

2009

Exploring novel radiotherapy techniques with Monte Carlo simulation and measurement

Heidi Nettelbeck
University of Wollongong

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses>

University of Wollongong

Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

Recommended Citation

Nettelbeck, Heidi, Exploring novel radiotherapy techniques with Monte Carlo simulation and measurement, Doctor of Philosophy thesis, School of Engineering Physics - Faculty of Engineering, University of Wollongong, 2009. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3024>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

NOTE

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Exploring novel radiotherapy techniques with Monte Carlo simulation and measurement

Heidi Nettelbeck

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree

Doctor of Philosophy



School of Engineering Physics

University of Wollongong

Australia

2009

Thesis supervisors: Doctor George J. Takacs and Professor Anatoly B.
Rosenfeld

ABSTRACT

This work is the first comprehensive investigation of potential changes in the radiobiological effectiveness of clinical photon beams caused by a redistribution of electrons in a magnetic field. It is also a fundamental study of both the influence of magnetic fields on the peak-to-valley dose ratio of microbeams and the accuracy of theoretical modelling for dose planning in Microbeam Radiation Therapy (MRT).

The application of a strong transverse magnetic field to a volume undergoing irradiation by a photon beam can produce localised regions of dose enhancement and dose reduction. Results from Monte Carlo PENELOPE simulation show regions of enhancement and reduction of as much as 111% and 77% respectively for magnetic fields of 1 to 100 T applied to Co^{60} , 6, 10, 15, and 24 MV photon beams. The dose redistribution is shown to occur predominantly through an alteration in the lower energy electron population, which may correspond to a change in the relative biological effectiveness.

In MRT, an experimental and theoretical investigation of the influence of transverse and longitudinal magnetic fields on the lateral dose profile and peak-to-valley dose ratio (PVDR) of microbeams is presented. Results show that longitudinal magnetic fields greater than 10 T are needed to produce an effect. Strong transverse magnetic fields, on the other hand, have no influence on microbeam profiles. The radiation response of the edge-on MOSFET and its ability to measure dose profiles of monoenergetic and polyenergetic microbeams are also investigated.

Simulations investigating the dependence of microbeam dose profiles on the accuracy of beamline modelling (i.e. synchrotron source, multislit collimator, and beam divergence) are also presented. Results show the asymmetric collimator construction is responsible for a 10% variation in the full-width at half-maximum of microbeams which affects the PVDR. Modelling the distributed source and beam divergence increases the penumbral dose by almost 30%. The influence of the collimator alignment, interaction medium, and the height of scoring regions on the PVDR are also investigated.

CERTIFICATION

I, Heidi Nettelbeck, declare that this thesis, submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in School of Engineering Physics, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

Heidi Nettelbeck

April 14, 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my supervisors, Doctor George Takacs and Professor Anatoly Rosenfeld and thank them for their guidance throughout the course of this project. In particular, I thank George for his assistance with the Monte Carlo aspects of this work, and Anatoly for sharing his in-depth knowledge of radiation dosimetry.

My appreciation also extends to Doctor Michael Lerch at the Centre for Medical Radiation Physics, University of Wollongong, and the scientists on the ID-17 biomedical beamline at the European Synchrotron Radiation Facility in Grenoble, France, for their assistance with the magneto-MRT experiments. I would also like to acknowledge Terry Braddock and Brad Oborn for constructing the magnet devices used in these experiments, and Doctor José Fernández-Varea for identifying the origin of a spurious peak in the simulated electron spectra.

I also thank the postgraduate students and staff in the School of Physics for their lively discussions and friendship over the years. I have fond memories of mountain and beach runs with George and Neil, and music sessions in the lab. Finally, I thank my friends and family for their ongoing encouragement. A special thank you to Daniel for his unfailing patience and support, and God for carrying me to the end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
PUBLICATION LIST	xix
 CHAPTER	
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background and motivation	1
1.2 Objectives and scope of this research	4
1.3 Thesis outline	5
 2 Radiation transport and the Monte Carlo PENELOPE code	 7
2.1 Interactions of radiation with matter	7
2.1.1 Photon interactions	7
2.1.2 Electron interactions	13
2.2 Monte Carlo PENELOPE code	14
2.2.1 Brief outline of code structure and operation	14
2.2.2 Particle transport	15
2.2.3 Electron transport in magnetic fields	16
 3 Influence of a transverse magnetic field on the dose distribution in photon beam radiotherapy	 19
3.1 Introduction	19
3.2 Simulation methods	23
3.3 Simulation results	29
3.3.1 Effect of the magnetic field strength	29
3.3.2 Effect of the photon beam energy	33
3.3.3 Effect of the depth and thickness of magnetic field	34
3.4 Discussion	40
3.5 Conclusion	45
 4 Effect of a transverse magnetic field on the electron distribution of high- energy photon beams	 47
4.1 Introduction	47
4.2 Simulation methods	50
4.3 Simulation results and discussion	55
4.3.1 Influence of a magnetic field on electron spectra below 1 MeV	58
4.3.2 Influence of a magnetic field on electron spectra below 10 keV	61
4.3.3 Influence of a magnetic field on electron spectra below 1 keV	65
4.3.4 Effect of magnetic field on the w -values of electrons	72
4.3.5 Effect of magnetic field on the spatial distribution of electrons	78

4.4	Conclusion	94
5	MOSFET dosimetry in Microbeam Radiation Therapy (MRT)	97
5.1	Introduction	97
5.1.1	Microbeam Radiation Therapy (MRT)	97
5.1.2	MOSFET dosimetry in MRT	102
5.1.3	MRT at the ESRF ID-17 biomedical beamline	106
5.2	Experimental and simulation methods	109
5.3	Results and discussion	114
5.3.1	Radiation response of MOSFET dosimeters	114
5.3.2	Measured and simulated dose profiles of microbeams	117
5.3.3	Measured and simulated peak-to-valley dose ratios (PVDRs)	127
5.4	Conclusion	136
6	Magneto-MRT: influence of a magnetic field on microbeam profiles	139
6.1	Introduction	139
6.2	Materials and methods	142
6.2.1	Magneto-MRT with a transverse magnetic field	142
6.2.2	Magneto-MRT with a longitudinal magnetic field	144
6.2.3	Magneto-MRT Monte Carlo simulations	154
6.3	Results and Discussion	155
6.3.1	Effect of a transverse magnetic field on microbeam profiles	155
6.3.2	Effect of a longitudinal magnetic field on microbeam profiles	161
6.4	Conclusion	169
7	A Monte Carlo study of the influence of MRT beamline components on microbeam profiles	171
7.1	Introduction	171
7.2	Materials and Methods	174
7.3	Results and discussion	178
7.3.1	Effect of the beam divergence	178
7.3.2	Effect of the multislit collimator	179
7.3.3	Effect of the source model	181
7.3.4	Effect of the multislit collimator lateral offset	184
7.3.5	Effect of the simulation model	187
7.3.6	Effect of the multislit collimator alignment	195
7.3.7	Effect of the collimator design	203
7.3.8	Effect of the interaction medium	205
7.3.9	Effect of the height of scoring regions	209
7.4	Conclusion	211
8	Conclusion	215
APPENDICES		
A	High current pulser for the magnet coil in magneto-MRT experiments	223
REFERENCES		
		227

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1	Range of electrons in water as a function of energy. 22
3.2	Comparison of the maximum DPF for a 15 MV beam with $B = 1$ to 100 T. 31
3.3	Comparison of the minimum DPF for a 15 MV beam with $B = 1$ to 100 T. 31
3.4	Comparison of the maximum DPF for a 15 MV beam with $B = 1$ to 100 T using bin depths of 0.1 and 0.2 cm. 32
3.5	Comparison of the minimum DPF for a 15 MV beam with $B = 1$ to 100 T, and bin depths of 0.1 and 0.2 cm. 33
3.6	Comparison of the maximum DPF for different photon beams with $B = 5$ T. 33
3.7	Comparison of the minimum DPF for different photon beams with $B = 5$ T. 34
4.1	Binding energies of hydrogen and oxygen. 50
4.2	Energies and probabilities of Auger electron production in water. 71
6.1	Peak and valley doses and PVDR of the central peak (peak 2) in an ar- ray of three microbeams. Peak and valley doses were measured with Gafchromic film at 0.1 and 0.2 cm depth (in perspex) in the presence and absence of a 1 T longitudinal magnetic field, B 163

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Cross sections for photon interactions in water. Data extracted from the NIST XCOM Photon Cross Sections database.	8
2.2	Angular distribution of Compton scattered photons calculated from the Klein-Nishina cross section. A plot of the intensity of a scattered photon of 0.1, 0.5, 1, 5, 10, and 15 MeV interacting with a free electron at the centre of this graph.	11
2.3	Angular distribution of Compton scattered electrons calculated from the Klein-Nishina cross section. A plot of the intensity of the electrons produced from Compton scattered photons of 0.1, 0.5, 1, 5, 10, and 15 MeV.	11
3.1	Energy dependence of the range, mean free path, and radius of curvature of an electron moving in magnetic field. The range of an electron (in water) as a function of energy is based on the data in table 3.1.	21
3.2	Effect of a slice of 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth) on the: (a) depth-dose, and (b) dose perturbation factor (DPF) of a 10 MV beam (direction of magnetic field is out of the page).	24
3.3	Figure (a) and (b) show the input photon beam spectrum used for simulations with 6 and 10 MV beams, respectively.	26
3.3	Figure (c) and (d) show the input photon beam spectrum used for simulations with 15 and 24 MV beams, respectively.	27
3.4	Dose distribution of a 15 MV beam (in water) subjected to a slice of 1, 2, 5, 10, 20 and 100 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), using bin depths of: (a) 0.2 cm, and (b) 0.1 cm.	30
3.5	Effect of the elastic scattering parameters C_1 and C_2 ($C = C_1 = C_2$) on the dose deposition of a 15 MV beam (in water) subjected to a 2 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth).	32
3.6	Dose distribution of Co^{60} , 6, 10, 15 and 24 MV photon beams (in water) subjected to a slice of 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth).	34
3.7	Dose distribution of a 15 MV beam with a slice of 5 T transverse magnetic field (2 cm thick) applied at different depths in the water phantom.	35
3.8	Effect of the magnetic field thickness. Figures (a) and (b) show the effect on the depth-dose of a 15 MV beam when a 2, 5 and 10 T transverse magnetic field is applied at 7.5 to 8.5 cm and 7 to 9 cm depth (i.e. 1 cm and 2 cm thick) in water, respectively.	36
3.8	Effect of the magnetic field thickness. Figures (c) and (d) show the effect on the depth-dose of a 15 MV beam when a 2, 5 and 10 T transverse magnetic field is applied at 6.5 to 9.5 cm and 6 to 10 cm depth (i.e. 3 cm and 4 cm thick) in water, respectively.	37
3.9	Effect of the magnetic field thickness. Figures (a) and (b) compare the effect of a 5 T transverse magnetic field of different thicknesses (1 to 4 cm) on the depth-dose (in water) of a 6 and 10 MV beam respectively.	38

3.9	Effect of the magnetic field thickness. Figures (c) and (d) compare the effect of a 5 T transverse magnetic field of different thicknesses (1 to 4 cm) on the depth-dose (in water) of a 15 and 24 MV beam respectively.	39
3.10	Influence of a magnetic field on the mean distance an electron travels along the beam direction from its origin at 6.9 cm depth.	41
3.11	Secondary electron spectrum of a 15 MV photon beam at different depths (5.5 to 10.5 cm) in water.	42
4.1	Relationship between relative biological effectiveness (RBE) and mean linear energy transfer (LET) for cell killing, where the three curves correspond to different levels of cell survival, or surviving fraction (SF).	48
4.2	Figure (a) plots the absorption and scattering contributions towards the total attenuation of water. Figure (b) plots the PENELOPE atomic photoelectric cross sections of hydrogen (K shell) and oxygen (K, L ₁ , L ₂ , and L ₃ shells).	51
4.3	First generation electron spectra for polyenergetic and monoenergetic photon beams (in water). Figure (a) plots the first generation electron spectra for Co ⁶⁰ , 6, 10, and 15 MV beams. Corresponding electron spectra for 1, 5, 10, and 15 MeV monoenergetic photon beams are shown in figure (b).	56
4.4	Secondary electron spectra (all generations) for a 15 MV beam with depth (in water). Figures (a) and (b) plot the electron spectra in the presence and absence of a slice of 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively.	57
4.5	Normalised electron spectra (below 1 MeV) for a 15 MV beam. Figures (a) and (b) plot a ratio of the electron population in the presence and absence of a 2 and 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively.	59
4.5	Normalised electron spectra (below 1 MeV) for a 15 MV beam. Figures (c) and (d) plot a ratio of the electron population in the presence and absence of a 10 and 20 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively.	60
4.6	Secondary electron spectra (below 10 keV) for a 15 MV beam. Figures (a) and (b) plot the electron spectra in five depth regions in the presence and absence of a 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively.	63
4.7	Normalised electron spectra (below 10 keV) for a 15 MV beam. A ratio of the electron population in five depth regions in the presence and absence of a 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth).	64
4.8	Ratio of electron spectra (below 10 keV) for a 15 MV beam as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the electron population in five depth regions in the presence and absence of a 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, and 20 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth).	64
4.9	Photon spectra (below 10 keV) for a 15 MV beam. Figures (a) and (b) plot the photon spectra with and without a 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively.	66
4.10	Electron spectra (below 1 keV) for a 15 MV beam. Figures (a) and (b) plot the electron spectra with and without a 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively.	67

4.11	Normalised electron spectra (below 1 keV) for a 15 MV beam. Figures (a) and (b) plot a ratio of the electron population in the presence and absence of a 2 and 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively.	68
4.11	Normalised electron spectra (below 1 keV) for a 15 MV beam. Figures (c) and (d) plot a ratio of the electron population in the presence and absence of a 10 and 20 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively.	69
4.12	Spectra of atomic relaxation electrons and photons (in water) for a 15 MV beam. Figures (a) and (b) plot the spectra of atomic relaxation electrons with and without a 5 T transverse magnetic field (7 to 9 cm depth), respectively. Atomic relaxation photons are plotted in figure (c).	70
4.13	Mean w -values of first generation electrons of the following photon beams: (a) Co ⁶⁰ , 6, 10, and 15 MV, and (b) 0.1, 0.5, 1, 5, 10, and 15 MeV.	73
4.14	Distance travelled by electrons before they are deviated from their initial trajectory by a given angle.	74
4.15	Distance electrons travel in water before the angle of deviation from their initial trajectory exceeds 25.8, 45.6, 60, and 90 degrees (i.e. $w = 0.9, 0.7, 0.5,$ and zero). A plot of the accumulative electron population as a function of distance travelled from the origin is shown in figures (a), (b), and (c) for 0.1, 0.5, and 1 MeV electrons, respectively.	75
4.15	Distance electrons travel in water before the angle of deviation from their initial trajectory exceeds 25.8, 45.6, 60, and 90 degrees (i.e. $w = 0.9, 0.7, 0.5,$ and zero). A plot of the accumulative electron population as a function of distance travelled from the origin is shown in figures (d), (e), and (f) for 5, 10, and 15 MeV electrons, respectively.	76
4.16	Population and mean w -values of first generation electrons for 15 MV beam beyond 6.9 cm depth (in water).	77
4.17	Magnetic field's influence on the interaction depths of electrons starting at 6.9 cm depth. Figure (a) plots the electrons' mean z -ranges as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the mean z -ranges with and without magnetic field is shown in figure (b), and a ratio of electrons with final positions downstream of their initial position ($z > z_{start}$) to those with final positions upstream ($z < z_{start}$) is plotted in figure (c).	80
4.17	Magnetic field's influence on the lateral ranges of electrons starting at 6.9 cm depth. Figure (d) plots the mean y -ranges of electrons as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the mean y -ranges with and without magnetic field is shown in figure (e), and a ratio of electrons with negative final y -positions ($y < 0$) to those with positive final y -positions ($y > 0$) is plotted in figure (f).	81
4.18	Magnetic field's influence on the interaction depths of electrons starting at 7.5 cm depth. Figure (a) plots the electrons' mean z -ranges as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the mean z -ranges with and without magnetic field is shown in figure (b), and a ratio of electrons with final positions downstream of their initial position ($z > z_{start}$) to those with final positions upstream ($z < z_{start}$) is plotted in figure (c).	84

4.18	Magnetic field's influence on the lateral ranges of electrons starting at 7.5 cm depth. Figure (d) plots the mean y -ranges of electrons as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the mean y -ranges with and without magnetic field is shown in figure (e), and a ratio of electrons with negative final y -positions ($y < 0$) to those with positive final y -positions ($y > 0$) is plotted in figure (f).	85
4.19	Magnetic field's influence on the interaction depths of electrons starting at 8.5 cm depth. Figure (a) plots the electrons' mean z -ranges as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the mean z -ranges with and without magnetic field is shown in figure (b), and a ratio of electrons with final positions downstream of their initial position ($z > z_{start}$) to those with final positions upstream ($z < z_{start}$) is plotted in figure (c).	88
4.19	Magnetic field's influence on the lateral ranges of electrons starting at 8.5 cm depth. Figure (d) plots the mean y -ranges of electrons as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the mean y -ranges with and without magnetic field is shown in figure (e), and a ratio of electrons with negative final y -positions ($y < 0$) to those with positive final y -positions ($y > 0$) is plotted in figure (f).	89
4.20	Magnetic field's influence on the interaction depths of electrons starting at 8.9 cm depth. Figure (a) plots the electrons' mean z -ranges as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the mean z -ranges with and without magnetic field is shown in figure (b), and a ratio of electrons with final positions downstream of their initial position ($z > z_{start}$) to those with final positions upstream ($z < z_{start}$) is plotted in figure (c).	91
4.20	Magnetic field's influence on the lateral ranges of electrons starting at 8.9 cm depth. Figure (d) plots the mean y -ranges of electrons as a function of magnetic field. A ratio of the mean y -ranges with and without magnetic field is shown in figure (e), and a ratio of electrons with negative final y -positions ($y < 0$) to those with positive final y -positions ($y > 0$) is plotted in figure (f).	92
5.1	Schematic diagram of a p -MOSFET (Metal-Oxide-Semiconductor Field Effect Transistor) dosimeter.	103
5.2	Schematic diagram of the MOSFET reader. The MOSFET dosimeter is read out under a constant current I_D with the gate and source grounded. The threshold voltage, V_{th} , measured across the MOSFET is proportional to the dose deposited in the SiO_2 gate oxide.	104
5.3	The dose response of MOSFET dosimeters to effective radiation energy. The dose response (in free-air geometry) was normalised to that obtained with 6 MV X-rays from a medical linear accelerator.	106
5.4	X-ray energy spectrum for MRT measured at the ESRF ID-17 biomedical beamline.	107
5.5	Schematic diagram of the MRT setup at the ESRF ID-17 beamline.	108
5.6	Scanning electron microscope image of the REM TOT500 RADFET chip ($1 \times 1 \times 0.5 \text{ mm}^3$), which shows the two low-sensitive MOSFETs, Q2 and Q3, and two high-sensitive MOSFETs, Q1 and Q4. The direction of the X-ray microbeam is indicated by the arrows.	110
5.7	Illustration of the MOSFET configuration used to scan the dose profiles of monoenergetic microbeams, where the beam direction is into the page.	112

5.8	Radiation response of MOSFET dosimeters. Figure (a) plots the normalised response of a MOSFET(H) dosimeter subjected to 43×0.15 s pulses of white beam radiation. The response of a MOSFET(L) dosimeter to 19×0.03 s irradiations with a 50 keV beam is shown in figure (b).	115
5.8	Radiation response of MOSFET dosimeters. Figure (c) plots the normalised response of a MOSFET(H) dosimeter subjected to 20×0.15 s pulses of irradiation with a 50 keV beam. The response of a MOSFET(H) dosimeter to 25×10 s irradiations with a 100 keV beam is shown in figure (d).	116
5.9	Dose profiles of monoenergetic microbeams measured at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) with a MOSFET(L) dosimeter. Figures (a) and (b) show the dose profile of the central peak in an array of 24 microbeams (peak 12) for 30 and 50 keV beams, respectively.	118
5.9	Dose profiles of monoenergetic microbeams measured at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) with a MOSFET(L) dosimeter. Figures (c) and (d) show the dose profile of the central peak in an array of 24 microbeams (peak 12) for 70 and 100 keV beams, respectively.	119
5.10	Dose profile of the central peak in an array of 24 microbeams (peak 12) obtained with the ESRF white beam and measured with a MOSFET(H) dosimeter at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex).	120
5.11	Comparison of the dose profile of the central peak in an array of 24 microbeams (peak 12) measured with a MOSFET at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) for the white beam and monoenergetic beams of 30, 50, 70, and 100 keV.	121
5.12	Simulated dose profile of the central microbeam in an array of 24 microbeams (peak 12) obtained at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) for the white beam and monoenergetic beams of 30, 50, 70, and 100 keV.	122
5.13	Simulated penumbral and valley dose of a single microbeam, and the central microbeam (peak 12) in an array of 24 microbeams. Figures (a) and (b) plot the dose profile of a single microbeam and peak 12, respectively, at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) for the white beam and monoenergetic beams of 30, 50, 70, and 100 keV.	123
5.14	Simulated microbeam profile showing the dose distribution according to the type of initial photon interaction. Figures (a) and (b) plot the dose contributions of a single microbeam at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) for monoenergetic beams of 30 and 50 keV, respectively.	124
5.14	Simulated microbeam profile showing the dose distribution according to the type of initial photon interaction. Figures (c) and (d) plot the dose contributions of a single microbeam at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) for monoenergetic beams of 70 and 100 keV, respectively.	125
5.15	Comparison of the Continuous Slowing Down Approximation (CSDA) range of electrons in silicon and perspex.	126
5.16	Photon interaction cross sections in silicon.	128
5.17	Measured PVDR of the central microbeam in an array of 24 (peak 12) calculated from peak and valley doses obtained at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) for 30, 50, and 70 keV beams and the white beam (maximum intensity of 83 keV).	129

5.18	Simulated PVDR of the central microbeam in an array of 24 (peak 12) calculated from the theoretical dose profiles at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) for 30, 50, 70, and 100 keV beams and the white beam (maximum intensity of 83 keV).	130
5.19	Measured PVDRs of microbeams 12, 17, and 22 (in an array of 24 microbeams) for the 50 keV and white beams, calculated from peak and valley dose measurements obtained with a MOSFET at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex).	132
5.20	Simulated PVDRs of microbeams 12, 17, and 22 (in an array of 24 microbeams) for the 50 keV and white beams, calculated from the theoretical dose profiles obtained at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex). The 50 keV measured PVDRs (meas 50 keV) are also shown for comparison.	133
5.21	Simulated PVDRs for an array of 24 microbeams, calculated from the theoretical dose profiles obtained at 1.1 cm depth (in perspex) with the white beam and 30, 50, 70, and 100 keV monoenergetic beams.	134
5.22	Measured and simulated PVDRs with depth (in perspex) for the central peak in an array of three microbeams (peak 2) produced with a white beam. The measured PVDRs were obtained at 0.9, 1.9, and 2.8 cm depth, and the theoretical PVDRs at various depths up to 1.2 cm.	134
5.23	Simulated peak and valley doses for the central peak in an array of three microbeams (peak 2) up to 2.8 cm depth (in perspex). Peak and valley doses have been normalised to their maximum values.	135
6.1	Impact of different types of interaction on the lateral dose profile of a single microbeam (25 μm wide) obtained with the ESRF white beam. Curve 1 plots the microbeam profile comprising all interaction contributions. Curves 2, 3, and 4 plot the profile with suppression of the photoelectric effect, Compton scattering, and electron tracking, respectively.	140
6.2	Simulated first generation electron spectrum of the ESRF white beam (in perspex).	141
6.3	Photos of the 1 T transverse magnetic field device used for magneto-MRT experiments (direction of magnetic field is towards the handle). The magnet device (right) was mounted on the goniometer stage, where a perspex phantom containing a MOSFET was wedged between the magnet poles (left).	143
6.4	Illustration of the 1 T longitudinal magnetic field device used for magneto-MRT experiments. A 0.3 cm diameter hole was drilled through the centre of the permanent magnets to allow the passage of microbeams parallel to the direction of magnetic field.	144
6.5	Scatter contributions from different magnet materials. Figure (a) plots the depth-dose profile of a pencil beam simulated with different magnet materials (NdFeB, perspex, and air) in three regions along central axis: air cavity 1, perspex phantom, and air cavity 2. Figure (b) plots the depth-dose profile with perspex replacing the air in cavity 2.	147
6.6	Effect of magnet scatter contributions on the radial dose. Figure (a) plots a ratio of the radial dose with and without NdFeB magnets, at the following depths: 2.48 cm (exit of air cavity 1), 2.60 and 2.90 cm (1 and 4 mm depth in perspex), and 3.02 cm (entrance to air cavity 2). Figures (b) and (c) plots the corresponding radial dose with perspex magnets instead of NdFeB, and perspex replacing the air in cavity 2.	148

6.7	Photo of the 2 T longitudinal magnetic field device used for magneto-MRT experiments. The device comprises a pair of cylindrical NdFeB permanent magnets with steel focus cones and a U-shaped iron circuit to maximise magnetic flux.	150
6.8	MATLAB simulation of the magnetic flux produced by the longitudinal magnetic field device. A maximum field of 2.2 T was calculated between the focus cones, which were separated by 1 cm.	151
6.9	Photos of the magnet coil used for magneto-MRT experiments. The 828-turn copper coil was mounted on the goniometer (left), where the cylindrical perspex phantom (housing the MOSFET) was inserted into the air core and secured to a perspex block behind the coil (right).	153
6.10	Oscilloscope output verifying the synchronisation of the current pulse (i.e. pulsed magnetic field) and the rectangular diode pulse (i.e. beam delivery).	153
6.11	Oscilloscope output verifying the coincidence of the pulsed current (i.e. discharge of capacitors) and magnetic field. Delay between the current and diode pulses was adjusted to provide a maximum magnetic field during irradiation of the target.	154
6.12	Lateral dose profile of an array of three microbeams measured with a MOSFET at 0.9 cm depth (in perspex) in the presence of a 1 T transverse magnetic field.	156
6.13	Effect of a 1 T transverse magnetic field on the valley dose of an array of three microbeams. Figures (a) and (b) plot the dose profiles of valley regions V_{12} and V_{23} (i.e. left and right of the central microbeam, peak 2) respectively, measured with a MOSFET at 0.9 cm depth (in perspex) in the presence and absence of magnetic field.	157
6.14	Valley dose for an an array of three microbeams measured with a MOSFET at 0.9, 1.9, and 2.8 cm depth (in perspex). Figures (a) and (b) plot the dose at the centre of valleys V_{12} and V_{23} (i.e. left and right of the central microbeam, peak 2) respectively, in the presence and absence of a 1 T transverse magnetic field.	158
6.14	Peak dose and PVDR for the central microbeam in an array of three microbeams (peak 2) measured with a MOSFET at 0.9, 1.9, and 2.8 cm depth (in perspex), in the presence and absence of a 1 T transverse magnetic field, is shown in figures (c) and (d) respectively. The PVDR was calculated using the dose at the centre of peak 2 and valleys V_{12} and V_{23} on either side.	159
6.15	Simulated effect of a transverse magnetic field on the dose profile of an array of three microbeams. A plot of the microbeam array scored between 0.8 and 1.0 cm depth (in perspex) in the presence and absence of a 2 and 100 T transverse magnetic field.	161
6.16	Dose profile of an array of three microbeams measured with Gafchromic film at 0.1, 0.2, 0.7, 1.1, and 1.2 cm depths (in perspex) in the absence of magnetic field.	162
6.17	Peak dose of the central microbeam in an array of three microbeams (peak 2) with depth. A plot of the peak dose measured with Gafchromic film at depths (in perspex) of 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, and 0.4 cm in the presence of a 1 T longitudinal magnetic field, and 0.1, 0.2, 0.7, 1.1, and 1.2 cm in the absence of magnetic field.	163

6.18	Effect of a 1 T longitudinal magnetic field on the peak and valley doses of an array of three microbeams. Figures (a) and (b) show the peak and valley dose profiles, respectively, measured with Gafchromic film at 0.2 cm depth (in perspex) in the presence and absence of magnetic field.	164
6.19	Simulated effect of a longitudinal magnetic field on the dose profile of a single microbeam. A plot of the profile scored between 1.0 and 1.2 cm depth (in perspex) in the presence and absence of a 2, 10, 20, 50, and 100 T magnetic field.	166
6.20	Simulated effect of a longitudinal magnetic field on the dose profile of an array of three microbeams. Figure (a) shows the dose profile of the array scored between 1.0 and 1.2 cm depth (in perspex) in the presence and absence of a 2, 10, 20, 50, and 100 T magnetic field. A ratio of the dose profile with and without magnetic field is plotted in figure (b).	168
6.21	Simulated effect of a longitudinal magnetic field on the PVDR of an array of three microbeams. A plot of the PVDR of the central microbeam against magnetic field strength, using the dose profiles scored between 1.0 and 1.2 cm depth (in perspex).	169
7.1	Photo of the Tecomet [®] multislit collimator (left) which comprises two identical tungsten air stacks mounted in an aluminum frame. Each stack (right) contains 125 parallel, 100 μm wide, 8 mm deep apertures with 400 μm centre-to-centre spacing.	173
7.2	Illustration of the lateral offset of the multislit collimator stacks. Figure (a) illustrates the adjustment of microbeam width by laterally moving one stack relative to the other (as indicated by arrows). Figure (b) shows an enlargement of a single collimator element, comparing the photon transmission through the central collimator aperture (C) and the fifth apertures to the left and right of centre (L5 and R5 respectively).	176
7.3	Illustration of the effect of multislit collimator alignment. Figure (a) shows the multislit collimator rotated through a small positive angle (with respect to the beam). Figure (b) shows an enlargement of a single collimator element, comparing the photon transmission through the central aperture (C) and the fifth apertures to the left and right of centre (L5 and R5 respectively).	178
7.4	The influence of the beam divergence (i.e. source to target distance). Figure (a) compares the dose profile of a single microbeam scored between 1 and 2 cm depth (in water) with and without beam divergence (Diverge and On Phantom, respectively). A ratio of the Diverge and On Phantom profiles is shown in figure (b).	180
7.5	The effect of the multislit collimator. Figure (a) plots a ratio of the dose profile of a single microbeam obtained with and without the multislit collimator (MSC and NoMSC, respectively) and a point source (Pt src). A ratio of the corresponding MSC and NoMSC profiles obtained with a distributed source (Dist src) is plotted in figure (b). All dose profiles were scored between 1 and 2 cm depth in water.	182
7.6	The effect of the source model. Figure (a) compares the dose profile of a single microbeam obtained with a point source (Pt src) to that produced by a distributed source (Dist src), using the multislit collimator (MSC). The dose profiles were scored between 1 and 2 cm depth (in water), where a ratio of the profiles is plotted in figure (b).	183

7.7	The effect of the multislit collimator (MSC) lateral offset. Figures (a) and (b) compare the dose profile of the central microbeam (C single) with those obtained for the 5th and 12th microbeams to the left and right of centre, respectively (i.e. in LHS array and RHS array).	185
7.7	The effect of the multislit collimator (MSC) lateral offset. Figures (c) and (d) compare the dose profiles of the 5th and 12th microbeams on either side of centre, respectively (i.e. L5 single with R5 single and L12 single with R12 single).	186
7.8	The effect of the simulation model. Figure (a) compares the dose profile of the central microbeam simulated with the single-beam and full array models (C single and C full, respectively) and scored between 1 and 2 cm depth in water. A ratio of these C profiles, and those obtained for the L12 and R12 microbeams at either edge of the array, are shown in figure (b).	189
7.9	Effect of the simulation model. Figure (a) shows the dose profile of a single microbeam used by the superposition model. Figure (b) plots the dose profile of the sup and full arrays obtained with the superposition and full array models, respectively, where a ratio of these profiles is shown in figure (c). All profiles were scored between 1 and 2 cm depth (in water).	191
7.10	The effect of the simulation model. Figure (a) plots a ratio of the sup and full array dose profiles of the L12 and R12 microbeams at the left and right edges of the array, respectively. Figure (b) compares the central microbeam profile in the full array (C full) with those at the left and right edges of the array (L12 full and R12 full, respectively).	193
7.11	The effect of the simulation model. Figure (a) compares the PVDRs of microbeams in the sup array and full array. A ratio of the peak and valley doses and PVDRs of microbeams in the sup and full arrays is plotted in figure (b).	194
7.12	The effect of the multislit collimator alignment on the dose profile of an array of 25 microbeams. Figures (a), (b), and (c) compare the dose profile of the full array with and without collimator rotations of $\pm 0.05^\circ$, $\pm 0.1^\circ$, and $\pm 0.2^\circ$ respectively.	196
7.13	The effect of the multislit collimator alignment on the dose profile of the central microbeam. Figures (a), (b), and (c) compare the dose profile of the central microbeam (C) produced with and without collimator rotations of $\pm 0.05^\circ$, $\pm 0.1^\circ$, and $\pm 0.2^\circ$ respectively.	197
7.14	The effect of positive angles of collimator rotation on the dose profiles of microbeams. Figures (a), (b), and (c) compare the dose profile of the central microbeam (C full) with those at the left and right edges of the array (L12 full and R12 full) for collimator rotations of 0.05, 0.1, and 0.2° respectively.	198
7.15	The effect of negative angles of collimator rotation on the dose profiles of microbeams. Figures (a), (b), and (c) compare the dose profile of the central microbeam (C full) with those at the left and right edges of the array (L12 full and R12 full) for collimator rotations of -0.05, -0.1, and -0.2° respectively.	200

7.16	The effect of the multislit collimator alignment on the peak and valley doses of microbeams. Figures (a) and (b) respectively compare the peak and valley doses of a microbeam array (normalised to dose in the central microbeam) with and without collimator rotations of $\pm 0.05^\circ$, $\pm 0.1^\circ$, and 0.2° . The dose profile obtained with a -0.2° rotation is not shown owing to poor statistics.	201
7.17	The effect of the multislit collimator alignment on the PVDRs of microbeams. Figure (a) compares the PVDRs of a microbeam array obtained with collimator rotations of $\pm 0.05^\circ$, $\pm 0.1^\circ$, and $\pm 0.2^\circ$. A ratio of the PVDRs with and without collimator rotation is plotted in figure (b).	202
7.18	The effect of the multislit collimator design on microbeam profiles. Figure (a) compares the dose profile of the central microbeam produced with the dual stack collimator (C full) with those at the left and right edges of array (L12 full and R12 full). The corresponding microbeam profiles obtained with a single stack collimator are shown in figure (b).	204
7.19	Effect of the alignment of the single stack collimator on the dose profiles of microbeams. Figures (a) and (b) plot the dose profiles of the central microbeam (C full) and the L12 full and R12 full microbeams (at the left and right edges of the array) produced with the single stack collimator rotated through 0.05° and -0.05° , respectively.	206
7.20	Effect of the interaction medium on microbeam profiles. Figure (a) compares the dose profile of the central peak in an array of 25 microbeams (C full) scored between 1 and 2 cm depth in water (H_2O) and polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA). A ratio of the dose profiles is shown in figure (b).	208
7.21	Single microbeam profile showing the dose distribution according to the type of initial photon interaction in water (H_2O) and polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) for a 100 keV beam, where CS = Compton scattering, PE = Photoelectric effect, and Total = contributions from CS, PE, and Rayleigh scattering.	209
7.22	Effect of the height of scoring regions on the valley dose of microbeams. Comparison of the valley dose of the central microbeam (C full) in five lateral slices (each 0.2 cm high) to the total valley dose in all slices (i.e. 0 to 1 cm).	210
7.23	Effect of the height of scoring regions on the PVDR of microbeams. A ratio of the PVDR in five individual lateral slices (each 0.2 cm high) to the total PVDR integrated over all slices (i.e. 0 to 1 cm).	210
A.24	Circuit diagram of the pulse time delay. Discharge of the capacitor bank was initiated with a trigger signal generated from either a manual trigger button on the control panel or by an external transistor-transistor logic (TTL) input pulse.	224
A.25	Circuit diagram of current pulser. When a current of 200 A was pulsed through the coil, a magnetic field of about 2.5 T was estimated at the centre of the coil's air core.	225
A.26	Test results for the magnet coil. Charging the capacitor bank to 300 V enabled a discharge current of around 200 A to be pulsed through the coil. This corresponded to a peak flux of 1.3 T at the centre of the coil's surface.	226