optimization software, the precision of generated patient and beam geometry, and the applicability of dose calculation algorithms to different clinical situations, including heterogeneity corrections.
3. Establish and manage a QA program for the entire IMRT system, to include the planning system, the delivery system, and the interface between these systems.
4. Act as a technical resource for the IMRT team.
5. Consult and participate with the radiation oncologist and other team members in implementing the immobilization/repositioning system for the patient.
6. Participate in review of contours and anatomic structures for the IMRT plan.
7. Review each patient’s IMRT plan for technical accuracy and precision.
8. Provide physical measurements for verification of the IMRT plan.

### C. Medical Dosimetrist

The responsibilities of the medical dosimetrist or other designated treatment planner shall be clearly defined and should include the following:

1. Contour clearly discernible critical normal structures.
2. Ensure proper orientation of volumetric patient image data on the IMRT RTP system (from CT and other fused image data sets).
3. Design and generate the IMRT treatment plan under the direction of the radiation oncologist and medical physicist as required.
4. Generate all technical documentation required to implement the IMRT treatment plan.
5. Be available for the first treatment and assist with verification for subsequent treatments as necessary.

#### D. Radiation Therapist

The responsibilities of the radiation therapist shall be clearly defined and should include the following:

1. Understand the proper use of the patient immobilization/repositioning system and fabricate and understand the proper use of devices for IMRT.
2. Under supervision of the radiation oncologist and medical physicist, perform initial (planning) simulation of the patient and generate the medical imaging data appropriate for the IMRT RTP system.
3. Under supervision of the radiation oncologist and medical physicist, perform verification (implementation) simulation and verify that the IMRT treatment plan was correctly imported for treatment.
4. Implement the IMRT treatment plan under the supervision of the radiation oncologist and the medical physicist or of the medical dosimetrist under the direction of the medical physicist.
5. Acquire periodic verification images for review by the radiation oncologist.
6. Perform periodic evaluation of the stability and ongoing reproducibility of the immobilization/repositioning system and report inconsistencies immediately to the radiation oncologist and the medical physicist.

#### E. Continuing Medical Education

Continuing medical education programs should include radiation oncologists, medical physicists, medical dosimetrists, and radiation therapists.

The continuing education of the physician and qualified medical physicist should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Guideline for Continuing Medical Education \(CME\)](#).

### III. QA FOR THE IMRT TREATMENT PLANNING SYSTEM

IMRT RTP systems are complex. The starting point of the IMRT process is a description of the desired dose distribution in terms of dose volume constraints for the delineated target tissue(s) as well as for the delineated surrounding nontarget tissues. Based on the dose constraints and on imaging data, a treatment plan is generated that shows the resulting dose distribution and the beam parameters required for its realization. If the dose distribution is not satisfactory, the initial dose constraints are modified, and a new plan is developed. This iterative process is continued until a clinically acceptable dose distribution has been found. Documentation must exist indicating that the medical physicist has authorized the RTP system for the intended clinical use and has established the QA program to monitor the IMRT system's performance as it relates to the IMRT planning process.

It is recognized that various testing methods may be used, with equal validity, to assure that a system feature or component is performing correctly. It is also noted that the commercial manufacturer may recommend specific QA tests to be performed on its planning systems. In these guidelines, the important elements of the QA program for the IMRT RTP system are identified, but the method and testing frequency are not specified.

Information with more scientific detail may be found in appropriate reports of the American Association of Physicists in Medicine (AAPM).

#### A. System Log

An ongoing system log should be maintained to record system component failures, error messages, corrective actions, and hardware and software changes.

#### B. System Data Input Devices

Input systems for image-based planning systems should be checked for functionality and accuracy. There must be correct anatomic registration: left, right, anterior, posterior, cephalad, and caudad, from all the appropriate input devices. If fused images are used, the accuracy should be verified.

#### C. System Output Devices

The functionality and accuracy of all printers, plotters, and graphical display units that produce, using digitally reconstructed radiographs (DRRs) or the like, a beam's-eye view (BEV) rendering of anatomic structures and/or treatment aids should be assured. There must also be checks to assure correct transfer of fluence information.

## D. System Software

The system's software should facilitate:

1. Assuring the continued integrity of the RTP system information files used for modeling the external radiation beams.
2. Confirming agreement of the beam modeling to current clinical data derived from physical measurements.
3. Assuring the integrity of the system to render the anatomic modeling correctly, including CT number consistency for conversion to relative electron density.
4. Assuring the consistency of dose optimization software.
5. Confirming the accuracy of the system-generated dose volume histograms (DVHs) and other tools for plan evaluation.
6. Confirming the accuracy of the calculated monitor units.

## IV. IMRT TREATMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Conforming the dose distribution to the target tissues with a high degree of precision and accuracy requires a greater complexity, not only in the planning aspects but also in the implementation process. The planning process must include inhomogeneity correction in optimization and dose calculations. The inhomogeneity correction algorithm should have been validated for accuracy for a wide range of densities and field sizes. The implementation process may be defined as an accurate registration of the patient geometry with the dose delivery geometry of the treatment unit. The relationship between those two geometries is specified by the IMRT treatment plan that delineates patient anatomy relative to the external beam parameters of the treatment unit. Implementation requires attention to detail and the combined skills of all members of the treatment team. The following are required:

### A. Correct Patient Positioning

The patient geometry must be reproducible and be in correct registration relative to the treatment unit. Immobilization devices are necessary to assure accurate, reproducible positioning of the patient relative to the treatment unit. Specific organ-immobilization or motion-gating devices may aid in reproducible treatment delivery.

### B. Correct Beam Delivery Parameters

All beam delivery parameters of the IMRT plan must be correctly transferred to the treatment unit and verified. This means using the approved treatment plan specifications: beam energies, jaw settings, treatment

aids, collimator position, gantry position and motion, treatment table settings, treatment distance, and isocenter location. In particular, MLC positioning and motion with the appropriate monitor unit settings must correspond to the approved settings of the treatment plan.

## V. IMRT DELIVERY SYSTEM QA

IMRT dose delivery uses an MLC, a binary collimator or a pencil beam with leaves or other collimating devices that project to a nominal beam width of 1 cm or less at the treatment unit isocenter. Such delivery methods include, for example, multiple static segment treatment (step-and-shoot), dynamic segment treatment (sliding window), binary-collimator tomotherapy, and intensity-modulated arc techniques. The precision and reproducibility of an IMRT treatment require the delivery system to accurately carry out the treatment as planned. A fundamental difference with IMRT dose delivery relative to conventional therapy is the mechanical accuracy of the MLC. The accuracy of the delivered dose depends on the accuracy of individual leaf position and the leaf gap width. Incorporating routine QA of the MLC into the facility's ongoing QA program is essential.

### A. MLC Leaf Position Accuracy

Leaf position accuracy affects the dose at the edges of a conventional static treatment field, but with IMRT delivery it affects the dose within the target, because the leaves modulate the dose across the target volume. A 1-2 mm leaf position tolerance may be acceptable for conventional fields, but submillimeter tolerance is preferable for accurate IMRT dose delivery. MLC test patterns should be created to verify the precise execution of the gap width defined by opposing leaves. These patterns should be executed at different collimator and gantry combinations and over the entire range of travel for all leaf pairs regularly and after each service or repair.

### B. Segmental MLC Delivery

Nonlinearity of monitor units below a certain threshold would not ordinarily impact the dose delivered from conventional static fields. However, IMRT dose delivery using the segmental MLC (sMLC) technique involves the summation of a large number of small monitor-unit segments. Nonlinearity within this region can have a significant impact on the dose delivered. An evaluation of beam stability at beam-on and within the first few monitor units is important.

### C. Dynamic MLC Delivery

Dynamic MLC (dMLC) delivery adds leaf speed and dose rate constancy to those factors already discussed that influence the accuracy of sMLC delivery. Dynamic delivery is more sensitive to the precision of leaf positioning and leaf gap width than sMLC. A leaf gap test pattern should be evaluated regularly and after each

service or repair, since the execution of a precise gap is fundamental to the accuracy of dose delivery with dMLC.

## **VI. PATIENT-SPECIFIC QUALITY ASSURANCE**

Treatment verification is linked to implementation; it may be considered the confirmatory phase of the IMRT treatment process, assuring compliance with the aforementioned sections for the individual patient. Through a process ongoing throughout treatment, verification data confirm the correctness of the administered dose using transfer of both the technical setup and the dose delivery data. The radiation oncologist must remain available to adjust, modify, and revise any and all aspects of the initial plan as the clinical situation warrants.

Verification of the patient treatment plan includes documentation of all of the elements associated with implementation as well as images of treatment ports and physical dose measurements. Each facility should develop its own policies and procedures to achieve daily correlation between the IMRT plan and dose delivery. Treatment verification elements are described below.

### **A. Treatment Unit Verification Data**

Correct verification of the IMRT plan in the actual clinical setting requires proper understanding, interpretation, transfer, and documentation of all aspects of the patient's clinical setup, positioning, and immobilization, as well as treatment unit parameters such as jaw setting, treatment aids, gantry angle, collimator angle, patient support table angle and position, treatment distance, and MLC setting. Record-and-verify systems allow for ongoing verification of the patient specific treatment parameters on the dose delivery unit and capture details of the actual treatment unit parameters in a computer record for each patient.

### **B. Image-Based Verification Data**

In addition to treatment unit data documentation, congruence between portal images and approved simulator films or DRRs is necessary for accurate treatment delivery. This method involves a comparison between the simulated images and actual images obtained with the treatment unit. Traditionally, this method employed pretreatment images recorded on film, which, when approved by the radiation oncologist, assured that the subsequent treatment delivered is properly administered to the designated clinical volumes.

Although each facility establishes its own provisions for initial and ongoing portal imaging throughout the treatment process, consideration should be given to the use of two different BEV images, such as concurrent

lateral and anteroposterior (AP) views, to delineate the correct placement of the beam's isocenter relative to patient anatomy. Such confirmation of patient positioning should be performed initially and then periodically, at least weekly, throughout the course of the patient's treatment. Verification images for each field should be acquired for each treatment field to verify the orientation of the MLC arrangement for that field.

### **C. Dose Delivery Verification by Physical Measurement**

The medical physicist should assure verification of actual radiation doses being received during treatment delivery. Prior to the start of treatment, accuracy of dose delivery should be documented by irradiating a phantom containing a calibrated dosimetry system to verify that the dose delivered is the dose planned.

## **VII. DOCUMENTATION**

Reporting should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Guideline for Communication: Radiation Oncology](#).

Documentation of delivered doses to volumes of target and nontarget tissues, in the form of dose volume histograms and representative cross-sectional isodose treatment diagrams, should be maintained in the patient's written or electronic record. As noted above, various treatment verification methodologies, including daily treatment unit parameters, images confirming proper patient positioning, and records of physical measurements confirming treatment dosimetry, should also be incorporated into the patient's record.

## **VIII. QUALITY CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT, SAFETY, AND PATIENT EDUCATION CONCERNS**

Policies and procedures related to quality, patient education, infection control, and safety should be developed and implemented in accordance with the ACR Policy on Quality Control and Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education Concerns appearing elsewhere in the ACR Practice Guidelines and Technical Standards book.

### **A. Patient and Personnel Safety**

Due to the larger number of monitor units needed to deliver IMRT treatments relative to those used in conventional treatment plans, room shielding issues must be addressed, including primary barrier and secondary barrier requirements (see AAPM Report 151). Beam leakage and secondary scatter should also be documented at the time of IMRT commissioning and periodically monitored over the equipment's lifespan.

## B. Continuing Quality Improvement

The Medical Director of Radiation Oncology is responsible for the institution and ongoing supervision of the continuing quality improvement (CQI) program as described in the [ACR Practice Guideline for Radiation Oncology](#) and the ACR Practice Guideline for the Performance of Radiation Oncology Physics for External Beam Therapy. It is the director's responsibility to identify problems, see that actions are taken, and evaluate the effectiveness of the actions.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This guideline was revised according to the process described in the ACR Practice Guidelines and Technical Standards book by the ACR Guidelines and Standards Committee of the Commission on Radiation Oncology in collaboration with the American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology (ASTRO).

Principal Reviewer: Alan C. Hartford, MD, PhD

### Collaborative Subcommittee

#### ACR

Alan C. Hartford, MD, PhD, Chair  
John S. Kent, MS  
Madeline G. Palisca, MS

#### ASTRO

David Beyer, MD  
Thomas J. Eichler, MD  
Brian Kavanagh, MD, MPH  
Chris Schultz, MD

### Guidelines and Standards Committee

Laurie E. Gaspar, MD, MBA, Chair  
E. Brian Butler, MD  
Cassandra S. Foens, MD  
Maria D. Kelly, MD, BCH  
John S. Kent, MS  
LaMar S. McGinnis, III, MD  
Janelle Park, MD  
Rachel A. Rabinovitch, MD  
Seth A. Rosenthal, MD  
Anthony H. Russell, MD  
Vipul V. Thakkar, MD  
Frank A. Vicini, MD  
Gregory M. Videtic, MD, CM  
Steven Leibel, MD, Chair, Commission

### Comments Reconciliation Committee

Venkata Rao Devineni, MD, Co-Chair  
Geoffrey S. Ibbott, PhD, Co-Chair  
Prabhakar Tripuraneni, MD, Co-Chair  
Frank A. Ascoli, MS  
Albert L. Blumberg, MD  
Indra J. Das, PhD

James A. Deye, PhD  
Cassandra S. Foens, MD  
Laurie E. Gaspar, MD, MBA  
Per Helge Halvorsen, MS  
Alan C. Hartford, MD, PhD  
John S. Kent, MS  
Paul A. Larson, MD  
Steven A. Leibel, MD  
Lawrence A. Liebscher, MD  
Madeline G. Palisca, MS  
William D. Powlis, MD  
Christopher Schultz, MD

## REFERENCES

1. Ezzell GA, Galvin JM, Low D, et al. Guidance document on delivery, treatment planning, and clinical implementation of IMRT: report of the IMRT Subcommittee of the AAPM Radiation Therapy Committee. *Med Phys* 2003;30:2089-2115.
2. Fraass B, Doppke K, Hunt M, et al. American Association of Physicists in Medicine Radiation Therapy Committee Task Group 53: quality assurance for clinical radiotherapy treatment planning. *Med Phys* 1998;25:1773-1829.
3. Galvin JM, Ezzell G, Eisbrauch A, et al. Implementing IMRT in clinical practice: a joint document of the American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology and the American Association of Physicists in Medicine. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2004;58:1616-1634.
4. Jones AO, Kleiman MT. Patient setup and verification for intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT). *Med Dosim* 2003;28:175-183.
5. Mell LK, Mehrotra AK, Mundt AJ. Intensity-modulated radiation therapy use in the U.S., 2004. *Cancer* 2005;104:1296-1303.
6. Palta JR, Mackie TR. *Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy: The State of the Art*. Medical Physics Monograph No. 29. (2003 Summer School Proceedings). Published for the American Association of Physicists in Medicine by Medical Physics Publishing.
7. *Structural Shielding Design and Evaluation For Megavoltage X-and Gamma-Ray Radiotherapy Facilities*. Bethesda, MD; National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements; NCRP Report 151; 2006.
8. Webb S. *Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy*. London, UK: Institute of Physics Publishing; 2001.
9. Williams PC. IMRT: delivery techniques and quality assurance. *Br J Radiol* 2003;76:766-776.