AbstractID: 4541 Title: Measurement of Neutron Background in Electron Beams from a Dedicated IORT Linear Accelerator and a Conventional Linear Accelerator

**Purpose:** To measure the neutron background for an electron-only (IORT) and a conventional linear accelerator. Methods & Materials: A Siemens Mevatron ME [6 (not used), 9, 12, 15 and 18 MeV] and several Varian Clinacs [6 (not used), 9, 12, 16 and 20 MeV] were used in this study. Bubble (Type BD-PND; BTI Bubble Technology Industries) and track-etch detectors (TE) (Luxel+, Ja; Landauer) were used in these experiments. The detectors were placed at 1m from the target at azimuthal angles of  $0^{\circ}$ ,  $45^{\circ}$ ,  $90^{\circ}$ ,  $135^{\circ}$  and  $180^{\circ}$ . **Results:** For conventional electrons at  $0^{\circ}$  the neutron leakages (Sv/Gy) are: 2x10<sup>-5</sup> at 12 MeV, 1.0x10<sup>-4</sup> at 16 MeV and 4x10<sup>-4</sup> at 20 MeV. For angles >0°, the leakage is almost angle independent  $[2x10^{-6} \text{ at } 12 \text{ MeV}; (0.5-2)x10^{-5} \text{ at } 16 \text{ MeV}]$ and  $(2-4) \times 10^{-5}$  at 20 MeV]. For the ME, the neutron leakage was lower than for the conventional linac and also independent of angle for angles  $>0^{\circ}$  {[0°: 6x10<sup>-6</sup> at 12 MeV;  $2x10^{-5}$  at 15 MeV;  $5x10^{-5}$  at 18 MeV]; [other angles:  $(2-5x10^{-7} \text{ at } 12 \text{ MeV}; (0.7-1.0)x10^{-6})$ at 15 MeV;  $(2-4)x10^{-6}$  at 18 MeV]}. Using the upper limit of  $5x10^{-7}$  Sv/Gy at 12 MeV for angles  $>0^{\circ}$  and assuming a workload of 200Gy/wk and an inverse square factor of 10, the neutron dose is 0.01 mSv/wk. For the primary beam at 12 MeV, the 10x higher dose is compensated by the attenuation in the primary beamstopper<sup> $\dagger$ </sup>. Conclusions: Measurements have been made of the neutron leakage from an IORT machine and a conventional linear accelerator. The results show that the IORT has a leakage well below that of the conventional machine and that at 12 MeV for the IORT machine, the leakage is sufficiently low at all angles as not to be a regulatory problem.

<sup>†</sup> G. Loi. et. al. Phys. Med. Biol. 51:695-702;2006