

Ernesto Amato<sup>1,2</sup>, Lucrezia Auditore<sup>1,2</sup>, Daniele Pistone<sup>1,2</sup>, Antonio Italiano<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BIOMORF Department, University of Messina, Italy
<sup>2</sup> INFN, Section of Catania, Italy
<sup>3</sup> MIFT Department, University of Messina, Italy

GEANT4



Università degli Studi di Messina



Università degli Studi di Messina



Oct 24 – 26, 2022

IPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE IATEMATICHE E INFORMATICHE, CIENZE FISICHE E SCIENZE DELLA TERRA

## Context: Bremsstrahlungs

- External Bremsstrahlung (EB), the "well-known" Bremsstrahlung: emission of photons with continuous energy spectrum due to deceleration of a travelling charged particle by another charged particle (typically an electron by an atomic nucleus of the medium in which is travelling)
- > Internal Bremsstrahlung (IB), the "unknown" Bremsstrahlung: process accompanying  $\beta$ -decay, consisting in emission of photons with a continuous energy spectrum from the parent nucleus, due to the interaction of the  $\beta$  particle with its own parent nucleus [1,2].



## Background and aim of the study

- Internal Bremsstrahlung (IB) was widely studied in the past decades: KUB theory [1, 2] + updated models [6-8] to calculate spectral distribution of IB photons, even if comparison with measurements [9, 10] not always satisfactory
- > However, currently IB is usually neglected in dosimetry and radioprotection studies when estimating energy deposition due to  $\beta$ -decays; no Monte Carlo (MC) simulation software accounts for IB
- > But is IB contribution to  $\beta$ -decay energy deposition effectively negligible?
- > In some recent works, IB emission intensity was observed to significantly contribute to the deposited energy for some high-energy  $\beta$ -emitting radionuclides: <sup>90</sup>Y, <sup>32</sup>P [3-5]
- Dose-Point-Kernels (DPKs) are extensively used for the dosimetry of gamma and beta emitters, and are usually computed with MC simulations, tallying the energy deposited around a point source as a function of the radial distance R
- The aim of this study was to quantify, by means of MC simulations, the contribution of IB photons to the DPKs of <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P, and revise the DPK values accordingly

#### Internal Bremsstrahlung spectra modeling

➢ In our previous works [3-5], we adopted IB photon spectral distributions, B(E), for <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P, obtained by fitting experimental data (+ theoretical models, if needed, to extrapolate at lower or higher energies) available in literature with the following function:

$$B(E) = a \cdot \left( e^{-bE^{\beta} - cE^{\gamma}} - e^{-bE_0^{\beta} - cE_0^{\gamma}} \right)$$

> where: a = 25.9; b, c, b and g fit parameters;  $E_0 =$  end-point energy of the  $\beta$  spectrum



#### Experimental verification

- We compared experimental measurements of the signal generated in a dose calibrator (well ionization chamber for activity measurements) by a source of <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P, with MC simulations including and not including respective IB spectra contribution
- Including IB, good agreement with exp. when using the following IB spectra modelizations: for <sup>90</sup>Y, fit of exp. data from Venkataramaiah + Ford and Martin model [4]; for <sup>32</sup>P, fit of exp. data from Liden and Starfelt [5]
- ▶ Not including IB, differences between exp. and MC up to -14% for  ${}^{90}$ Y, up to -17% for  ${}^{32}$ P → IB emission contributes up to these values to the signal in the examined setup



Source	I <sub>EXP</sub> (pA/MBq)	IB in MC	I <sub>MC</sub> (pA/MBq)	ε (%)
<sup>90</sup> Y	$0.198\pm0.001$	no	$0.174 \pm 0.002$	-12.1
<sup>90</sup> Y (shielded)	$0.192\pm0.001$	no	$0.166\pm0.002$	-13.5
<sup>90</sup> Y	$0.198\pm0.001$	yes	$0.198\pm0.002$	0.0
<sup>90</sup> Y (shielded)	$0.192\pm0.001$	yes	$0.189\pm0.002$	-1.6
<sup>32</sup> P	$0.1259\pm0.0005$	no	$0.1057\pm0.0010$	-16.0
<sup>32</sup> P (shielded)	$0.1222\pm0.0005$	no	$0.1013\pm0.0010$	-17.1
<sup>32</sup> P	$0.1259\pm0.0005$	yes	$0.1302\pm0.0010$	+3.4
<sup>32</sup> P (shielded)	$0.1222\pm0.0005$	yes	$0.1251\pm0.0010$	+2.4

# Dose-Point-Kernel (DPK) estimation with GAMOS

- Dose-Point-Kernel (DPK) is defined as the energy deposited all around a radioactive point source in a homogeneous medium, thus giving information on the absorbed dose as a function of the distance from the source [11-13]
- > We computed DPKs for <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P in water including and not including IB spectra
- > MC simulations performed with GAMOS 6.2.0:
- <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P decays simulated via *RadioactiveDecay* GEANT4 module (NB it dose not account for IB emission!); IB emission simulated as an additive spectrum term to the source, modelled as in our previous works
- Geometry: point source at the centre of concentric shells of water (G4\_WATER; d = 1 g/cm<sup>3</sup>); shell thickness: 0.02 cm; shells' radius: min 0 cm, max 5 cm
- > Scored quantity: energy deposited in each shell
- N. of events: 10<sup>8</sup> events, No variance reduction techniques applied



# <sup>90</sup>Y absorbed dose distribution

- Absorbed dose (AD) estimated as a function of the distance R from the source
- Neglecting IB emission (blue line), comparing with <sup>90</sup>Y DPK from Graves et al. (2019) [13], good agreement found, since also Graves et al. neglected IB!
- When adding IB photons to the MC simulations (red line), for distances larger than 1.2 cm, AD values are higher than the previously obtained ones
- > IB source term contributes up to 30% to AD at the examined distances larger than the average range of  $\beta$ s from <sup>90</sup>Y.



# <sup>32</sup>P absorbed dose distribution

- Absorbed dose (AD) estimated as a function of the distance *R* from the source
- Neglecting IB emission (red line), comparing with <sup>32</sup>P DPK from Graves et al. (2019) [13], good agreement found, since also Graves et al. neglected IB!
- When adding IB photons to the MC simulations (blue line), for distances larger than 0.8 cm, AD values are higher than the previously obtained ones
- > IB source term contributes up to 40% to AD at the examined distances larger than the average range of  $\beta$ s from <sup>32</sup>P.



### <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P Dose-Point-Kernels

> Results confirmed also in terms of "proper" DPKs, in the conventional units as "scaled absorption function"  $F_{\beta}$  [14]

$$F_{\beta}(R/X_{90}) = 4\pi R^2 \rho X_{90} \phi_{\beta}(R)$$

R = distance from the source r = density of the medium  $X_{g_0} =$  emitted energy 90-percentile distance  $\phi_\beta(R) =$  point isotropic specific absorbed fraction

$$\varepsilon(\%) = 100 \cdot \frac{(F_{\beta+IB}(R/X_{90}) - F_{\beta}(R/X_{90}))}{F_{\beta}(R/X_{90})}$$





## <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P Dose-Point-Kernels

> Results confirmed also in terms of "proper" DPKs, in the conventional units as "scaled absorption function"  $F_{\beta}$  [14]

$$F_{\beta}(R/X_{90}) = 4\pi R^2 \rho X_{90} \phi_{\beta}(R)$$

R = distance from the source r = density of the medium  $X_{g_0} =$  emitted energy 90-percentile distance  $\phi_\beta(R) =$  point isotropic specific absorbed fraction

$$\varepsilon(\%) = 100 \cdot \frac{(F_{\beta+IB}(R/X_{90}) - F_{\beta}(R/X_{90}))}{F_{\beta}(R/X_{90})}$$

▶ For  $R > 2X_{g_0}$ , contribution from IB emission



## <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P Dose-Point-Kernels

> Results confirmed also in terms of "proper" DPKs, in the conventional units as "scaled absorption function"  $F_{\beta}$  [14]

$$F_{\beta}(R/X_{90}) = 4\pi R^2 \rho X_{90} \phi_{\beta}(R)$$

R = distance from the source r = density of the medium  $X_{g_0} =$  emitted energy 90-percentile distance  $\phi_\beta(R) =$  point isotropic specific absorbed fraction

$$\varepsilon(\%) = 100 \cdot \frac{(F_{\beta+IB}(R/X_{90}) - F_{\beta}(R/X_{90}))}{F_{\beta}(R/X_{90})}$$

- > For  $R > 2X_{g_0}$ , contribution from IB emission
- > Rel. percent diff.  $\epsilon$  between DPK with and without IB up to 30% for <sup>90</sup>Y and up to 40% for <sup>32</sup>P





## What happens beyond the average range of $\beta$ particles?

- > Within the average range of the  $\beta$  particles emitted by  ${}^{90}$ Y and  ${}^{32}$ P, the contribution of External Bremsstrahlung (EB) photons to the energy deposited is negligible; adding IB photons to the source term does not affect significantly this results
- > However, for larger distances from the source, the energy deposition is mainly due to EB photons generated by the interaction of  $\beta$  particles with the surrounding medium
- When adding IB photons to the source in MC simulation, at those distances a further contribution comes from these photons





- Internal Bremsstrahlung (IB) is a process accompanying β-decay, usually neglected in MC simulations
- Dose-Point-Kernels (DPKs) are extensively used for the dosimetry of gamma and beta emitters, and currently are calculated neglecting IB
- A revision of <sup>90</sup>Y and <sup>32</sup>P DPKs, including IB spectrum in MC simulation, provides results significantly affected by the additive IB source term
- For distances from the source larger than the average range of β particles, the revisited <sup>90</sup>Y DPK values are higher than the values currently used by 20-30%, while the <sup>32</sup>P DPK are higher by 30-40%
- The inclusion of IB process in MC simulation, among the processes occurring during the decay of β-emitting nuclides, is strongly advisable in order to obtain more realistic estimations

[1] Knipp JK, Uhlenbeck GE. Emission of gamma radiation during the beta decay of nuclei. Physica 1936;3:425-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-8914(36)80008-1.

[2] Bloch F. On the Continuous γ-Radiation Accompanying the b-Decay. Phys. Rev. 1936;50:272-8. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.50.272.

[3] Italiano, A., Auditore, L., Amato, E., 2020. Enhancement of radiation exposure risk from  $\beta$ -emitter radionuclides due to Internal Bremsstrahlung effect: A Monte Carlo study of 90Y case case. Phys. Med. 76:159-165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmp.2020.06.018.

[4] Auditore L et al. 2021 Relevance of Internal Bremsstrahlung photons from 90Y decay: an experimental and Monte Carlo study. Phys Med. 90 158-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmp.2021.10.006.

[5] Auditore et al. 2022 Internal Bremsstrahlung emission during 32P decay. Rad. Meas. 155:106799. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radmeas.2022.106799.

[6] Lewis RR, Ford GW. Coulomb effect in inner bremsstrahlung. Phys Rev 1957;107:756-65. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.107.756.

[7] Felsner G. Coulomb-Korrecturen bei der inner Bremsstrahlung. Zeitschrift für Physik 1963;174:43–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01418812.

[8] Ford GW, Martin CF. Detour transitions in internal bremsstrahlung. Nucl Phys A 1969;134:457-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9474(69)91068-9.

[9] Powar MS, Singh M. Measurement of the internal bremsstrahlung spectrum of 90Y. J Phys G Nucl Phys 1975; 1:453-60. https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4616/1/4/010.

[10] Venkataramaiah P, Sanjeeviah H, Sanjeevaiah B. Study of inner bremsstrahlung accompanying beta decay in 185W e 90Y. J Phys G Nucl Phys 1980;6:1443-51. https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4616/6/11/015.

[11] Botta F, Mairani A, Battistoni G et al. Calculation of electron and isotopes dose point kernels with FLUKA Monte Carlo code for dosimetry in nuclear medicine therapy. Med Phys. 2011;38(7):3944-3954. doi: https://doi.org/10.1118/1.3586038.

[12] Papadimitroulas P, Loudos G, Nikiforidis GC, Kagadis GC. A dose point kernel database using GATE Monte Carlo simulation toolkit for nuclear medicine applications: comparison with other Monte Carlo codes. Med Phys. 2012;39(8):5238-47. doi: https://doi.org/10.1118/1.4737096.

[13] Graves SA, Flynn RT and Hyer DE 2019 Dose point kernels for 2,174 radionuclides Med. Phys. 46(11) 5284-93. https://doi.org/10.1002/mp.13789.

[14] Bardies M, Kwok C and Sgouros G. Dose point-kernels for radionuclide dosimetry in Series in Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering. Therapeutic applications of Monte Carlo calculations in nuclear medicine. Edited by Zaidi H and Sgouros G; Bristol and Philadelphia: Institute of Physics Publishing; 2003. 158. 364 p.

# THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

Daniele Pistone, PhD email: daniele.pistone@unime.it



Università degli Studi di Messina





# and special thanks to all the colleagues collaborating in the presented studies!

