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**Figure 6-1.** Predefined segments of a typical patient used for conformal (3DCRT) breast and simplified intensity modulated (sIMRT) breast techniques.  

**Figure 6-2.** Schematic flow-chart for beam orientation optimization program. The two main parts are: dose calculation and segment weight optimization.  

**Figure 6-3.** Typical objective cost function surface and contour plots corresponding to plans 3CDRT (A and B) and sIMRT (C and D). The ordinate axis is the optimized objective cost value while the abscissas represent the gantry angles for the corresponding beams. The ‘x’s mark the global minimum at ($300^\circ, 130^\circ$) and ($130^\circ, 300^\circ$) for uniform beams and ($305^\circ, 105^\circ$) and ($105^\circ, 305^\circ$) for non-uniform beams. Beam transposition does not affect the cost so two global minima exist. Figure 6-3D
shows the bimodal solutions near (305°, 105°) and (300°, 155°) with a local maximum at (300°, 130°).

**Figure 6-4.** Typical axial dose distributions comparing 3CDRT (A) and sIMRT (B) plans. Notice the redistribution of dose within the breast, shifting dose away from the heart and the medial aspect of the breast.

**Figure 6-5.** Renormalized (A) and un-normalized (B) dose-volume histograms (DVHs) comparing optimized segment weights for a typical patient. The lines represent the optimal 3DCRT and sIMRT beam orientations using maximum breast dose thresholds of 55 Gy (sIMRT55) and 60 Gy (i.e. sIMRT60). The volumes of interest are the breast and the heart. The 3DCRT DVH has excellent target coverage but limited cardiac sparing. The sIMRT60 DVH has excellent target coverage with dramatic heart sparing but increased target dose heterogeneity. The sIMRT55 DVH has similar heart sparing, improved target dose homogeneity but slightly inferior target coverage (as measured by the volume enclosed by the 95% isosurface) compared to sIMRT60.

**Figure 7-1.** A typical full fluence intensity profile seen from a tangential beam’s-eye-view used in the full IMRT plans. Note the outlined region of low intensity overlying the heart that corresponds to the heart outline depicted in Figure 7-2.

**Figure 7-2.** Representative diagram showing a tangential beam’s-eye-view with predefined segments (A, B and C) used in the simplified IMRT plans. The dotted lines represent the outlines for the planning target volume (PTV), the heart (HRT) and the left lung (LNG). The solid line around the PTV represents segment A, defined as the PTV with a 6 mm margin. Segment B is defined as segment A minus the heart outline shown vertically hatched. Segment C is defined as segment B minus the left lung outline shown horizontally hatched. For clarity, margins are not drawn to scale.

**Figure 7-3.** A schematic diagram demonstrating the geometry of beam orientation, planning target volume (PTV) and organ at risk (OR). Parallel beams, used clinically, cannot adequately spare the OR and cover the PTV. Regions of relative underdosage are indicated by the solid arrows. More optimal beams with a hinge angle of 210° better spare the OR and cover the PTV but at the cost of increased target dose inhomogeneity. Regions of relative overdosage are indicated by the dotted arrow.

**Figure 7-4.** The axial view with a dose wash for a patient for all the plans: 3D conformal with clinical beam orientations (CN-C), full intensity modulation with clinical beam orientations (FI-C), simplified intensity modulation with clinical beam orientations (SI-C), full intensity modulation with optimal beam orientations (FI-O) and simplified intensity modulation with optimal beam orientations (SI-O). The dose washes are normalized to the maximum dose and the curves outlined correspond to the 25, 47.5, 50 and 55 Gy isodose lines. The uniform beams of the CN-C plan do not allow modulation of dose to the heart while the non-uniform beams of the FI-C and SI-C plans do. The optimal beam orientations clearly allow better conformity of dose to the target.

**Figure 7-5.** Typical dose-volume histograms corresponding to the plans in Figure 7-4 for the planning target volume (PTV) and the heart (HRT). The dark lines represent the PTV and the light lines represent the HRT. There is significant sparing of the heart when going from uniform (e.g. CN-C plans) to non-uniform (e.g. all other plans)
beams. The encircled portion is magnified and corresponds to the region of underdosage where the PTV and HRT overlap. Note the greater dose inhomogeneity present with the SI plans: SI-C and SI-O. There is less target underdosage going from clinical to optimal beam orientations and better cardiac sparing with the IMRT plans (compared to the CN-C plans). The maximum dose to the heart corresponds to the beam orientation with the -C plans being slightly higher than the -O plans.

**Figure 7-6.** Magnified views of the dose-volume histograms shown in Figure 7-5. Comparing CN-C to FI-C to SI-C, target coverage becomes worse (but with significant heart sparing). Comparing SI-O to CN-C to FI-O, target coverage and heart sparing improves but with greater target dose inhomogeneity. There is less target underdosage going from clinical to optimal beam orientations and better cardiac sparing with the IMRT plans (compared to the CN-C plans).