Case study: Akron General Health System

SCRIPTING TO IMPROVE PLANNING CONSISTENCY, EFFICIENCY AND TO STREAMLINE THE RECOMMISIONING PROCESS



Akron General Health System in Akron, Ohio, USA.

Akron General Health System, found within the heart of Ohio, has implemented RayStation treatment planning system. This case study describes how they are using Python Scripting to streamline their workflow while providing continuity during the planning process. The treatment planning system supports the integration of automated scripts that allows users to interact with objects in the patient database and present them or analyze them to develop custom output and reports. Jeremy Donaghue, chief physicist, shares three scripts that have been clinically implemented, having a positive impact on their facility.



Jeremy Donaghue Chief physicist at Akron General Health System

Akron General was able to streamline these processes while also avoiding human input errors, making the entire process less intense and time-consuming on the dosimetrist."

As described by Jeremy Donaghue:

In Radiation Oncology, departments usually define their own standards for reports. Utilizing the scripting features of RayStation, Akron General has been able to streamline these efforts while also reducing the potential for human input errors (typos). This has simplified the process and reduced the amount of time spent by the staff.

After a patient's CT is imported a script is run to generate a treatment plan with

appropriate naming conventions, prescription settings (when available), localization beams and contour names (when available). Use of the script helps maintain consistency across the database and planning process. Future development will include the recognition of all of the information in the CT/Sim's description tags, allowing for auto population. The currently implemented script prompts the screen setup window shown in Figure 1.

🐻 Set Patient Informatio	on 🗖 🗖 💌	
Body Site:	Lung	
Physician:	Fromm	
Planner:	JDD	
BeamSet Name:	right lung/nodes 🔻	
Exam:	AVG 🔹	
Exam Orientation:	HeadFirstSupine •	
Tx Machine:	RRO Synergy 🔹	
Expected Plan Type:	3D 🔻	
GO!		

Figure 1: Script-generated window for setting patient plan information.



A second scripting example demonstrates how efficiency and safety can be improved with post processing. The script is executed once a treatment plan is complete. It is used to sort the order of the treatment fields into what has been determined to be the most efficient order for the machine and then names the fields appropriately. Once the treatment order has been established, the expected treatment table coordinates are computed. The plan is then transferred to the record and verify system. The script checks to verify that the data was transferred appropriately and that no corruption or manipulation after transfer has occurred. This is a crucial step for complex IMRT or VMAT plans.

Figure 2 shows the output of the script. Prescription data and treatment field parameters are checked and a report is created. This file can be automatically imported into the R&V system. At Akron General, we use Mosaiq from Elekta.

The third and final script assists with software upgrades and recommissioning. Once the system has been commissioned and the acceptance treatment plans have been established, it is possible to programmatically pull data out of all the defined reference plans. When a new version is released, comparing the original "gold standard" data to the calculated results from the new version of software is an automated process. This allows our facility to rapidly commission the treatment planning software as upgrades occur.

Patient: DOE, JOHN MR: 0000530311 Treatment Plan: 3D Brain Beam Set: whole brain Prescription Name: Pass Fractions: Pass Total Dose: Pass Type: FAIL Mismatch: Plan vs Point Percentage: Pass FIELD DATA Machine 6 G86 7 G274 C316 C44 Field Number PASS PASS Field Name PASS PASS Field Name PASS PASS Field Name PASS PASS Field Name PASS PASS Mu PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Gouch PASS PASS Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 36,37,38,39					
Fractions: Pass Total Dose: Pass Type: FAIL Mismatch: Plan vs Point Percentage: Pass FIELD DATA Machine 6 G86 7 G274 Machine 6 G86 7 G274 C316 C44 Field Number PASS PASS Modality PASS PASS Wedge PASS PASS Mu PASS PASS Jaws PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	MR: 0000530311 Treatment Plan: 3D				
Machine 6 G86 7 G274 C316 C44 Field Number PASS PASS Field Name PASS PASS Modality PASS PASS Wedge PASS PASS Mu PASS PASS Control Points(#) PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg Weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Fractions: Pass Total Dose: Pass Type: FAIL Mismatch: Plan vs Point				
C316 C44 Field Number PASS Field Name PASS PASS PASS Modality PASS PASS PASS Wedge PASS PASS PASS MU PASS Control Points(#) PASS Dams PASS Control Points(#) PASS DASS PASS Control Points(#) PASS DASS PASS Couch PASS Couch PASS MLC FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	FIELD DATA				
Field Name PASS PASS Modality PASS PASS Wedge PASS PASS Wu PASS PASS Control Points(#) PASS PASS Jaws PASS PASS Energy PASS PASS Collimator PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg Weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Machine				
Modality PASS PASS Wedge PASS PASS MU PASS PASS Control Points(#) PASS PASS Jams PASS PASS Dams PASS PASS Control Points(#) PASS PASS Jams PASS PASS Control Points(#) PASS PASS Courch PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Field Number	PASS	PASS		
wedge PASS PASS MU PASS PASS Control Points(#) PASS PASS Jaws PASS PASS Energy PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Collimator PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg Weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Field Name	PASS	PASS		
MU PASS PASS Control Points(#) PASS PASS Jaws PASS PASS Jaws PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Collimator PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Modality	PASS	PASS		
Control Points(#) PASS PASS Jaws PASS PASS Energy PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Collimator PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Wedge	PASS	PASS		
Jaws PASS PASS Energy PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Collimator PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	MU	PASS	PASS		
Energy PASS PASS Gantry PASS PASS Collimator PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Control Points(#)	PASS	PASS		
Gantry PASS PASS Collimator PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Jaws	PASS	PASS		
Collimator PASS PASS Couch PASS PASS Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Energy	PASS	PASS		
Couch PASS PASS Seg Weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Gantry	PASS	PASS		
Seg weighting PASS PASS MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Collimator	PASS	PASS		
MLC FAIL FAIL 6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	Couch	PASS	PASS		
6 G86 C316 Segment Data: MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:		PASS			
MLC LEAF: (2) 37,38,39 7 G274 C44 Segment Data:	MLC	FAIL	FAIL		
the result (a) solariaging					

Figure 2: Sample report showing an MLC mismatch and other test output.

Summary

We think the Python scripting functionality in the RayStation Treatment Planning System provides the following benefits:

- Eliminates time spent on fixing documentation errors that may have little to no significant impact on patient treatment.
- Brings consistency to plans performed by all of the dosimetrists or physicians.
- Allows more time to be invested in evaluating the quality of the treatment plan.
- Helps reduce possible treatment errors.
- · Allows us to recommission new software versions quickly.

For more information on RayStation or to see a demo please contact sales@raysearchlabs.com

