

## Activity Simulations and First Results on Phantom Positioning

Veronica Ferrero, Elisa Fiorina, Francesco Pennazio

INSIDE meeting, ROMA, June 14<sup>th</sup> 2016

10x10x12 cm<sup>3</sup> water phantom at different positions along z (beam axis) 30 uCi activity new reconstruction model (x=140, y=70, z=165 slices, 0.16 cm each)







Exit point in FOV

Entrance point in FOV

Central point in FOV

10x10x12 cm^3 water phantom at different positions along z (beam axis)

Exit point in FOV



Entrance point in FOV











Entrance inflection point

Exit inflection point



3

.4.2 [cm}

14

13.8

13.6

13.4

13.2

13

12.8

10x10x12 cm<sup>3</sup> water phantom at different positions along z (beam axis)

Exit point in FOV



Entrance point in FOV







si**slice**nių y 66 122 188 244 3**30** 366 422 494 5454 660

9000

5**Q**0

6**6**r

700

8030

Exitrinflegationpopint



4.2 z[cm<sup>1</sup>

14

13.8

13.6

13.4

13.2

13

12.8

**Homogeneous Activity Simulation** 

10x10x12 cm^3 water phantom at different positions along z (beam axis)

Central point in FOV







Exit inflection point







Monocromatic proton beam (50mm in water, 81 MeV/u circa) 15x15x20 cm^3 PMMA homogeneous phantoms (4x) repeated acquisitions with phantoms at different positions in z





Monocromatic proton beam (50mm in water, 81 MeV/u circa) 15x15x20 cm<sup>3</sup> PMMA homogeneous phantoms (4x) repeated acquisitions with phantoms at different positions in z



Inside

Monocromatic proton beam (50mm in water, 81 MeV/u circa) 15x15x20 cm^3 PMMA homogeneous phantoms (4x) repeated acquisitions with phantoms at different positions in z



1.5cm 1.5cm 1.5cm



9

## How precisely can we determine the position?

"test" phantom to measure the beam entrance point with respect to the start of the FOV

image reconstruction as soon as LORs are available

sigmoidal fit





## Monocromatic proton beam (50mm in water, 81 MeV/u circa) 15x15x20 cm^3 PMMA homogeneous phantoms (4x) repeated acquisitions with phantoms at different positions in z



## How precisely can we determine the position?

---- discrepancy in positioning <u>lesser</u> than 0.3 mm

Isotopes production is a poor signal  $\rightarrow$  all the statistics must be simulated.

STEP 1: Beam simulation	Time-tagged activity scoring	STEP 2: PET simulation	Data analysis & image reconstruction
About 1/100 of primary hadrons	<ul> <li>Annihilation time and position</li> <li>Isotope production map:</li> <li><sup>11</sup>C (t<sub>1/2</sub>=1220.04s)</li> <li><sup>15</sup>O (t<sub>1/2</sub>=122.4s)</li> <li><sup>10</sup>C (t<sub>1/2</sub>=19.290s)</li> <li></li> </ul>	All positrons are simulated. Detector simulation.	Same as real data: Line Of Response (LOR) list extraction Image reconstruction (MLEM algorithm, 5 iterations)
		tim	e

The temporal structure of the beam delivery is simulated.

Isotope decays are simulated.

The 4D reconstructed image depends on the acquisition time.