## AbstractID:8727Title:Studyoftranslationa l andr otational setuperr orsandtheircorrectionmethods forhead&neckpat ientsusingkil ovoltagecone -beamcom putedtomogr aphy(kVCB CT)

**Purpose:** To investigate the magnitude of the six degree setuperrors in head & neck patients (HNC) and evaluate which correction data, obtained from thre edegree ands ix degree 3D/3D registration, is more appropriate for setup correction if the setuperrors are corrected by translational shifts.

**Methods and Materi als:** kVCBCT images were acquired on the first day of treatment and weekly thereafter for 21 HNC patients treated with IM RT. A total of 14 5 CBCT image sets were acquired. The C BCT images were registered with the corresponding planning CT images using two d ifferent 3D rigid registration approaches. With Approach1 t he registrations were conducted with translations alone, with Appr oach2 al lsix degrees were t aken into account. These tuperr or with them aximum rotational error was simulated on planning CT for two patients, then the errors were ecorr ected by applying the translational data obtained f rom Approach1 (Correction1) and Appr roach2 (Cor rection2), respectively. Dosimetric indices were ecompared for the two corrections.

**Results**: For the se 21HNCpa tients, the average translation al errors determined with Approach 1 were  $1.0\pm 3.5$ ,  $0.8\pm 3.5$ ,  $1.6\pm 3.8$ m m and the values determined with Approach 2 were  $1.1\pm 5.0, 0.4\pm 3.8, 2.2\pm 4.7$ mminLR, AP and SIdi rections respectively. The average rotational errors determined by Approach 2 were  $0.6^{\circ}\pm 1.1^{\circ}, 0.1^{\circ}\pm 1.9^{\circ}, 0.3^{\circ}\pm 0.8^{\circ}$  and the average maximume rrors were  $0.9^{\circ}\pm 1.6^{\circ}, 0.5^{\circ}\pm 3.0^{\circ}, 0.4^{\circ}\pm 1.1^{\circ}$  a round LR, AP and SIa xesrespectively. The PTV prescription dose coverage was 86.1% and 92.3% for patient 1, 92.1% and 92.4% for patient 2 with Correction 1 and Correction 2 respectively.

**Conclusions**: Relativelyl arger otational errors were observed in HNC patients. Instinctively, it appeared that the Correction1 were more accurate than Corr ection2 if onlyt ranslational correction swere involved. The result or patient1 showed that it may not be the case. The dosimetric impact of b oth corrective approaches hast obefur therinve stigated to evaluate which approach should be applied to correct the setuperrors.