

This is a provisional PDF only. Copyedited and fully formatted version will be made available soon.

REPORTS OF PRACTICAL ONCOLOGY AND RADIOTHERAPY

ISSN: 1507-1367

e-ISSN: 2083-4640

IROCA-TES: Improving Quality in Radiation Oncology through Clinical Audits – Training and Education for Standardization

Authors: Julian Malicki, Carla Lopez Castro, Magdalena Fundowicz, Marco Krengli, Carmen Llacer-Moscardo, Sebastian Curcean, Carles Munoz-Montplet, Luisa Carvalho, Ewelina Konstany, Tania Patricia Hernández Barragán, Carla Pisani, Peter Isvan Laszlo, Miquel Macia Garau, Marta Kruszyna-Mochalska, Joana Lencart, Dorota Zwierzchowska, Alvar Rosello, Adelina Brezae, Eva Loureiro Varela, Piotr Milecki, Micol Zannetti, Coza Ovidiu, Eva Gonzalez, Debora beldi, Ferran Guedea

DOI: 10.5603/RPOR.a2023.0035

Article type: Letter to the Editor

Published online: 2023-06-13

This article has been peer reviewed and published immediately upon acceptance. It is an open access article, which means that it can be downloaded, printed, and distributed freely,

provided the work is properly cited.

IROCA-TES: Improving Quality in Radiation Oncology through Clinical Audits — Training and Education for Standardization

10.5603/RPOR.a2023.0035

Julian Malicki^{1, 2}, Carla Lopez Castro³, Magdalena Fundowicz⁴, Marco Krengli^{5, 6}, Carmen Llacer-Moscardo⁷, Sebastian Curcean⁸, Carles Munoz-Montplet⁹, Luisa Carvalho¹⁰, Ewelina Konstany¹¹, Tania Patricia Hernández Barragán¹², Carla Pisani¹³, Peter Isvan Laszlo¹⁴, Miquel Macia Garau¹⁵, Marta Kruszyna-Mochalska¹¹, Joana Lencart¹⁶, Dorota Zwierzchowska¹, Alvar Rosello¹⁵, Adelina Brezae¹⁷, Eva Loureiro Varela¹⁸, Piotr Milecki¹⁹, Micol Zannetti²⁰, Coza Ovidiu²¹, Eva Gonzalez²², Debora Beldi^{20, 23}, Ferran Guedea²⁴

^{1,2}nd Radiotherapy Department, Greater Poland Cancer Centre, Poznan, Poland

²Faculty of Medicine, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran

³Department of Radiotherapy, Instituto Português de Oncologia do Porto Francisco Gentil EPE, Porto, Portugal

⁴Radiotherapy Ward I, Greater Poland Cancer Centre, Poznan, Poland

⁵Translational Medicine, University of Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy

⁶Translational Medicine, University Hospital Maggiore della Carità, Maggiore della Carità — Novara, Italy

⁷Radiation Therapy, ICM Montpellier, Montpellier, France

⁸Department of Radiation Oncology, Oncology Institute Prof Dr Ion Chiricuta, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

⁹Medical Physics and Radiation Protection, Institut Català d'Oncologia Girona, Girona, Spain

¹⁰Radiation Oncology, IPO-PORTO, Porto, Portugal

¹¹Medical Physics Department, Greater Poland Cancer Centre, Poznan, Poland

¹²Hospital de Especialidades Centro Médico Nacional de Occidente IMSS, Guadalajara, Mexico

¹³Radiotherapy, Novara Hospital, Novara, Italy

¹⁴Department of Radiation Oncology, Oncology Institute Prof Dr Ion Chiricuta, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

¹⁵Department of Radiation Oncology, Catalan Institute of Oncology, Barcelona, Spain

¹⁶Medical Physics Service & Medical Physics, Instituto Português de Oncologia do Porto, Radiobiology and Radiation Protection Group CI-IPOP, Porto, Portugal

¹⁷Montpellier Cancer Research Institute, Montpellier, France

¹⁸Department of Information Systems, L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Catalan Institute of Oncology, Spain

¹⁹Department of Radiotherapy, Greater Poland Cancer Centre, Poznan, Poland

²⁰Division of Radiation Oncology, University Hospital Maggiore della Carità, Novara, Novara, Italy

²¹Department of Radiotherapy with High Energies and Brachytherapy, Oncology Institute Prof Dr Ion Chiricuta, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

²²Department of Processes & Quality Management, L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Catalan Institute of Oncology, Spain

²³University of Eastern Piedmont, Maggiore della Carità Hospital, Novara, Italy

²⁴Institut Catala d'Oncologia, L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Spain

Correspondence to: Julian Malicki, 2nd Radiotherapy Department, Greater Poland Cancer Centre, Poznan, Poland; e-mail: Julian.malicki@wco.pl

Abstract

Background: Clinical audits are an important tool to objectively assess clinical protocols, procedures, and processes and to detect deviations from good clinical practice. The main aim of this project is to determine adherence to a core set of consensus-based quality indicators and then to compare the institutions in order to identify best practices.

Materials and methods: We conduct a multicentre, international clinical audit of six comprehensive cancer centres in Poland, Spain, Italy, Portugal, France, and Romania as a part of the project, known as IROCATES (Improving Quality in Radiation Oncology through Clinical Audits — Training and Education for Standardization).

Results: Radiotherapy practice varies from country to country, in part due to historical, economic, linguistic, and cultural differences. The institutions developed their own processes to suit their existing clinical practice.

Conclusions: We believe that this study will contribute to establishing the value of routinely performing multi-institutional clinical audits and will lead to improvement of radiotherapy practice at the participating centres.

Key words: radiotherapy; clinical audit; quality indicators

Introduction

Radiotherapy treatment planning and delivery has become increasingly complex in recent years due to technological advances in radiotherapy equipment. The introduction of advanced techniques has improved clinical outcomes by allowing for precise dose delivery to the target while reducing radiation doses to critical organs. However, given the importance of ensuring the precision of radiation delivery [1–3], it is essential to optimize the radiotherapy process and to implement procedures designed to detect and prevent errors [4]. In this context, clinical audits are an important tool to objectively assess clinical protocols, procedures, and processes. Clinical audits are widely used in medicine and offer numerous benefits, including the capacity to detect deviations from good clinical practice.

The main aim of this project is to determine adherence to a core set of consensus-based quality indicators—jointly established by the partners in accordance with the best available evidence—and then to compare the institutions in order to identify best practices. A second aim is to harmonise radiotherapy practice among the participating centres and to promote the use of advanced radiotherapy equipment (which is more effective, accurate, and safer than older technologies), and to encourage the wider application of clinical audits. The ultimate objective is to improve treatment outcomes for patients.

Materials and methods

The clinical audits will evaluate clinical and treatment-related data for 100 patients per tumour site (rectal and prostate cancer) to verify adherence to a set of quality indicators. The audit will be performed by analysing the medical records of patients treated between January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2019.

Results

Despite the widespread availability of clinical guidelines and protocols, radiotherapy practice varies from country to country, in part due to historical, economic, linguistic, and cultural differences. In addition, new technologies tend to be incorporated only gradually, centre-by-centre, over time [5]. As a result, institutions often have to develop their own processes to suit their existing clinical practice. While some variation between countries and centres is normal and expected, it is clear that every effort must be made to adhere to established, evidence-based protocols. This is especially important in radiation oncology, in which even small deviations can have major negative effects.

To date, inter-institutional external clinical audits have been used only sparingly in radiotherapy [6–10]. However, there is a growing interest in expanding the use of clinical audits and quality indicators, including a directive from the European Union [11–14]. Given the proven benefits of external audits, together with the need to harmonise clinical practice in Europe, our group previously carried out a multicentre clinical audit in four different European countries (Spain, Poland, Portugal, and Italy). The results of that study, known as IROCA (*Improving Quality in Radiation Oncology through Clinical Audits*) [15, 16], revealed important differences in clinical practice in radiotherapy planning and delivery for rectal and prostate cancer.

Currently, our group is conducting a multicentre, international clinical audit of six comprehensive cancer centres in Poland, Spain, Italy, Portugal, France, and Romania. This project, known as IROCA-TES (*Improving Quality in Radiation Oncology through Clinical Audits–Training and Education for Standardization*), involves the following centres: 1) Catalan Institute of Oncology (ICO, Barcelona, Spain), 2) Greater Poland Cancer Centre (GPCC; Poznan, Poland), 3) Instituto Português de Oncologia do Porto Francisco Gentil (IPO, Porto, Portugal), 4) University Hospital Maggiore della Carita (UPO, Novara, Italy), 5) Cancer Institute of Montpellier (ICM, Montpellier, France), and 6) The Oncology Institute Prof. Dr. Ion Chiricuta (IOCN, Cluj Napoca, Romania).

The IROCA-TES project can be considered, at least partly, a follow-up to the original IROCA study. However, the new study has been expanded to include more centres and more patients. In addition, the study design has been improved and streamlined based on our previous experience.

The focus will be on evaluating medical, dosimetric, and technical data related to diagnosis and treatment. A questionnaire will be used to guide collection of the study data, which will then be entered into a purpose-built online database. After all data have been collected and entered into the database, the auditing team will prepare a report and meet with the audited institution to discuss the results. A series of meetings will be held to discuss the findings and to reach a consensus on harmonising the radiotherapy procedures and processes.

Conclusion

The primary objectives of this study are to improve clinical practice at the participating centres and to identify “best practices”, which can then be implemented at all participating centres to improve treatment outcomes for the benefit of our patients. Finally, we believe that

this study will contribute to establishing the value of routinely performing multi-institutional clinical audits.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

Financial disclosure

None declared.

Acknowledgements

We thank Bradley Londres for professional language editing.

References

1. Malicki J, Piotrowski T, Guedea F, et al. Treatment-integrated imaging, radiomics, and personalised radiotherapy: the future is at hand. *Rep Pract Oncol Radiother.* 2022; 27(4): 734–743, doi: [10.5603/RPOR.a2022.0071](https://doi.org/10.5603/RPOR.a2022.0071), indexed in Pubmed: [36196410](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36196410/).
2. Adamczyk M, Piotrowski T, Adamiak E, et al. Dosimetric consequences of prostate-based couch shifts on the precision of dose delivery during simultaneous IMRT irradiation of the prostate, seminal vesicles and pelvic lymph nodes. *Phys Med.* 2014; 30(2): 228–233, doi: [10.1016/j.ejmp.2013.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmp.2013.06.003), indexed in Pubmed: [23860339](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23860339/).
3. Peszynska-Piorun M, Malicki J, Golusinski W. Doses in organs at risk during head and neck radiotherapy using IMRT and 3D-CRT. *Radiol Oncol.* 2012; 46(4): 328–336, doi: [10.2478/v10019-012-0050-y](https://doi.org/10.2478/v10019-012-0050-y), indexed in Pubmed: [23412761](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23412761/).
4. Malicki J, Bly R, Bulot M, et al. Patient safety in external beam radiotherapy, results of the ACCIRAD project: Recommendations for radiotherapy institutions and national authorities on assessing risks and analysing adverse error-events and near misses. *Radiother Oncol.* 2018; 127(2): 164–170, doi: [10.1016/j.radonc.2018.04.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2018.04.006), indexed in Pubmed: [29729846](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29729846/).
5. Grau C, Defourny N, Malicki J, et al. HERO consortium. Radiotherapy equipment and departments in the European countries: final results from the ESTRO-HERO survey. *Radiother Oncol.* 2014; 112(2): 155–164, doi: [10.1016/j.radonc.2014.08.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2014.08.029), indexed in Pubmed: [25443859](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25443859/).
6. Fundowicz M, Macia M, Marin S, et al. Preoperative radiotherapy for rectal cancer: a comparative study of quality control adherence at two cancer hospitals in Spain and Poland. *Radiol Oncol.* 2014; 48(2): 210–218, doi: [10.2478/raon-2014-0008](https://doi.org/10.2478/raon-2014-0008), indexed in Pubmed: [24991212](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24991212/).
7. Scalliet PGM. Federal College of Radiotherapy, Brussels. Clinical radiotherapy audits in Belgium, 2011-2014. *Cancer Radiother.* 2015; 19(6-7): 621–623, doi: [10.1016/j.canrad.2015.05.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canrad.2015.05.006), indexed in Pubmed: [26321683](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26321683/).
8. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Comprehensive audits of radiotherapy practices: a tool for quality improvement. Quality assurance team for radiation oncology (QUATRO). Vienna: International Atomic Energy Agency; 2007. <http://www-pub.iaea.org/books/IAEABooks/7680/Comprehensive-Audits-of-Radiotherapy-Practices-A-Tool-for-Quality-Improvement> (04.08.17).

9. Pechačová Z, Suková J, Lohynská R, et al. Internal clinical audit at a radiotherapy department - our own experience. *Onkologie*. 2022; 16(4): 173-176, doi: [10.36290/xon.2022.033](https://doi.org/10.36290/xon.2022.033).
10. Torras MG, Canals E, Jurado-Bruggeman D, et al. Clinical Audit of the Radiotherapy Process in Rectal Cancer: Clinical Practice Guidelines and Quality Certification Do Not Avert Variability in Clinical Practice. *Transl Oncol*. 2018; 11(3): 794-799, doi: [10.1016/j.tranon.2018.03.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranon.2018.03.015), indexed in Pubmed: [29704788](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29704788/).
11. Cionini L, Gardani G, Gabriele P, et al. Italian Working Group General Indicators. Quality indicators in radiotherapy. *Radiother Oncol*. 2007; 82(2): 191-200, doi: [10.1016/j.radonc.2006.12.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2006.12.009), indexed in Pubmed: [17267059](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17267059/).
12. Danielson B, Brundage M, Pearcey R, et al. Development of indicators of the quality of radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer. *Radiother Oncol*. 2011; 99(1): 29-36, doi: [10.1016/j.radonc.2011.02.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2011.02.013), indexed in Pubmed: [21458094](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21458094/).
13. Council Directive 2013/59/EURATOM, of 5 December 2013 laying down basic safety standards for protection against the dangers arising from exposure to ionising radiation, and repealing Directives 89/618/Euratom, 90/641/Euratom, 96/29/Euratom, 97/43/Euratom and 2003/122/Euratom 2003.
14. Rosi A. Clinical audit on quality indicators in radiotherapy: Guidelines for a modern radiotherapy [Audit clinico su indicatori di qualità in radioterapia: Linee guida per una moderna radioterapia]. *Rivista Medica*. 2007; 13(3): 103-107.
15. Fundowicz M, Aguiar A, de Castro CL, et al. Multicentre clinical radiotherapy audit in rectal cancer: results of the IROCA project. *Radiat Oncol*. 2020; 15(1): 208, doi: [10.1186/s13014-020-01648-7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-020-01648-7), indexed in Pubmed: [32854730](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32854730/).
16. Lopes de Castro C, Fundowicz M, Roselló A, et al. Results of the IROCA international clinical audit in prostate cancer radiotherapy at six comprehensive cancer centres. *Sci Rep*. 2021; 11(1): 12323, doi: [10.1038/s41598-021-91723-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-91723-0), indexed in Pubmed: [34112863](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34112863/).