



Thomas Jefferson University
Jefferson Digital Commons

Department of Radiation Oncology Faculty Papers

Department of Radiation Oncology

9-1-2009

In Reply to Dr. Hurkmans et al.

Ying Xiao, PhD

Thomas Jefferson University, Ying.Xiao@jeffersonhospital.org

Lech S. Papiez, PhD

University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

James M. Galvin, DSc

Thomas Jefferson University

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://jdc.jefferson.edu/radoncfp>

 Part of the [Oncology Commons](#), and the [Radiology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Xiao, PhD, Ying; Papiez, PhD, Lech S.; and Galvin, DSc, James M., "In Reply to Dr. Hurkmans et al." (2009). *Department of Radiation Oncology Faculty Papers*. Paper 9.

<http://jdc.jefferson.edu/radoncfp/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jefferson Digital Commons. The Jefferson Digital Commons is a service of Thomas Jefferson University's [Center for Teaching and Learning \(CTL\)](#). The Commons is a showcase for Jefferson books and journals, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, unique historical collections from the University archives, and teaching tools. The Jefferson Digital Commons allows researchers and interested readers anywhere in the world to learn about and keep up to date with Jefferson scholarship. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Radiation Oncology Faculty Papers by an authorized administrator of the Jefferson Digital Commons. For more information, please contact: JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu.

As submitted to: *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*

***Biology Physics* and later published as:**

In Reply to Dr. Hurkmans et al.

International Journal of Radiation Oncology Biology Physics,

Volume 75, Issue 1, 1 September 2009, Page 318

DOI: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2009.05.051

We thank Hurkmans et al for their interest in our published manuscript. The points they raised were 1) not reporting on the volume dependence of the deviation from intended target coverage when density corrected is applied, 2) recommended criteria with heterogeneity correction are based upon plans that are not optimized with heterogeneity correction. We specified in the manuscript the limitation that the density corrected plans were not optimized. We agree with Hurkmans et al that this is a very important point to present. The optimized criteria should also include consideration of other important factors such as tumor motion management. The recommended criteria were intended to be an initial guidance to further investigation to optimize these criteria. We have initiated the investigation with the cases from RTOG study 0236 and planed against criteria from Xiao et al¹, RTOG 0813 and those from ROSEL study². Of the twenty cases we studied, we found that these were comparable criteria. Similar cases fulfill or fail either set of criteria. Further investigations and fine tuning of the criteria involving more cases from an increased number of institutions are warranted to ensure acceptable balance between plan quality and accrual for future SBRT lung clinical trials.

Ying Xiao, PhD

Radiation Oncology

Thomas Jefferson University

Philadelphia, PA 19107

Lech S Papiez, PhD

Radiation Oncology

UT Southwestern Medical Center

Dallas, TX 75390

James M Galvin, DSc

Radiation Oncology

Thomas Jefferson University

Philadelphia, PA 19107

REFERENCES

1. Xiao Y, Papiez L, Paulus R, et al. Dosimetric evaluation of heterogeneity corrections for RTOG 0236: Stereotactic body radiotherapy of inoperable stage I-II Non-Small-cell lung cancer. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biology*Physics*. 2009;73:1235-1242.

2. Hurkmans CW, Cuijpers JP, Lagerwaard FJ, et al. Recommendations for implementing stereotactic radiotherapy in peripheral stage IA non-small cell lung cancer: Report from the quality assurance working party of the randomised phase III ROSEL study. *Radiat Oncol.* 2009;4:1 Accessed 4/29/2009.