Journal of Namibian Studies, 21 S1 (2017) : 1-6 ISSN: 2197-5523 (online)

New Approaches And Technologies In Radiation Therapy

Mohammed Mohsen Alotaibi[1] , Sami Abdulaziz Alanazi[2] , Abdullah Mones Alamri[3] , Majeed Obaid Alrowaily[4]

[1-4]Rad Tech

Abstract:

The last ten years have seen advancements in other focal prostate- directed therapies as well as more accurate targeting and delivery of radiation. Proton beam radiation, high-dose-rate (HDR) brachytherapy, stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT), cryoablation, high-intensity focused ultrasound, and other nonradiotherapy treatments are among the therapeutic modalities that have beenstudied for the treatment of prostate cancer in an effort to minimize toxicity while enhancing cancer control. On the other hand, high-risk prostate cancer necessitates treating the prostate and any regions where the cancer may spread thoroughly. As a result, regional radiation therapy has been extensively studied in conjunction with the majority of new radiation treatment modalities, including SBRT, HDR,and proton beam radiation. The use of SBRT, HDR, and proton beamradiation is promising, though the data is still developing.

Keywords: Radiation Therapy; Techniques.

Introduction

Radiation and other nonsurgical treatments can now be precisely targeted and delivered to the prostate, thanks to advancements in the last ten years. More accurate radiotherapy techniques aim to avoid over-treating prostate-contingent normal tissue when treating prostate cancer, which is highly likely to remain localized within the prostate. Proton beam radiation, high-dose-rate (HDR) brachytherapy, cryoablation, high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU), radiofrequency ablation (RFA), and stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT) are among the therapeutic modalities that have been studied for the treatment of prostate cancer in an effort to minimize toxicity while enhancing cancer control.

But there are other clinical considerations for high-risk prostate cancer in addition to preserving normal tissue. Due to their increased resistance to current fractionated radiation doses, high-risk prostate cancer patients may be more likelyto experience a local prostate recurrence following standard radiation treatment1.As a result, they may benefit from new technologies that aim to increase

the dose locally. High-risk disease has a higher chance of extraprostatic and more distant disease, which counteracts the need for local dose escalation. The effectivenessof locally targeted therapy and extreme dose escalation may be limited due to the increased risk of extraprostatic and disseminated disease. Moreover, there may be a greater chance of treatment-related toxicity with locally intensified therapy. Consequently, it is important to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of any locally directed treatment (Zumsteg, 2015).

Moderate SBRT and Hypofractionation

It has been proposed that altered fractionation—generally, higher fractions per treatment—delivers a higher radiobiologic dose to the prostate and prostate cancer (Arcangeli, 2012).

External beam radiation therapy can be delivered by two general methods: SBRT, which typically delivers doses greater than 5 Gy per fraction, andmoderate hypofractionation, which delivers doses between 2.2 and 4 Gy per fraction. Other studies have reported on quality of life and toxicity, though we await cancer-related efficacy results. The conventional or hypofractionatedhigh–dose intensity-modulated radiotherapy in prostate cancer (CHHiP) trial recently reported on a cohort that included some high-risk patients (roughly 11%- 13% of the cohort) and reported that toxicity seems equivalent between moderate hypofractionation and conventional radiotherapy (Kang, 2011).

Monotherapy:

In 2013, King et al. published a study that may be the largest investigation into the use of SBRT for prostate cancer.The study included data from 1100 patients who had clinically localized prostate cancer. In this, 125 high-risk patients (defined asPSA > 20, Gleason score 8–10, or clinical stage T2c–T3) were treated with doses of 35–40 Gy administered over 5 treatments of 7-8 Gy. Treatment was well tolerated, and the 5-year biochemical recurrence-free survival rate of 81% compares favorably to historical rates. Because there were few patients in the high-risk group with a 5-year follow-up, the authors cautioned that care should betaken when interpreting their results (King et al., 2013).

Patients at intermediate risk were included in the HYPO-RT-PC trial, which finished accrual in 2015. The primary outcome of the trial was freedom from PSAfailure at five years after treatment.The goal of this study is to provide more insight into the relative advantages and risks of SBRT in patients at higher risk (Yoon, etal., 2014).

Full-Gland Boost Intervention:

Patients with intermediate- and high-risk diseases have also been

studied for theuse of SBRT as a means of administering a "boost" of radiation to the prostate following additional regional radiotherapy. After 45 Gy of pelvic radiation, researchers used 2 fractions of 9.5–10.5 Gy to target the prostate (Fowler, 2005). Notably, based on CTCAE v4 criteria, one patient had a late grade 3 urinary tract obstruction. Positive patient-reported outcomes include expanded prostate cancer index composite scores that return to baseline six months after treatment.

Proton Beam:

Using the physical characteristics of protons, roton beam radiation therapy (PRT) aims to target the prostate while minimizing dose to surrounding tissue and organs at risk, including the rectum, bladder, small bowel, and femoral heads. The majority of early research has been on prostate cancer that is earlyand low risk.

Since PRT is typically used in conjunction with other treatment modalities, therearen't many studies that evaluate its use alone in high-risk prostate cancer.Furthermore, through dosimetric studies, the dose distribution of PRT in high-risk prostate cancer has been examined in silico. demonstrating a general decrease in the dose of low- and medium-range radiation to organs that are vulnerable (Schimmel, et al. 2016).

Brachytherapy with HDR :

The normal tissue tolerance of the bladder and rectum places a limit on the doseat which patients can receive external beam radiation therapy (EBRT) without risk, even with the most advanced techniques. Intensity-modulated, image- guided HDR brachytherapy permits a level of dose escalation and conformity that is challenging to accomplish with EBRT. The most often used isotope in HDR brachytherapy is iridium-192, which is delivered at a dose rate of more than12 Gy/hour by definition. Treatments are either administered as an outpatient (single fraction) or necessitate a brief hospital stay (multifraction and single implant).

Most centers use transrectal ultrasound (TRUS) guidance to place fiducials andHDR catheters while conscious sedation is administered and an epidural is used. There are numerous benefits to HDR brachytherapy over low-dose-rate (LDR) brachytherapy, despite the fact that both are excellent treatment modalities. With the catheters in place, HDR brachytherapy plans are optimized and administered, providing a more accurate representation of the actual dose delivered. On the other hand, LDR brachytherapy is prone to seed misplacement and migration. Furthermore, more consistent coverage of extraprostatic diseaseis made possible by the highly conformal dose distributions that HDR brachytherapy can achieve. This is particularly crucial for patients with high-risk prostate cancer (Syndikus, et al., 2015).

Monotherapy:

Traditionally, HDR brachytherapy has been used primarily as a post-EBRT booster in patients with high-risk prostate cancer. This is due to the widespreadbelief among doctors that patients with extraprostatic diseases that may not be sufficiently treated by brachytherapy and high-risk patients may benefit from pelvic EBRT. On the other hand, some researchers contend that lesions exhibiting extraprostatic extension can be adequately covered by HDR brachytherapy in conjunction with inverse planning and plan optimization (Arcangeli, 2012).

Nonsurgical and Nonradiotherapy Alternatives:

With the goal of providing focal treatment, alternative therapies to radiation and surgery are still being researched for the treatment of high-risk diseases. The most extensively researched are cryoablation and HIFU. These two technologiesare being studied as a compromise between active surveillance and whole-gland treatment, with the goal of providing prostate ablative therapy in a minimally invasive way. Regretfully, there are still insufficient long-term data, and it is still debatable and unclear whether focal therapy is beneficial for high-risk diseases.

High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound:

The goal of HIFU therapy is to cause coagulative necrosis in the prostate by applying heat energy, and it has mostly been studied for low-risk conditions. On the other hand, there is data on high- and intermediate-risk diseases. Seventy- eight percent of the 704 patients examined in a retrospective German study had intermediate- or high-risk conditions. Interestingly, 736 of the original 1440 caseswere not included in the analysis for various reasons. Urinary incontinence was likely in this carefully chosen group, with a startling 19%–24% risk of bladder neckstenosis or scarring. Though at a rate of less than 1%, rectourethral fistula, persistent perineal pain, and other toxicities were observed. Of the patients at highrisk, 32% required salvage therapy (Chappell, et al., 2003).

Recommendations:

Treatments for prostate cancer at high risk are constantly changing. Prostate cancer is a high-risk disease that requires comprehensive treatment in addition to the important consideration of treatment-related toxicities. Disease control may be enhanced by increasing the dose administered to the prostate through HDR, SBRT, or proton radiation.

though more research is required. The majority of newly developed radiation therapies, including SBRT, HDR, and proton beam radiation, have been extensively studied in conjunction with regional radiation therapy.

The use of modern proton beam radiation, HDR, and SBRT shows promise, though the evidence is still developing. Nonradiation focal therapy is still in the experimental stage when it comes to treating high-risk patients; it has primarily been suggested for treating partial glands.

Conclusion:

In conclusion; For dose escalation, HDR brachytherapy is a safe and efficient treatment option that can be used as monotherapy or as a boost following EBRT.Plan optimization and inverse planning have improved due to recent technological advancements, producing highly conformal dose distributions that minimize dose to the urethra, bladder, and rectum while maximizing dose to the target. More clinical research should be conducted to determine whether HDR brachytherapy is better than other treatment modalities that aim to increase the dose to the prostate.

More data regarding the advantages and disadvantages of SBRT and HDR boosttherapy will be needed to determine the course of treatment for high-risk prostatecancer. It will take some time to determine the best treatment volumes, dosages, and methods before SBRT and HDR boost can be regularly used in conventional therapy. Considering the randomized data that favors earlier chemotherapy in thecase of metastases and possibly in cases of extreme risk, More research shouldbe done on the integration of new focal technologies and systemic therapy.

References:

- Z.S. Zumsteg, D.E. Spratt, P.B. Romesser, et al. Anatomical patterns of recurrence following biochemical relapse in the dose escalation era of external beam radiotherapy for prostate cancer J Urol, 194 (2015), pp. 1624-1630.

- J.F. Fowler, M.A. Ritter, R.J. Chappell, et al.What hypo fractionatedprotocols should be tested for prostate cancer? Int J Radiat Oncol BiolPhys, 56 (2003), pp. 1093-1104

- S. Arcangeli, L. Strigari, S. Gomellini, et al. Updated results and patterns of failure in a randomized hypofractionation trial for high- risk prostate cancer Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 84 (2012), pp. 1172-1178

- G. Arcangeli, J. Fowler, S. Gomellini, et al. Acute and late toxicity in a randomized trial of conventional versus hypofractionated three- dimensional conformal radiotherapy for prostate cancer Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 79 (2011), pp. 1013-1021

- A. Wilkins, H. Mossop, I. Syndikus, et al. Hypofractionated radiotherapy versus conventionally fractionated radiotherapy for patients with intermediate-risk localised prostate cancer: 2-Year patient-reported outcomes of the randomised, non-inferiority, phase 3 CHHiP trial Lancet Oncol, 16 (2015), pp. 1605-1616

- S. Aluwini, F. Pos, E. Schimmel, et al. Hypofractionated versus conventionally fractionated radiotherapy for patients with prostate cancer (HYPRO): Late toxicity results from a randomised, non- inferiority, phase 3 trial Lancet Oncol, 17 (2016), pp. 464-474

- J.F. Fowler, I. Toma-Dasu, A. DasuIs the alpha/beta ratio for prostate tumours really low and does it vary with the level of risk at diagnosis? Anticancer Res, 33 (2013), pp. 1009-1011

- J.F. Fowler The radiobiology of prostate cancer including new aspectsof fractionated radiotherapy Acta Oncol, 44 (2005), pp. 265-276.

- A. Pollack, G. Walker, E.M. Horwitz, et al.Randomized trial of hypofractionated external-beam radiotherapy for prostate cancerJ Clin Oncol, 31 (2013), pp. 3860-3868

- W.R. LeeExtreme hypofractionation for prostate cancerExpert Rev Anticancer Ther, 9 (2009), pp. 61-65

- C.R. King, D. Freeman, I. Kaplan, et al.Stereotactic body radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer: Pooled analysis from a multi-institutional consortium of prospective phase II trials Radiother Oncol, 109 (2013), pp. 217-221

- J.K. Kang, C.K. Cho, C.W. Choi, et al.Image-guided stereotactic body radiation therapy for localized prostate cancer Tumori, 97 (2011), pp. 43-48.

- Y.H. Lee, S.H. Son, S.C. Yoon, et al. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for prostate cancer: A preliminary report Asia Pac J Clin Oncol, 10 (2014), pp. e46-e53