Advances in Radiation Therapy: A Comprehensive Review of Techniques and Clinical Applications in Cancer Treatment

Rajhans Kumar[1], Santosh Kumar[2], Y.P. Singh[1]

[1]Institute of applied science, Mangalayatan University, Beswan, Aligarh -202146

[2] State Cancer Institute IGIMS, Patna – 800014

ABSTRACT: Cancer treatment has witnessed remarkable advancements, particularly in radiotherapy, which continues to evolve with innovative techniques that enhance precision, efficacy, and patient outcomes. This review explores the fundamentals and comparative benefits of modern radiotherapy approaches, including 3D Conformal Radiation Therapy (3DCRT), Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT), and Volumetric Modulated Arc Therapy (VMAT). It provides an in-depth examination of their clinical applications, efficacy in targeting tumors while sparing critical organs, and integration with other oncological modalities. A synthesis of recent studies underscores their impact on diverse cancer types, emphasizing tailored treatment planning and the ongoing pursuit of improved therapeutic outcomes

INTRODUCTION

Cancer encompasses a spectrum of diseases characterized by the uncontrolled proliferation of cells and their ability to invade adjacent tissues, potentially forming masses or tumors in various organs. The imperative of effective cancer treatment lies in curtailing the dissemination of aberrant cells, alleviating symptoms, and enhancing patient well-being. Over the past decades, substantial progress has been made in the development of diverse oncological treatment modalities aimed at precisely targeting and eradicating tumor tissues while minimizing collateral damage to healthy cells. This discourse provides an in-depth examination of the available cancer treatment techniques. Surgical intervention remains a cornerstone in oncology, entailing the physical excision of neoplastic tissue. Surgeons endeavor to resect tumors along with surrounding margins to inhibit further growth. Nonetheless, surgical procedures can result in complications such as infections and damage to organs, and they may not achieve complete eradication of malignant cells, leading to potential recurrence. Furthermore, advanced-stage malignancies may diminish the efficacy of surgery, and the recovery process can be arduous. Patient eligibility for surgery is contingent on factors such as age and overall health. Chemotherapy employs cytotoxic agents to eliminate or suppress the proliferation of cancer cells, operating systemically to address metastatic disease. Although effective, chemotherapy frequently impacts normal cells, precipitating adverse effects such as nausea, fatigue, and alopecia. Advances in chemotherapy have led to the advent of more targeted and individualized therapeutic approaches, thereby reducing off-target effects. However, chemotherapy remains associated with significant drawbacks, including side effects, immunosuppression, and long-term health issues. The challenge of selectively targeting malignant cells, the development of resistance, and the overall impact on patient well-being underscore the complexity of chemotherapy, with ongoing research striving for more selective and less toxic alternatives. Hormone therapy is predominantly utilized in the management of hormone-responsive malignancies, such as breast and prostate cancer. This modality functions by inhibiting or disrupting hormonal pathways that sustain specific cancer types. For instance, in breast cancer, hormone therapy may involve agents that block estrogen receptors. By disrupting hormonal signals that drive cancer growth, hormone therapy can decelerate or halt the progression of hormone-sensitive tumors. Generally, hormone therapy is less toxic than chemotherapy, with side effects primarily related to hormonal alterations. However, it can affect bone health, induce resistance, and cause menopausal symptoms and fertility issues, with a risk of incomplete eradication of cancer cells. Treatment decisions are guided by the type of cancer and the patient's health status. Targeted therapy is an advanced approach focusing on specific molecular targets critical for cancer cell growth and metastasis. In contrast to chemotherapy's broad-spectrum action on rapidly dividing cells, targeted therapy aims at distinct proteins or pathways pivotal in oncogenesis. This specificity enhances treatment efficacy and reduces adverse effects. Targeted therapy agents, which include small molecules and monoclonal antibodies, are often used concomitantly with other therapies and are particularly effective in cancers with identifiable genetic or molecular aberrations. Nonetheless, targeted therapy encounters obstacles such as resistance development, adverse effects, limited applicability, and cost considerations. Integrating targeted therapy with other treatments can be complex, and its long-term effects remain uncertain. Despite these challenges, targeted therapy is a valuable and precise modality in cancer treatment.[1-6]

Radiation therapy is a fundamental component of cancer management, utilizing high-dose radiation to selectively target and destroy cancer cells while sparing normal tissue. Techniques such as external beam radiation and brachytherapy are tailored to the specific cancer type. Despite potential side effects, ongoing advancements aim to mitigate these impacts. Radiation therapy can serve curative or palliative purposes and is often integrated with other treatments for optimal outcomes. The precision and individualized treatment planning, considering factors like cancer type and stage, are crucial for its success.[6]

Unlike invasive surgical procedures, radiation therapy offers a non-invasive option for patients ineligible for surgery or those preferring less physically demanding treatments. Moreover, radiation therapy preserves healthy tissue surrounding the tumor, especially in critical areas where organ function must be maintained. A notable advantage of radiation therapy is its versatility and adaptability. It can be seamlessly integrated with other modalities, such as surgery, chemotherapy, or immunotherapy, thereby augmenting the overall effectiveness of cancer treatment. The precision enabled by modern techniques, such as Volumetric Modulated Arc Therapy (VMAT), 3D Conformal Radiation Therapy (3DCRT), and Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT), facilitates accurate targeting of neoplastic cells while minimizing damage to adjacent healthy tissues. Radiation therapy is applicable across a broad spectrum of cancers, proving invaluable in cases where surgical access is challenging or when systemic treatments are insufficient. Its efficacy in treating localized tumors, particularly in early-stage cancer, underscores its significance. Additionally, the reduced side effects associated with advanced radiation therapy technologies contribute to a more favorable treatment experience compared to systemic approaches like chemotherapy. The outpatient nature of many radiation therapy sessions allows patients to maintain a semblance of normalcy in their routines during treatment, potentially enhancing their quality of life. [7-8]

This review aims to critically evaluate the advancements and comparative efficacy of modern radiotherapy techniques, with a focus on 3DCRT, IMRT, and VMAT. By synthesizing current knowledge, it provides insights for clinicians and researchers to optimize radiotherapy planning, enhance tumor control, minimize damage to healthy tissues, and improve patient outcomes.

BASICS OF RADIOTHERAPY PHYSICS

Radiotherapy leverages ionizing radiation, such as X-rays and gamma rays, to treat various forms of cancer by causing molecular damage, particularly to the DNA of cancer cells, thereby inhibiting their ability to replicate and proliferate. Key aspects of radiation physics include the interaction of radiation with matter through three primary mechanisms: the photoelectric effect, Compton scattering, and pair production. The photoelectric effect occurs when X-rays eject inner-shell electrons, leading to the absorption of energy by atoms within the targeted tissue, which is crucial for generating free radicals that damage cancer cell DNA. Techniques like Image-Guided Radiation Therapy (IGRT) enhance this process by maximizing energy absorption in tumors while minimizing impact on healthy cells. Compton scattering involves X-rays interacting with outer-shell electrons, releasing a scattered photon and a recoil electron, which transfers energy to the tissue and creates free radicals that disrupt cancer cell DNA. Advanced methods like intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) utilize this principle to enhance treatment precision and efficacy. Pair production, which occurs at very high energies, involves high-energy photons creating an electron-positron pair when interacting with a nucleus. This process aids in ionizing tissues near cancer cells and damaging their DNA, and is instrumental in refining treatment plans through technologies like positron emission tomography (PET) scans, improving tumor visualization and targeting accuracy. Understanding these principles is essential for optimizing radiotherapy, ensuring precise and effective cancer treatment with minimal collateral damage.[9]

ADVANCED RADIATION THERAPY TECHNIQUES:

3D conformal radiation therapy (3dcrt) It is a gold standard technique-forward planning. In 3DCRT, radiation beams are shaped to match the three-dimensional contours of the tumor. This method guarantees precise targeting of the tumor reduce unnecessary exposure to normal tissue. [10, 11]

Intensity-modulated radiation therapy (imrt) IMRT is a radiotherapy technique that adjusts the intensity of beam of radiation to deliver higher doses to tumors in terms of segment while minimizing exposure to surrounding healthy tissues, reducing side effects. It is effective for treating complex-shaped tumors near critical structures. [12]

Volumetric modulated arc therapy (vmat) VMAT is a advanced radiotherapy procedure that dynamically adjusts the MLC (multi leaf collimeter) shape, rate of dose, and speed of gantry of the radiation beam as it move around the patient. This allows for precise and efficient delivery of radiation with regard to arc to the tumor and as much as spare normal tissues, distinguishing it from traditional techniques and offering shorter treatment times.[12]

3DCRT employs external beams shaped to match the three-dimensional tumor contours, albeit with limitations in precision. VMAT introduces dynamism by delivering radiation in a continuous arc, optimizing conformity and often reducing treatment times. IMRT, with its capacity to adjust individual beam intensities, excels in precision and flexibility, particularly for complex tumor geometries. Both VMAT and IMRT surpass 3DCRT in conformity, with VMAT offering an efficiency advantage. The choice among these techniques hinges on factors such as tumor complexity and the desire for precision, emphasizing the evolving landscape of personalized and efficient radiotherapy delivery. [13-14]

In cancer radiation therapy, the proximity of tumors to vital organs poses risks to nearby structures. For breast cancer, nearby organs example the lungs(ipsilateral and contralateral), heart (particularly for left-sided tumors), oesophagus and opposite breast may be affected [15]. In prostate cancer, Rectum,Bladder ,R/L femur head penile bulb are at risk, leading to potential gastrointestinal side effects [16]. Lung cancer radiation may impact the esophagus, causing potential esophageal complications. Head & neck cancer pose a risk to R/L parotid,larynx,thyroid, optic nervs, brainstem R/L eye R/L lens etc , possibly resulting Head and neck cancer radiation can impact salivary glands, causing oral complications [17]. For cervical cancer, nearby organs like the bladder and rectum may be affected, leading to urinary or gastrointestinal issues [14]. Precise treatment planning is crucial to minimize risks to these organs while effectively treating the cancer.

Preserving organs at risk in cancer treatment is imperative for various reasons. The foremost consideration is to minimize potential side effects associated with radiation therapy, enhancing the overall quality of life for patients. Beyond this, the preservation of organ functionality is essential, as many critical organs contribute to vital bodily functions. Prioritizing organ protection not only reduces the risk of long-term complications but also contributes to a patient-centered approach, promoting their overall well-being throughout and after treatment. Striking a balance between effectively treating cancer and safeguarding healthy tissues is paramount for optimizing treatment efficacy and ensuring a successful, comprehensive approach to cancer care. [18-19]

In the context of radio-therapy, approaches such as 3DCRT, IMRT, and VMAT are used to safeguard organs at risk (OARs). 3DCRT customizes beam angles and shapes to minimize exposure to healthy tissues, with manual optimization involving collaborative efforts between oncologists and physicists. IMRT uses variable beam intensities, employing inverse planning to iteratively optimize the plan and achieve precise dose modulation while sparing OARs. VMAT, an advanced form of IMRT, delivers radiation in a dynamic arc, optimizing gantry rotation, dose rate, and arc shape simultaneously. In each method, the goal is to strike a balance between effective tumor treatment and minimizing radiation impact on nearby critical structures, tailoring the approach to the specific characteristics of the cancer and patient anatomy.[20-22]

REVIEW OF STUDIES ON RADIOTHERAPY TECHNIQUES

A comparative analysis led by Hongfu et al. examined VMAT and IMRT for left-breast cancer patients, focusing on the irradiated dose to the PTV and critical OARs, particularly the heart and coronary artery. Despite reduced monitor units and shorter delivery times, 2-field IMRT plans demonstrated favorable PTV coverage and OAR sparing, except for the heart and coronary artery, highlighting the significant contribution of the coronary artery dose to elevated dose regions encompassing the entire heart [23]. Reshma Bhaskaran's 2021 study on 44 breast cancer patients explored the efficacy of 3DCRT with esophagus delineation as an OAR, finding a statistically significant reduction in esophageal dose without compromising plan quality, suggesting its potential to mitigate acute esophageal toxicity during breast cancer radiotherapy [24]. Similarly, Soma S. Mohammad Amin's study assessed the impact of esophagus contouring during treatment planning on esophageal radiation exposure in breast cancer patients receiving radiation in the supraclavicular fossa. The esophagus-sparing group demonstrated a reduction in esophageal mean dose (Dmean), maximum dose, and volume parameters (V5, V10, V15, V20), concluding that considering the esophagus during treatment planning can reduce esophageal dose while maintaining plan quality, potentially decreasing the risk of acute esophagitis and esophageal cancer. [25]

Guang Hua Jin's investigation compared dosimetry for left-sided breast cancer across five methods: conventional tangential fields with wedges, field-in-field (FIF), tangential IMRT, multi-field IMRT, and VMAT. While all methods met V95% (V47.5), except VMAT, tangential IMRT exhibited improved homogeneity index (HI) for the PTV and reduced radiation exposure to OARs [26]. Yaqin Wu's research contrasted dosimetric features between VMAT and 9-field IMRT for cervical cancer patients with para-aortic lymph nodes, finding VMAT plans demonstrated superior conformity index (CI) and HI, lower average maximum doses to kidneys, and reduced doses to the rectum and bladder, with a significant reduction in monitor units (MUs) by 51%, enhancing treatment efficiency by 31% [27]. Warisarra et al.'s study on pediatric medulloblastoma patients undergoing craniospinal irradiation (CSI) compared IMRT and VMAT, noting that while IMRT provided superior target coverage, VMAT exhibited better dose homogeneity, conformity, and lower mean MUs, favoring VMAT due to heightened CI, enhanced dose HI, and reduced MU usage. [28]

Mariangle's investigation evaluated dosimetric merits and drawbacks of VMAT for CSI in adults with medulloblastoma, comparing it with 3DCRT and IMRT. Both VMAT and IMRT plans exhibited high CI and HI for the PTV, with VMAT and IMRT reducing maximum and average doses to the eyes, lenses, and thyroid, although IMRT provided better protection for optic nerves, esophagus, heart, and liver but increased mean doses in the lungs, stomach, and kidneys, all within acceptable tolerance levels [29]. Silpa's research compared dosimetric parameters in VMAT plans using flattening filter (FF) and flattening filter-free (FFF) beams for oral cavity cancers, finding similar dose distributions with no significant disparities in OAR doses. FFF VMAT plans exhibited lower mean doses for OARs, whereas FF VMAT plans demonstrated higher homogeneity and conformity, suggesting both plans are comparable in quality, with FFF offering time and cost-saving advantages. [30]

Brijesh Goswami's investigation compared the integral dose delivered to OARs, non-target body, and target body during CSI for medulloblastoma patients, finding RapidArc exhibited the lowest integral dose (ID) for each patient, demonstrating superior normal tissue sparing compared to 3DCRT plans, suggesting RapidArc as a superior alternative for CSI treatment [31]. Imane Benali's comparison between IMRT and 3DCRT for high-grade glioblastoma treatment in 22 patients revealed that IMRT, especially with RapidArc, was superior in optimizing PTV dose and sparing OARs[32]. Fuli's investigation compared FFF and conventional FF beams in VMAT for post-hysterectomy cervical cancer, finding FFF-VMAT demonstrated comparable CI but slightly inferior HI compared to FF-VMAT, with no significant differences in OAR doses, suggesting FFF beams yield similar target and OAR dose distributions as FF beams with reduced beam-on time.[33]

Samuel's research compared dosimetric distinctions between IMRT and VMAT for post-mastectomy breast cancer patients, finding IMRT provided superior target coverage and HI, while VMAT resulted in reduced delivery time. Both techniques achieved clinical objectives, with IMRT providing better PTV coverage, homogeneity, and OAR sparing [34]. Juan Xui's investigation assessed the practicability and dosimetric merits of simplified non-coplanar VMAT for hippocampal-sparing whole brain radiotherapy (HA-WBRT), finding non-coplanar VMAT enhanced dose homogeneity and reduced D50% in the brain compared to IMRT and coplanar VMAT, also decreasing D2% for the hippocampus, optic nerve, and lens, presenting an effective and uncomplicated plan for HA-WBRT [35].

P. Mohandas' research assessed the impact of multi-criteria optimization (MCO) on VMAT for CSI, finding MCO-VMAT demonstrated marginal enhancements in HI and CI without compromising target coverage, significantly reducing mean and maximum doses to OARs, suggesting MCO-VMAT as a viable option for CSI with improved OAR sparing [36]. Rui Wang's research compared VMAT with IMRT for left breast cancer patients post-modified radical mastectomy (MRM), finding VMAT exhibited superior conformity, significantly reduced mean dose (Dmean), and volume parameters (V5, V10) of the heart compared to IMRT, with VMAT demonstrating similar effectiveness in sparing OARs and advantages in terms of average monitor units and treatment time [37]. Elif Eda's investigation compared 3DCRT, IMRT, and VMAT for treating central nervous system (CNS) tumors in children requiring craniospinal radiation therapy (CSRT), finding VMAT significantly superior over IMRT in average doses to the optic nerve, thyroid, esophagus, heart, and oral cavity, with IMRT showing better average doses to the lungs and kidneys, and VMAT demonstrating lower maximum doses for all OARs. [38]

Jan Hofmaier's investigation explored the potential for reducing exposure to the opposite hippocampus in glioblastoma radiation therapy using VMAT, finding a median decrement of 36% in the opposite hippocampus generalized equivalent uniform dose compared to 3DCRT, with other dose parameters remaining consistent or better, suggesting VMAT enables a considerable reduction in dose to the opposite hippocampus without compromising other treatment parameters, although the impact on neurocognitive status and oncological outcomes should be further explored in prospective clinical trials. [39]

DISCUSSION

This literature review summarizes key findings from studies on various radiation therapy procedures, considering VMAT, IMRT, and 3DCRT. These techniques have been evaluated across different cancer types, with a focus on optimizing treatment plans. [23-39]

Studies, such as those comparing VMAT and IMRT for breast and cervical cancer, highlight the importance of meticulous planning to achieve a balance between target coverage and sparing critical organs. In breast cancer, considerations for the heart and coronary artery dose are crucial, while the inclusion of esophagus delineation in 3DCRT planning demonstrates reduced esophageal doses without compromising plan quality.[23-39]

Notable findings include the dosimetric advantages of VMAT in craniospinal irradiation for medulloblastoma, showcasing improved dose homogeneity and conformity. Comparative studies, like Fuli's examination of FFF and conventional FF arc in VMAT for cervical cancer, suggest comparable quality, with FFF plans potentially offering time and cost savings.[23-39]

In summary, these studies collectively contribute valuable insights into the evolving landscape of radiotherapy techniques, emphasizing the importance of tailoring treatment plans to individual patient needs, optimizing target coverage, and minimizing radiation exposure to surrounding healthy tissues. Advances in techniques like VMAT and IMRT show promising outcomes, supporting their continued exploration and integration into clinical practice.[23-39]

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, this review article underscores the diverse applications and comparative advantages of various radiotherapy techniques such as VMAT, IMRT, and 3DCRT across different cancer types and treatment settings. They highlight the importance of tailored treatment planning to optimize both target coverage and sparing of critical organs, aiming to enhance therapeutic efficacy while minimizing potential side effects in cancer patients.

REFERENCES

1. Brown JS, Amend SR, Austin RH, Gatenby RA, Hammarlund EU, Pienta KJ. Updating the definition of cancer. Molecular Cancer Research. 2023 Nov 1;21(11):1142-7.
2. Baskar R, Lee KA, Yeo R, Yeoh KW. Cancer and radiation therapy: current advances and future directions. International journal of medical sciences. 2012;9(3):193.
3. Dare AJ, Anderson BO, Sullivan R, et al. Surgical Services for Cancer Care. In: Gelband H, Jha P, Sankaranarayanan R, et al., editors. Cancer: Disease Control Priorities, Third Edition (Volume 3). Washington (DC): The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank; 2015 Nov 1. Chapter 13. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK343623/ doi: 10.1596/978-1-4648-0349-9_ch13
4. Amjad MT, Chidharla A, Kasi A. Cancer Chemotherapy. [Updated 2023 Feb 27]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023 Jan-. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK564367/
5. Deli T, Orosz M, Jakab A. Hormone Replacement Therapy in Cancer Survivors - Review of the Literature. Pathol Oncol Res. 2020 Jan;26(1):63-78. doi: 10.1007/s12253-018-00569-x. Epub 2019 Jan 8. PMID: 30617760; PMCID: PMC7109141.
6. Debela DT, Muzazu SG, Heraro KD, Ndalama MT, Mesele BW, Haile DC, Kitui SK, Manyazewal T. New approaches and procedures for cancer treatment: Current perspectives. SAGE Open Med. 2021 Aug 12; 9:20503121211034366. doi: 10.1177/20503121211034366. PMID: 34408877; PMCID: PMC8366192.
7. Semwal MK. Khan's the physics of radiation therapy. Journal of Medical Physics. 2020 Apr;45(2):134.
8. Buchholz TA, Tucker SL, Moore RA, McNeese MD, Strom EA, Jhingrin A, Hortobagyi GN, Singletary SE, Champlin RE. Importance of radiation therapy for breast cancer patients treated with high-dose chemotherapy and stem cell transplant. International Journal of Radiation Oncology* Biology* Physics. 2000 Jan 15;46(2):337-43.
9. Johns HE, Cunningham JR. The physics of radiology, fourth edition, Americal Lecture Series; Publication no.1054, ISBN 0-398-046-69-7.
10. Khan FM, Sperduto PW, Gibbons JP. Khan's Treatment Planning in Radiation Oncology:. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2021 Sep 17.
11. Barrett A, Morris S, Dobbs J, Roques T. Practical radiotherapy planning. CRC Press; 2009 Jun 26.
12. Das, Indra J and Sanfilippo, Nicholas J and Fogliata, Antonella and Cozzi, Luca,"Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy, IMRT, IMAT and VMAT",Book Chapter{5-1 to 5-14}, IOP Publishing,2053-2563, ISBN: 978-0-7503-1335-3,2020.
13. Chen SN, Ramachandran P, Deb P. Dosimetric comparative study of 3DCRT, IMRT, VMAT, Ecomp, and Hybrid techniques for breast radiation therapy. Radiation Oncology Journal. 2020 Dec;38(4):270.
14. Raina P, Singh S. Comparison between Three-Dimensional Conformal Radiation Therapy (3DCRT) and Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT) for Radiotherapy of Cervical Carcinoma: A Heterogeneous Phantom Study. J Biomed Phys Eng. 2022 Oct 1;12(5):465-476. doi: 10.31661/jbpe.v0i0.2101-1257. PMID: 36313412; PMCID: PMC9589078.
15. Abdulkareem NK. Intensity modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) technique for left breast cancer by different numbers of beam fields. International Journal of Radiation Research. 2021;19(1):167-74.
16. Kószó RL, Varga Z. Individualised radiotherapy serving reduced toxicity in breast and prostate cancer. Radiother Oncol. 2018;126:487-92.
17. Trifiletti DM. Clinical Radiation Oncology **Weblink** https://econtour.org/training/ARRO_RadOnc_Review.pdf
18. Malicki J. The importance of accurate treatment planning, delivery, and dose verification. Reports of Practical Oncology and Radiotherapy. 2012;17(2):63-5.
19. Nelms BE, Tomé WA, Robinson G, Wheeler J. Variations in the contouring of organs at risk: test case from a patient with oropharyngeal cancer. International Journal of Radiation Oncology* Biology* Physics. 2012 Jan 1;82(1):368-78.
20. Rehman J, Tailor RC, Isa M, Afzal M, Chow J, Ibbott GS. Evaluations of secondary cancer risk in spine radiotherapy using 3DCRT, IMRT, and VMAT: A phantom study. Medical Dosimetry. 2015 Mar 1;40(1):70-5.

21. Liu H, Chen X, He Z, Li J. Evaluation of 3D-CRT, IMRT and VMAT radiotherapy plans for left breast cancer based on clinical dosimetric study. Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics. 2016 Dec 1;54:1-5.
22. Zhao J, Hu W, Cai G, Wang J, Xie J, Peng J, Zhang Z. Dosimetric comparisons of VMAT, IMRT and 3DCRT for locally advanced rectal cancer with simultaneous integrated boost. Oncotarget. 2016 Feb 2;7(5):6345.
23. Zhao, H., He, M., Cheng, G. et al. A comparative dosimetric study of left sided breast cancer after breast-conserving surgery treated with VMAT and IMRT. Radiat Oncol 10, 231 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-015-0531-4
24. Bhaskaran R, Pulickal SG, Reghu H, Perumangat A, Moolath GB. Comparison of dose volumetric parameters of oesophagus in the radiation treatment of carcinoma breast with and without oesophagus delineation. Journal of Radiotherapy in Practice. 2023;22:e10.
25. Amin SS, Faraj KA, Kamangar TM, Yarahmadi M. Comparison of esophagus dose in breast cancer patients undergoing supraclavicular irradiation with and without esophagus countering. Journal of Cancer Research and Therapeutics. 2023 Jul 19.
26. Jin GH, Chen [26]LX, Deng XW, Liu XW, Huang Y, Huang XB. A comparative dosimetric study for treating left-sided breast cancer for small breast size using five different radiotherapy techniques: conventional tangential field, filed-in-filed, tangential-IMRT, multi-beam IMRT and VMAT. Radiation oncology. 2013 Dec;8(1):1-8.
27. [27] Wu Y, Zhu B, Han J, Xu H, Gong Z, Yang Y, Huang J, Lu E. A comparative dosimetric study of cervical cancer patients with para-aortic lymph node metastasis treated with volumetric modulated arc therapy vs. 9-field intensity-modulated radiation therapy. Annals of translational medicine. 2019 Nov;7(22).
28. Warissara Rongthong1 , Siwadol Pleanarom1 , Nan Suntornpong1 , Teeradon Treechairusame1 , Kullathorn Thephamongkhol1,Dosimetric Study of Craniospinal Irradiation in Children: Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy vs. Volumetric Modulated Arc Therapy Journal of Thai Association of Radiation Oncology, Page no. 68-76vol. 26 No.2 July - December 2020
29. Leones MD, Pérez JE, Silva LI. Evaluación de la técnica Arcoterapia Volumétrica Modulada (VMAT) para la Irradiación Cráneo-Espinal (ICE) en pacientes adultos con meduloblastoma y su comparación dosimétrica con Radioterapia Conformada en 3 Dimensiones (RTC-3D) y Radioterapia de Intensidad Modulada (IMRT). Revista Brasileira de Física Médica. 2021 Jul 13;15:528.
30. Kumar SA, MM M, CA S, KB R, Jose L, Muttath G, KP S. Dosimetric comparison of FF and FFF beams in VMAT treatment plans of head and neck cancers. Onkologia i Radioterapia. 2021 Oct 1;15(7).
31. Goswami B, Jain RK, Yadav S, Kumar S, Oommen S, Manocha S, Jadav GK. Dosimetric comparison of integral dose for different techniques of craniospinal irradiation. Journal of Radiotherapy in Practice. 2021 Sep;20(3):345-50.
32. Benali I, Kaanouch O, Naim A, El Gouach H, Dahbi Z, Kouhen F. Dosimetric Comparison: Volumetric Modulated Arc Therapy (VMAT) and 3D Conformal Radiotherapy (3D-CRT) in High Grade Glioma Cancer—Experience of Casablanca Cancer Center at the Cheikh Khalifa International University Hospital. International Journal of Medical Physics, Clinical Engineering and Radiation Oncology. 2021 May 18;10(2):111-7.
33. Zhang F, Jiang H, Xu W, Wang Y, Gao J, Liu Q, Wang P, Lu N, Chen D, Yao B, Hou J. A dosimetric evaluation of flattening filter-free volumetric modulated arc therapy for postoperative treatment of cervical cancer*. Oncology and translational medicine. 2016 Aug 1;2(4):179-84.
34. Adeneye S, Akpochafor M, Adedewe N, Habeebu M, Jubril R, Adebayo A, Salako O, Joseph A, Ariyo I, Awhariado E, Lawal R. A Dosimetric Comparison of Volumetric Modulated Arc Therapy and Intensity Modulated Radiotherapy in Patients Treated with Post-Mastectomy Radiotherapy. European Journal of Breast Health. 2023 Jan;19(1):92.
35. Xue J, Jin S, Zhang H, Zou K, Sheng J, Tang J, Zhao W, Yang P, Tang L, Lv X, Lv L. A simplified non-coplanar volumetric modulated arc therapy for the whole brain radiotherapy with hippocampus avoidance. Frontiers in Oncology. 2023 Apr 17;13:1143564.
36. Mohandass P, Khanna D, Selvaganapathi A, Nishaanth B, Saravanan C, Thiyagaraj T, Bhalla N, Puri A, Blessy M. Impact of Multi-criteria Optimization on 6-MV Flattening Filter-Free Volumetric Modulated Arc Therapy for Craniospinal Irradiation. Iranian Journal of Medical Physics. 2020 Nov 1;17(6).

37. Wang R, Shen J, Yan H, Gao X, Dong T, Li S, Wang P, Zhou J. Dosimetric comparison between intensity-modulated radiotherapy and volumetric-modulated arc therapy in patients of left-sided breast cancer treated with modified radical mastectomy: CONSORT. Medicine. 2022 Jan 1;101(2).

38. Özer EE, Çoban Y, Çifter F, Karacam S, Uzel Ö, TÜRKAN OS. Dosimetric Comparison of Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy and Volumetric Modulated Arc Therapy in Craniospinal Radiotherapy of Childhood. Turkish Journal of Oncology/Türk Onkoloji Dergisi. 2021 Jan 1;36(1).

39. Hofmaier J, Kantz S, Söhn M, Dohm OS, Bächle S, Alber M, Parodi K, Belka C, Niyazi M. Hippocampal sparing radiotherapy for glioblastoma patients: a planning study using volumetric modulated arc therapy. Radiation Oncology. 2016 Dec;11(1):1-8.