



HAL
open science

Defining field output factors in small fields based on dose area product measurements: a feasibility study

Julien Jurczak, Benjamin Rapp, jean-marc bordy, Stéphanie Josset, Stephane Dufreneix

► **To cite this version:**

Julien Jurczak, Benjamin Rapp, jean-marc bordy, Stéphanie Josset, Stephane Dufreneix. Defining field output factors in small fields based on dose area product measurements: a feasibility study. Medical Physics, 2024, 10.1002/mp.16950 . cea-04457936

HAL Id: cea-04457936

<https://cea.hal.science/cea-04457936>

Submitted on 14 Feb 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Defining field output factors in small fields based on dose area 2 product measurements: a feasibility study

3 J. Jurczak^{1,2}, B. Rapp¹, J-M. Bordy¹, S. Josset³, S. Dufreneix^{1,3,*}

4 ¹CEA, List, Laboratoire National Henri Becquerel (LNE-LNHB), Palaiseau, France

5 ²Institut Curie, Medical Physics Department, F-75005, Paris

6 ³Institut de Cancérologie de l'Ouest, Angers/Saint-Herblain, France

7 *Corresponding author. E-mail: stephane.dufreneix@ico.unicancer.fr

8
9 **Background:** Dose area product in water (DAP_w) in small fields rely on the use of detectors
10 with a sensitive area larger than the irradiation field. This quantity has recently been used
11 to establish primary standards down to 5 mm field size with an uncertainty smaller than
12 0.7%. It has the potential to decrease the uncertainty related to field output factors but it is
13 not currently integrated into treatment planning systems.

14 **Purpose:** The aim of this study was to explore the feasibility of converting a DAP_w into a
15 point dose in small fields through the determination of a volume averaging correction
16 factor. By determining the field output factors, a comparison between the so-called “ DAP_w
17 to point dose” approach and the IAEA TRS483 methodology was performed.

18 **Method:** Diodes, diamonds and a micro ionization chamber were used to measure field
19 output factors following the IAEA TRS483 methodology on two similar linacs equipped
20 with circular cones down to 6 mm diameter. For the “ DAP_w to point dose” approach,
21 measurements were performed with a dedicated and built-in-house 3 cm diameter plane-
22 parallel ionization chamber calibrated in terms of DAP_w in the French Primary Dosimetry
23 Standards Laboratory LNE-LNHB. Beam profile measurements were performed to
24 generate volume averaging correction factors enabling the conversion of an integral DAP_w
25 measurement into a point dose and the determination of the field output factors. Both sets
26 of field output factors were then compared.

27 **Results:** By following the IAEA TRS483 methodology, field output factors agreed within
28 $\pm 3\%$ for all detectors on both linacs. Large variation were observed for the volume
29 averaging correction factors with a maximum spread between the detectors of 26% for the
30 smallest field size. Consequently, deviations up to 15% between the “IAEA TRS483” and
31 the “ DAP_w to point dose” methodologies were found for the field output factor of the
32 smallest field size. It was attributed to the difficulty of accurately determine beam profiles
33 in small fields.


34 **Conclusion:** Although primary standards associated to small uncertainties can be
35 established in terms of DAP_w in a primary laboratory, the “ DAP_w to point dose”
36 methodology requires a volume averaging correction to derive a field output factor from
37 DAP_w measurements. None of the point detector studied provided satisfactory results and
38 additional work using other detectors such as film is still required to allow the transfer of a
39 DAP primary standard to users in terms of absorbed point dose.

40
41 **Keywords:** *small field, output factor, dose area product*

42 43 44 **1. Introduction**

45 Small field measurements remain challenging due to the loss of lateral charged particle equilibrium,
46 the occlusion of the primary photon source and the size of the detector relative to the size of the radiation
47 field which generates volume averaging over the detector sensitive area and perturbation of the particle
48 fluences ^{1,2}. In a primary dosimetry standards laboratory, calorimetric measurements could be performed
49 in terms of absorbed dose at a point in water for field sizes down to 2 cm x 2 cm ^{3,4}. In radiation oncology
50 departments, small field output factors are measured with dedicated detectors following the IAEA
51 TRS483 code of practice ¹.

52 An alternative approach to point dose measurements in small fields was proposed by performing
53 integral measurements with detectors larger than the irradiation field ⁵⁻⁷. A new metric, the dose area
54 product in water (DAP_w) was introduced. It represents the energy per mass deposited by the beam over
55 the sensitive area of the detector and is expressed in Gy.cm². It can be interpreted as the integral of the
56 absorbed dose distribution over the sensitive area of the detector. As a consequence, the absorbed dose
57 D_{abs} at a point located at (x,y) distance from the axis has a contribution to the dose integral depending
58 on (x,y) distances. An example in a circular field and assuming a cylindrical geometry is given in Figure
59 1: the most important contribution to the DAP comes from the penumbra region of the beam profile and
60 profile tails have a contribution that cannot be neglected. DAP_w properties were investigated ⁸⁻¹⁰ and
61 primary standards were established in terms of DAP_w for field sizes ranging from 5 mm to 15 mm ^{11,12}
62 using a new designed large section graphite calorimeter. Dedicated and built-in-house large section
63 plane-parallel ionization chambers were then calibrated, with a relative standard uncertainty smaller
64 than 0.7 % for all calibration coefficients in small fields ¹².



65

66 *Figure 1 : Example of the variation of absorbed dose to water with off-axis distance (solid line, left axis) and its*
 67 *corresponding contribution to the dose integral (dotted line, right axis) in a 10 mm diameter field.*

68 The clinical implementation of the DAP_w based on measurements with a large section plane-parallel
 69 ionization chamber has however not yet been investigated. The most direct option to exploit DAP
 70 primary standards would be to introduce DAP_w in treatment planning systems (TPS). This would require
 71 a formalism modification in TPS at least the for output factor input data, considering an integrated
 72 measurement instead of a point dose. Another and easier solution would be to convert DAP_w
 73 measurements into point dose thanks to a volume averaging correction factor ideally generated from a
 74 2D dose mapping of the beam. A 1.2% difference was previously observed between a calibration
 75 coefficient derived from DAP_w measurements and one directly established in terms of absorbed dose to
 76 water at a point in a square 2 cm field¹³. However, no other studies investigated the link between DAP_w
 77 and point dose for smaller field sizes and the transfer of primary standards measurements to radiation
 78 oncology departments is still to be formalized.

79 The aim of this study was to explore the feasibility of using the DAP_w quantity in a radiation
 80 oncology department for small fields through a conversion into point dose. Measurements were
 81 performed in circular field sizes down to 6 mm diameter using a large section plane-parallel ionization
 82 chamber calibrated in terms of DAP_w at the French Primary Dosimetry Standards Laboratory LNE-
 83 LNHB. Several solid point detectors were used to define the field output factors following the IAEA
 84 TRS483 methodology¹. Assuming an axial symmetry, the volume averaging factors were determined
 85 based on profile measurements with the different point detectors. Field output factors derived from the
 86 large section plane-parallel ionization chamber measurements and combined with the volume averaging
 87 correction factors were compared to field output factors derived from the IAEA TRS483 methodology¹.

88

89 2. Materials and methods

90 2.1. Plane-parallel ionization chamber and formalism

91 The large section plane-parallel ionization chamber, denoted reference chamber afterwards was
 92 designed and built in-house at the French primary dosimetry standards laboratory LNE-LNHB ¹².
 93 Developed for measurements in small fields up to 15 mm, its collection area has a diameter of 30 mm
 94 enabling the integration of the energy deposited by the beam over its sensitive area.

95 For the purpose of this study, the reference ionization chamber was calibrated in terms of absorbed
 96 dose to water D_w (Gy.C⁻¹) in a 10 cm x 10 cm field in a 6 MV FFF beam at the laboratory, using water
 97 calorimetry as a primary standard, according to the expression:

$$98 \quad N_{D,w,fref} = \left[\frac{D_w}{Q_w^*} \right]_{fref} \quad (1)$$

99 Where:

- 100 - $N_{D,w,fref}$ (in Gy.C⁻¹) is the calibration coefficient in terms of absorbed dose to water at a point
- 101 - D_w is the absorbed dose to water at a point measured by water calorimetry
- 102 - Q_w^* is the collected charge measured by the reference ionization chamber and corrected from
- 103 the influence quantities (temperature, pressure, polarity, recombination and volume averaging
- 104 over its collection area)

105 This reference chamber was also calibrated in terms of dose area product in water DAP_w
 106 (Gy.cm².C⁻¹) in a 6 MV FFF beam for various circular field sizes (denoted f_{clin}) ranging from 5 to 15
 107 mm diameter, using graphite calorimetry as a primary standard, according to the expression:

$$108 \quad N_{DAP,w,fclin} = \left[\frac{DAP_w}{Q_w^*} \right]_{fclin} = \left[\frac{D_{core}}{Q_w^*} \right]_{fclin} \left[\frac{D_w}{D_{core}} \right]_{MC,fclin} S_{core} k_i \quad (2)$$

109 Where:

- 110 - $N_{DAP,w}$ (in Gy.cm².C⁻¹) is the calibration coefficient in terms of DAP_w
- 111 - DAP_w is the dose-area product in water
- 112 - D_{core} is the average absorbed dose in the core (sensitive part) of the calorimeter
- 113 - $\left[\frac{D_w}{D_{core}} \right]_{MC}$ is the graphite to water dose conversion factor calculated by Monte Carlo
- 114 - S_{core} is the core area
- 115 - k_i an impurity correction factor taking into account the effects on the absorbed dose of all the
- 116 impurities within the core that are different from graphite (mainly thermistors for temperature
- 117 measurement). This correction was considered here dosimetrically negligible because
- 118 thermistors are located at the periphery of the core and are not in the direct beam.

119 Details on the reference chamber and its calibration coefficients can be found in ¹². Since
 120 $N_{DAP,w,fclin}$ was found slightly dependent on field size, calibration coefficients in terms of DAP_w were
 121 defined for each field size studied by linearly interpolating to the corresponding measured FWHM.

122 Derived from equation (2), the absorbed dose to water at a point located on the beam axis, in a
 123 clinical field, can be expressed as:

$$124 \quad D_{w,fclin} = \frac{N_{DAP,w,fclin} Q_w^*}{S_{core} k_i} \quad (3)$$

125 A field output factor $\Omega_{Q_{clin}, Q_{ref}}^{f_{clin}, f_{ref}}$ measured by the reference chamber can then be defined as:

$$126 \quad \Omega_{Q_{clin}, Q_{ref}}^{f_{clin}, f_{ref}} = \frac{D_{w, f_{clin}}}{D_{w, f_{ref}}} = \frac{1}{S_{core} k_i} \frac{N_{DAP, w, f_{clin}} Q_{w, f_{clin}}^*}{N_{D, w, f_{ref}} Q_{w, f_{ref}}^*} \quad (4)$$

127 The numerator of the formula for f_{clin} is based on the DAP_w formalism whereas the denominator of
 128 the formula for f_{ref} is based on the usual point dose formalism. $N_{DAP, w, f_{clin}}$, $N_{D, w, f_{ref}}$, S_{core} and k_i were
 129 provided by the primary standards laboratory. $Q_{w, f_{clin}}^*$ and $Q_{w, f_{ref}}^*$ were measured with the reference
 130 chamber in two radiation oncology departments. Those last quantities are the collected charge corrected
 131 from influence quantities: temperature, pressure, polarity, recombination and volume averaging over its
 132 collection area. Details and formulas for the correction factors for the influence quantities can be found
 133 in the IAEA TRS398¹⁴ and IAEA TRS483¹. Of specific interest for this study is the volume averaging
 134 correction factor. It can be expressed as^{1,15}:

$$135 \quad k_{vol} = \frac{\iint_A dx dy}{\iint_A OAR(x, y) dx dy} \quad (5)$$

136 Where:

- 137 - x and y are the coordinates on the axes orthogonal to the beam central axis
- 138 - A is the area of the projection of the sensitive volume of the reference chamber on a plane
 139 orthogonal to the beam axis
- 140 - $OAR(x, y)$ is the off-axis ratio, which is the 2-D lateral beam profile at the measurement depth
 141 normalized to unity on the central axis

142 In a 10 cm x 10 cm reference field, the volume averaging correction factor is close to unity, even
 143 for a large sensitive area in a FFF beam: for example, $k_{vol, f_{ref}} = 1.0067$ for the 30 mm diameter sensitive
 144 area of the reference chamber in a 6 FFF beam. However, for fields f_{clin} smaller than the sensitive area
 145 of the reference chamber, it strongly increases with decreasing field size since the sensitive area is no
 146 longer homogeneously irradiated. Measurement of the off-axis ratio $OAR(x, y)$ in the radiotherapy
 147 departments for the small fields studied is then needed. Ideally, the determination of $k_{vol, f_{clin}}$ requires
 148 a complete 2D mapping of the beam over the sensitive area and radiochromic films seem to be good
 149 candidates considering their water equivalency and high spatial resolution. However, they are associated
 150 to a potential penumbra blurring that need to be taken into account². Their use also remain challenging
 151 to perform accurate dose measurements¹⁶. Point detectors can also be used by assuming the axial
 152 symmetry of the circular cones. Only a hemi-profile could be used to determine $k_{vol, f_{clin}}$ following the
 153 equation:

$$154 \quad k_{vol} \approx \frac{\int_0^{R_A} r dr}{\int_0^{R_A} OAR(r) dr} \quad (6)$$

155 Where R_A is the radius of the sensitive area of the reference chamber.

156

157 *2.2. Detectors and setup*

158 Measurements were performed on two Varian TrueBeam STx (Varian Medical Systems, Palo Alto,
 159 CA, USA) named Linac1 and Linac2 in a 6 MV FFF beam (1400 MU/min), at 10 cm depth in water and
 160 90 cm SSD. Field sizes were defined by circular cones of 15, 12.5, 10, 7.5 and 6 mm nominal diameter
 161 manufactured by Brainlab (Brainlab AG, Munich, Germany) while the jaws were set to a 20 mm x
 162 20 mm square field. Each Linac had its own set of cones.

163 Five consecutive charge measurements, each over 20 s, were performed with the reference chamber
 164 for each circular cone, in a single measurement session. A 10 cm x 10 cm reference field was measured
 165 before and after each cone measurement to correct from a potential drift of the accelerator.

166 Detectors used in this study for field output factor and $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ determination are summarized in
 167 Table 1. All solid dosimeters were positioned with their axis parallel to the beam axis. Reference
 168 chamber measurements were performed perpendicular to the beam. The IBA_Razor_Nano chamber axis
 169 was positioned parallel to the beam for the profile measurement to avoid any stem effect while it was
 170 positioned perpendicular to the beam for the field output factor determination to minimize the k_{pol} and
 171 k_{rec} corrections¹⁷. Some models (PTW_60018 and PTW_60019) were doubled to evaluate the intra-
 172 model reproducibility.

173

Table 1 : Detectors used in this study

Name	Linac1	Linac2	Type	Active material / additional components	Diameter of the sensitive area (mm)	Typical sensitivity (nC/Gy)
Reference chamber	x	x	Ionization chamber	Air cavity Electrodes: graphite Wall: cross- linked polystyrene	30	NA (depending on field size)
IBA_Razor Nano chamber	x		Ionization chamber	Air cavity Central electrode: Graphite Wall: Shonka (C-552)	2	0.11
IBA_SFD	x	x	Stereotactic field diode	Silicon Wall: ABS + Epoxy resin	0.6	6
PTW_60017	x	x	Diode E	Silicon Wall: RW3 + Epoxy resin	0.6	9
PTW_60018_1 (SN 000186)	x	x	Diode SRS	Silicon Wall: RW3 + Epoxy resin	0.6	175
PTW_60018_2 (SN 000434)	x					

PTW_60019_1 (SN 122271)	x	x		Carbon		
PTW_60019_2 (SN 123788)	x		Diamond	Wall: RW3 + Epoxy resin	2.2	1

174

175 *2.3. Field output factors*

176 Field output factors were determined for point detectors listed in Table 1. For each detector, a pre-
 177 irradiation of at least 1000 MU was performed before acquiring two profiles in the crossline and inline
 178 directions for centering with the smallest 6 mm diameter cone. A 10 cm x 10 cm reference field was
 179 measured before and after each cone measurement. Each time a cone was set up, two profiles were
 180 performed to verify (and correct if necessary) the alignment of the detector on central axis before
 181 performing the point dose measurement. On the beam axis, an average over 3 charge readings was
 182 considered.

183 The $k_{Q_{clin}, Q_{msr}}^{f_{clin}, f_{msr}}$ correction factors defined in the IAEA TRS-483 ¹ were applied for the diodes and
 184 diamond detectors. Since the IBA Razor Nanochamber was not listed in the IAEA TRS-483, no
 185 correction factor was applied. For this detector, Partanen *et al.* reported a 1.034 correction factor in a
 186 5 mm field at 6 MV FFF ¹⁸ but Lopez-Sanchez *et al.* reported a 1.005 correction factor for similar
 187 conditions ¹⁹.

188 The field output factor derived from the reference chamber measurements was compared to the
 189 average field output factor over all point detectors. Data were reported respective to the equivalent
 190 square field size defined as:

$$191 \quad S_{clin} = r\sqrt{\pi}$$

192 Where r is the circular field radius defined by the points where, on average, the dose level amounts to
 193 50% of the maximum dose at the measurement depth ¹. Profiles measured with the PTW_60018_1
 194 detector were arbitrarily taken for the determination of r but all detectors gave r values within 0.1 mm.

195

196 *2.4. Determination of $k_{vol, f_{clin}}$*


197 Profiles measured by point detectors listed in Table 1 were used, with a 0.1 mm resolution between
 198 -15mm and +15mm in the crossline and inline directions. Minimum acquisition time was 1s per step
 199 and beam profiles were normalized on the axis. For each cone, the mean $k_{vol, f_{clin}}$ over the 4 hemi-
 200 profiles was considered and the standard deviation was reported.

201 A $k_{vol, f_{clin}}$ value was thus determined for each cone and each detector (i.e. 40 k_{prof} values).
 202 Following equation (4), a field output factor was derived and compared to the average field output factor
 203 over all point detectors defined in section 2.3.

204

205 **3. Results**206 *3.1. Field output factors*

207 Deviation of individual field output factors per detector compared to the mean value over all
 208 detectors is visible in Figure 2 for the different S_{clin} studied. The correspondence between field size and
 209 S_{clin} is provided in Table 2. All measurements agree with $\pm 3\%$, even for the uncorrected values of the
 210 IBA Razor Nanochamber. A good reproducibility is observed between two detectors of the same type
 211 (PTW 60018 and PTW 60019) with a maximum deviation of 0.4%. A good reproducibility is also
 212 observed between the two linacs: except for the measurement with the IBA SFD in the smallest circular
 213 field (2.2%), the maximum deviation is 0.5%.



214

215

Figure 2 : deviation of field output factors compared to the mean value over all detectors.

216

The average field output factors taken as a reference for the comparison of the DAP_w and point
 217 dose approaches are given in Table 2. The mean relative standard deviation associated is 1.2%. A
 218 comparison with Monte Carlo field output factors calculated by Hermida-Lopez *et al.*²⁰ shows a
 219 maximum deviation of 3.2% which is similar to the deviations observed by these authors in their
 220 literature review. These authors also provided an experimental field output factor for a 7.5 mm diameter
 221 cone based on measurements with PTW_60019 SFD and EBT3 films. They found a value of 0.65 in
 222 agreement with our study (0.4% deviation).

223

Table 2 : mean field output factor and their associated standard deviation.


Field size (mm)	S_{clin} (mm)	Mean $\Omega_{Q_{clin}, Q_{ref}}^{f_{clin}, f_{ref}}$ (1 SD)	Hermida-Lopez <i>et al.</i> ²⁰ MC value	Deviation (ref: ²⁰)
15	13.0	0.760 (0.009)	0.78	-2.6%
12.5	10.9	0.736 (0.008)	0.76	-3.1%
10	8.6	0.701 (0.008)	0.72	-2.6%

7.5	6.5	0.653 (0.008)	0.67	-2.6%
6	5.2	0.608 (0.007)	0.62	-1.9%

224

225 3.2. $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values

226 An example of measured relative profile in the 6 mm circular cone is shown in Figure 3. As expected,
 227 differences are observed in the penumbra region: the IBA_Razor_Nanochamber gives the smoothest
 228 penumbra whereas the IBA_SFD gives the sharpest. An overall good reproducibility between the 2
 229 PTW_60018 is observed. The 2 PTW_60019 detectors are in agreement in the penumbra region but
 230 slightly differ in the profile tails: at 15 mm from the axis, the dose measured by the PTW_60019_2
 231 (0.5%) is approximatively twice the one measured by the PTW_60019_1 (0.2%). Fluctuations of 0.05%
 232 are observed for the IBA_Razor_Nanochamber in the profile tails probably linked to the small sensitive
 233 volume of the ionization chamber and its associated poor sensitivity (Table 1). The integration time was
 234 not increased to reduce the noise for this detector in order to keep the overall measurement session
 235 duration reasonable (approximately 2 hours for the 5 small profiles, without considering the output
 236 factor measurements).



237

238 Figure 3 : Hemi beam profiles normalized on the axis measured with various point detectors in the 6 mm circular cone on
 239 Linac1.

240 For each detector and field size, the mean $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values calculated from the relative profiles are
 241 reported in Table 3 with their associated standard deviations $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values increases when the field
 242 size decreases enlightening the importance of the contribution of profile penumbra and tail to the dose

243 integral. Standard deviations range between 0.1% and 2.7% and generally increase when the field size
 244 decreases. These values confirmed the hypothesis that an axial geometry can be assumed.

245 A large variability of the $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ is observed depending on the detector considered: for a specific
 246 linac and field size, the spread of $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values increases from 4.4% for the 15 mm circular cone to
 247 25.8% for the 6 mm circular cone. $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values for the IBA_Razor_Nanochamber are noticeably
 248 smaller than the values derived from solid detectors. Some profiles measured with the same detector on
 249 both linacs either give relatively close $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values (PTW_60017 and PTW_60018_1), or give
 250 differences up to 17% (IBA_SFD and PTW_60019_1). Profile measurements on Linac1 with the
 251 PTW_60018_1 and PTW_60018_2 give $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values in agreement within 1% whereas differences up
 252 to 13% are observed between PTW_60019_1 and PTW_60019_2.

253 *Table 3 : $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values derived from profiles or 2D dose map measurements for several detectors. Standard deviations are*
 254 *given in parenthesis.*


Detector	Linac	Cone diameter / S_{clin} (mm)				
		15 / 13.0	12.5 / 10.9	10 / 8.6	7.5 / 6.5	6 / 5.2
IBA_SFD	Linac1	3.84 (0.05)	5.43 (0.04)	8.02 (0.08)	13.1 (0.1)	18.9 (0.2)
	Linac2	3.85 (0.01)	5.20 (0.01)	8.08 (0.08)	13.1 (0.2)	18.9 (0.2)
	<i>Deviation Linac2/Linac1</i>	0.3%	-4.2%	-0.8%	-0.3%	-0.1%
PTW_60017	Linac1	3.87 (0.01)	5.48 (0.04)	8.17 (0.04)	13.4 (0.2)	19.8 (0.4)
	Linac2	3.91 (0.01)	5.33 (0.02)	8.33 (0.03)	13.6 (0.2)	20.0 (0.2)
	<i>Deviation Linac2/Linac1</i>	1.2%	-2.8%	2.0%	2.2%	1.4%
PTW_60018_1	Linac1	3.85 (0.01)	5.46 (0.02)	8.07 (0.04)	13.3 (0.1)	19.3 (0.2)
	Linac2	3.85 (0.01)	5.23 (0.04)	8.16 (0.04)	13.3 (0.2)	19.6 (0.2)
	<i>Deviation Linac2/Linac1</i>	0.0%	-4.2%	1.2%	0.2%	1.3%
PTW_60018_2	Linac1	3.83 (0.02)	5.46 (0.04)	8.07 (0.05)	13.2 (0.1)	19.2 (0.0)
<i>Deviation PTW_60018_1/ PTW_60018_2</i>		0.7%	0.1%	-0.1%	0.4%	0.8%
PTW_60019_1	Linac1	3.90 (0.06)	5.53 (0.04)	8.17 (0.10)	13.4 (0.1)	19.3 (0.1)
	Linac2	3.78 (0.02)	5.08 (0.02)	7.83 (0.06)	12.3 (0.2)	17.2 (0.3)
	<i>Deviation Linac2/Linac1</i>	-3.1%	-8.1%	-4.1%	-8.6%	-10.7%
PTW_60019_2	Linac1	3.83 (0.01)	5.40 (0.02)	7.95 (0.07)	12.9 (0.2)	18.3 (0.1)
<i>Deviation PTW_60019_1/ PTW_60019_2</i>		-0.6%	-0.9%	5.9%	9.1%	12.6%
IBA_Razor_Nanochamber	Linac1	3.74 (0.01)	5.27 (0.05)	7.49 (0.15)	11.5 (0.2)	15.2 (0.4)

255

256 3.3. Comparison of the DAP_w and point dose approaches

257 Figure 4 shows the DAP_w measured with the reference chamber on the two linacs. Errors bars are
 258 plotted considering a 0.63% uncertainty on the $N_{DAP,w,f_{clin}}$ ¹² and a repeatability of 0.05% but they are


259 smaller than the symbols. This confirms that DAP measurements associated to a small uncertainty can
 260 be performed in radiation oncology departments in small fields.



261
 262 *Figure 4 : DAP_w measured by the reference chamber on two linacs*

263 Using $k_{vol,clin}$ values, field output factors were derived from the DAP_w measurement with the
 264 reference chamber associated to profiles measurements for each detectors. The comparison against the
 265 mean field output factors defined in section 3.1. is shown in Figure 5. Large deviations (up to 14% for
 266 the smallest field size) are observed and no detector used for the determination of the $k_{vol,clin}$ value
 267 gives a field output factor in agreement with the reference within 5 % for all field sizes. For the two
 268 largest fields (15 and 12.5 mm diameter), a mean deviation of 4% is found between the “DAP to dose
 269 point” and the IAEA TRS 483 methodologies. Deviation then increases with decreasing field size with
 270 a quasi-systematic overestimation of the value derived from DAP_w measurements for solid detectors
 271 whereas a large underestimation is observed for the IBA_Razor_Nanochamber. Results for the
 272 PTW_60019 show a large variability between the 2 linacs and between PTW_60019_1 and
 273 PTW_60019_2. This is attributed to the variability of the measurements in the profile tails: for the 6 mm
 274 field size, at 15 mm from the axis, the relative dose measured by the PTW_60019_1 is 0.2% on Linac1
 275 and 0.8% on Linac2 whereas the dose measured with the PTW_60019_2 is 0.5% on Linac1. On the
 276 contrary, the profile penumbra and tail measured by the IBA_SFD and PTW_60018 are much more
 277 reproducible: 0.4% for the IBA_SFD at 15 mm from the axis on both linacs and 0.3% for the
 278 PTW_60018_1 on both linacs and PTW_60018_2. These small differences have a non-negligible impact
 279 on the volume averaging correction factor since the integration is performed on a 15 mm radius circle.

280 The surface covered by the profile penumbra and tail is thus important as their contribution to the dose
 281 integral.



282
 283 *Figure 5 : Field output factors derived from a DAP_w measurement and a $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ value for various detectors. Deviation*
 284 *against the mean field output factor defined in 3.1. is plotted.*

285
 286 **4. Discussion**
 287 This study evaluated the feasibility of deriving a field output factor in small fields from
 288 measurements with a reference chamber calibrated in terms of DAP_w . The formalism to do so requires
 289 a volume averaging correction factor to determine the dose integral over the sensitive area of the
 290 reference chamber. Results show that this correction factor is critical and that none of the detectors
 291 studied provide a satisfactory “ DAP_w to point dose” conversion based on such profile measurements. A
 292 large spread of the $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values is observed stressing that the commercial detectors studied could not
 293 be used for the “ DAP_w to point dose methodology”. The intra-model reproducibility for the PTW_60018
 294 and PTW_60019 shows contrasted results: a relative good agreement is observed for the PTW_60018
 295 (4.2 % maximal dispersion on the $k_{vol,f_{clin}}$ values for both detectors and linacs) but a maximum 12.6 %
 296 dispersion is observed for the PTW_60019. This adds a difficulty to transfer DAP_w primary standards
 297 to radiation oncology departments in terms of point dose since the conversion should not depend on the
 298 specific detector used for the profile measurement. Although robust for the establishment of primary
 299 standards in small fields, the DAP_w approach suffer difficulties to be transferred to users in terms of point
 300 dose. The variation between detectors for field output factor measurements ($\pm 3\%$) in the IAEA TRS483
 301 approach is replaced and magnified in the DAP_w approach by the variation between detectors for beam

302 profile measurements. This study highlights the difficulty to accurately determine a beam profile in
303 small fields and especially the scatter dose far from the axis where the energy dependence of the
304 detectors is of primary importance ²¹. The ideal detector for profile measurements in small fields should
305 have a small sensitive volume to avoid incorrect determination of the width of the penumbra and be the
306 least perturbing tissue equivalent ². Francescon *et al.* calculated with Monte Carlo correction factors for
307 profile measurements as a function of off-axis distance ²². Large correction factors (up to 1.3) were
308 reported after the geometric field edge depending on the detector. The PTW_60019 showed the smallest
309 correction factors but still underestimated the dose up to 5 % at 8 mm from the central axis (for a
310 geometric field edge at 4 mm). Lopez-Sanchez *et al.* also reported correction factors between 0.8 and
311 1.1 in the penumbra region of a 5 mm circular cone for two ionization chambers including the
312 IBA_Razor_NanoChamber ¹⁹. Similarly, Underwood *et al.* reported large variation of the correction
313 factor with off-axis distance for a PTW_60003 Diamond detector and a PTW_31006 PinPoint ionization
314 chamber ²³. No current commercially available point detector seems to be adequate for profile
315 measurements in small fields.

316 One default of the formalism applied to the solid detectors used in this study is that the beam profile
317 is normalized to the beam axis without considering the fact that each detector has its own and different
318 response on the beam axis for a given field size. However, as observed by Underwood *et al.* ²³, the
319 under- or over-response of a detector on the beam axis could be compensated by an over- or under-
320 response on the tails by normalizing the beam profiles to the detector's response in a 10 cm x 10 cm
321 beam. At the end, such calibrated beam profiles could lead to a unique dose area product without any
322 detector effect. Here, by normalizing the beam profile on the axis, the under- or over-response on the
323 beam axis is ignored and there cannot be a compensation between the beam axis and the tails. The over-
324 response at the tails can be even amplified or the under-response reduced, thus affecting the k_{vol}
325 calculation. However, the calibrated beam profiles described by Underwood *et al.* ²³ are not compatible
326 with the formalism proposed here : a normalized profile is needed to calculate the dose on the beam axis
327 and consequently the detector used to measure the beam profile needs to be energy-independent on the
328 beam axis and off axis. Solid detectors remain useful to check the consistency of the k_{vol} calculation.

329 Future work will include the investigation of radiochromic films and the development of an in-house
330 film optical reader compatible with metrological applications. The 2D dose mapping of the beam could
331 then be measured and the cylindrical symmetry of the circular cones would not be needed. k_{vol} could
332 then be determined using equation (5). Other tissue equivalent point detectors like plastic scintillator
333 could also be evaluated.

334

335 5. Conclusion

336 Two methodologies were compared to determine field output factor in small fields: the first
337 described in the IAEA TRS483 based on point dose measurements and the second based on dose area
338 product measurements with a large reference chamber, associated to volume averaging correction

339 derived from profiles or 2D dose map measurements. Reference field output factors based on point
 340 measurements were determined on two linacs with several detectors. A standard deviation over all
 341 detector smaller than 1.4% was achieved. Volume averaging correction factors were determined with
 342 numerous detectors and showed large variations depending on the detector with a spread up to 26% for
 343 the smallest field size. Due to this large variability depending on the detector used for the profile
 344 measurement, the DAP_w to point dose methodology can not easily be transferred to users in terms of
 345 absorbed dose at a point although it is promising to establish dosimetric standards in a primary
 346 laboratory.

347

348

349 **References:**

- 350 1. IAEA, AAPM. *Dosimetry of Small Fields Used in External Beam Radiotherapy*. International
 351 Atomic Energy Agency Technical Report Series 483; 2017.
- 352 2. Das IJ, Francescon P, Moran JM, et al. Report of AAPM Task Group 155: Megavoltage photon
 353 beam dosimetry in small fields and non-equilibrium conditions. *Med Phys*. 2021;48(10):e886-
 354 e921. doi:10.1002/mp.15030
- 355 3. Krauss A, Kapsch RP. Experimental determination of kQ factors for cylindrical ionization
 356 chambers in 10 cm × 10 cm and 3 cm × 3 cm photon beams from 4 MV to 25 MV. *Phys Med Biol*.
 357 2014;59(15):4227-4246. doi:10.1088/0031-9155/59/15/4227
- 358 4. Delaunay F, Kapsch RP, Gouriou J, et al. Comparison of absorbed-dose-to-water units for Co-60
 359 and high-energy x-rays between PTB and LNE–LNHB. *Metrologia*. 2012;49:S203-S206.
- 360 5. Djouguela A, Harder D, Kollhoff R, Rühmann A, Willborn KC, Poppe B. The dose-area product,
 361 a new parameter for the dosimetry of narrow photon beams. *Z Med Phys*. 2006;16(3):217-227.
 362 doi:10.1078/0939-3889-00317
- 363 6. Sánchez-Doblado F, Hartmann GH, Pena J, Roselló JV, Russiello G, Gonzalez-Castaño DM. A
 364 new method for output factor determination in MLC shaped narrow beams. *Phys Med*.
 365 2007;23(2):58-66. doi:10.1016/j.ejmp.2007.03.002
- 366 7. Niemelä J, Partanen M, Ojala J, et al. Measurement and properties of the dose-area product ratio
 367 in external small-beam radiotherapy. *Phys Med Biol*. 2017;62(12):4870-4883. doi:10.1088/1361-
 368 6560/aa6861
- 369 8. Niemela J, Partanen M, Ojala J, et al. Measurement and properties of the dose-area product ratio
 370 in external small-beam radiotherapy. *Phys Med Biol*. 2017;62(12):4870-4883. doi:10.1088/1361-
 371 6560/aa6861
- 372 9. Niemelä J, Partanen M, Ojala J, Kapanen M, Keyriläinen J. Dose-area product ratio in external
 373 small-beam radiotherapy: beam shape, size and energy dependencies in clinical photon beams.
 374 *Biomed Phys Eng Express*. 2021;7(3). doi:10.1088/2057-1976/abf6aa
- 375 10. Pimpinella M, Caporali C, Guerra AS, et al. Feasibility of using a dose-area product ratio as beam
 376 quality specifier for photon beams with small field sizes. *Phys Med*. 2018;45:106-116.
 377 doi:10.1016/j.ejmp.2017.12.012

- 378 11. Dufreneix S, Ostrowsky A, Le Roy M, et al. Using a dose-area product for absolute measurements
379 in small fields: a feasibility study. *Phys Med Biol.* 2016;61(2):650-662. doi:10.1088/0031-
380 9155/61/2/650
- 381 12. Jurczak J, Rapp B, Delaunay F, Gouriou J, Dufreneix S, Bordy JM. Dose area product primary
382 standards established by graphite calorimetry at the LNE-LNHB for small radiation fields in
383 radiotherapy. *Phys Med.* 2022;98:18-27. doi:10.1016/j.ejmp.2022.03.013
- 384 13. Dufreneix S, Ostrowsky A, Rapp B, Daures J, Bordy JM. Accuracy of a dose-area product
385 compared to an absorbed dose to water at a point in a 2 cm diameter field. *Med Phys.*
386 2016;43(7):4085. doi:10.1118/1.4953207
- 387 14. IAEA. Absorbed Dose Determination in External Beam Radiotherapy: An International Code of
388 Practice for Dosimetry based on Standards of Absorbed Dose to Water. Published online 2006.
- 389 15. Kawachi T, Saitoh H, Inoue M, Katayose T, Myojoyama A, Hatano K. Reference dosimetry
390 condition and beam quality correction factor for CyberKnife beam. *Med Phys.* 2008;35(10):4591-
391 4598. doi:10.1118/1.2978228
- 392 16. Niroomand-Rad A, Chiu-Tsao ST, Grams MP, et al. Report of AAPM Task Group 235
393 Radiochromic Film Dosimetry: An Update to TG-55. *Med Phys.* 2020;47(12):5986-6025.
394 doi:10.1002/mp.14497
- 395 17. Looe HK, Büsing I, Tekin T, et al. The polarity effect of compact ionization chambers used for
396 small field dosimetry. *Med Phys.* 2018;45(12):5608-5621. doi:10.1002/mp.13227
- 397 18. Partanen M, Niemelä J, Ojala J, Keyriläinen J, Kapanen M. Properties of IBA Razor Nano
398 Chamber in small-field radiation therapy using 6 MV FF, 6 MV FFF, and 10 MV FFF photon
399 beams. *Acta Oncol.* 2021;60(11):1419-1424. doi:10.1080/0284186X.2021.1979644
- 400 19. Lopez-Sánchez M, Pérez-Fernández M, Pardo E, et al. Small static radiosurgery field dosimetry
401 with small volume ionization chambers. *Phys Med.* 2022;97:66-72.
402 doi:10.1016/j.ejmp.2022.04.002
- 403 20. Hermida-López M, Sánchez-Artuñedo D, Rodríguez M, Brualla L. Monte Carlo simulation of
404 conical collimators for stereotactic radiosurgery with a 6 MV flattening-filter-free photon beam.
405 *Med Phys.* 2021;48(6):3160-3171. doi:10.1002/mp.14837
- 406 21. Shields L, Nikandrovs M, Vintró LL, Clean BM. Energy-dependence investigation for a range of
407 clinically used detectors from 70 kV to 6 MV. *Med Phys.* 2023;50(1):582-589.
408 doi:10.1002/mp.15857
- 409 22. Francescon P, Kilby W, Noll JM, Masi L, Satariano N, Russo S. Monte Carlo simulated
410 corrections for beam commissioning measurements with circular and MLC shaped fields on the
411 CyberKnife M6 System: a study including diode, microchamber, point scintillator, and synthetic
412 microdiamond detectors. *Phys Med Biol.* 2017;62(3):1076-1095. doi:10.1088/1361-6560/aa5610
- 413 23. Underwood TSA, Winter HC, Hill MA, Fenwick JD. Detector density and small field dosimetry:
414 integral versus point dose measurement schemes. *Med Phys.* 2013;40(8):082102.
415 doi:10.1118/1.4812687