

In-silico calculations of DNA damage induced by DaRT for a better understanding of the radiobiological effectiveness of this treatment

- L. Ballisat¹, J. Velthuis¹, L. Beck¹, C. De Sio¹, Y. Shi¹, J. Duan¹, K. Maclean¹,
- S. Guatelli², D. Sakata³, A. Rozenfeld², S. Incerti⁴, H. Tran⁴
- ¹School of Physics, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- ²Centre For Medical Radiation Physics, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia
- ³School of Allied Health Sciences, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan
- ⁴CNRS, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France

IV Geant4 International User Conference at the physics-medicine-biology frontier 24-26th October 2022

Overview

- DaRT
- Aims
- Simulation
- Results
 - –DNA damage due to α -particles with kinetic energies in the DaRT decay chain
 - -Impact of DNA density on DNA damage
- Summary

Diffusing alpha-emitters Radiation Therapy (DaRT)

- Interstitial brachytherapy technique
- Clinical trials ongoing
 - Skin, oral cavity and prostate cancer
 - Israel, USA, Japan, Italy, France
- Radium-224 seeds
- Diffusion increases the range over which dose is delivered
- Complex decay chain with several αparticles with different kinetic energies



(left) dose distribution calculated from autoradiography and (right) histological section of a human solid tumour treated with 224Ra wires in a human solid tumour¹



¹ Cooks et al. Anticancer Research, 32: 5315-5322 (2012)

Aims

To simulate the DNA damage induced by DaRT for a better understanding of the radiobiological effectiveness.

- Calculate DNA damage due to α-particles with kinetic energies in the DaRT decay chain
 - How does the distribution vary with LET (linear energy transfer)?
 - What is the distribution of simple and complex damages¹?
- Calculate impact of DNA density on DNA damage
 - DNA density varies between cell types and during the cell cycle
 - Can simulation time be reduced by increasing the simulation density?



Simulation

- Geant4 11.0
- Simplified cell nucleus with straight strands of chromatin fibre to reduce simulation time
 - ~21,000 base pairs per chromatin fibre
 - Number and position of chromatin fibre strands can be varied
- Primary source spherical surface 1 µm radius centred on the nucleus
- G4EmDNAPhysics_option2 inside the nucleus and G4EmStandard_option4 outside
- Direct damage
 - Direct damage radius 0.35 nm
 - Linear damage model¹ 5 37.5 eV
- Indirect damage
 - IRT model
 - 40.5% probability of OH• radical causing an indirect strand break
 - Cut off time 5 ns
 - Radicals removed > 9 nm from DNA

bristol.ac.uk







4

Aim 1: Calculate DNA damage from α particles with kinetic energies in the DaRT decay chain Simplified Cell

- To understand the radiobiological effectiveness of DaRT an understanding of DNA damage for the relevant kinetic energies is required
- Incident α-particles with kinetic energy in range 0.1 - 9 MeV, to cover DaRT range
- Track structure is dependent on the kinetic energy however two particles with different kinetic energy can have the same LET





Individual Strand Break Results

6

- Direct damage is constant
- Higher kinetic energy α-particles (above maximum LET)
 - Indirect damage decreases with increasing LET
- Lower kinetic energy α-particles (below maximum LET)
 - Indirect damage is lower for an α -particle with kinetic energy below the maximum LET

Indirect damage is more significant than direct damage at low LET

Position of OH• radicals up to 1 ns, ~120 keV/µm





Double Strand Break Results

- Number of total DSB increases with increasing LET
- Complexity of DSB increases with increasing LET
- Number of complex DSB increases approximately linearly with LET

DSB complexity increases with LET therefore more detrimental damage to the cell is done at higher LET



Aim 2: Calculate impact of DNA density on DNA damage

- Base pair density in human cells varies in the range¹ 0.007 0.058 bp/nm³
- Fix number of base pairs, vary volume and chromatin fibre spacing
- 1.3 million base pairs
- Primary source spherical surface 1 µm radius centred on the nucleus
 - Incident α -particles with kinetic energy in range 3 8 MeV
 - Maximum variation in kinetic energy across the target 5% of mean kinetic energy



275 nm 0.056 bp/nm³ bristol.ac.uk

350 nm 0.035 bp/nm³



Base Pair Density Results

- The number of strand breaks increases approximately linearly with base pair density
- LET of a 3 MeV α-particle is higher than at 8 MeV, therefore more energy is deposited per unit distance and more strand breaks occur.

Base pair density significantly affects the amount of DNA damage



Base Pair Density Simulation Time

- Aim to see if simulation time could be reduced by using higher density geometries as less primary particles are required
- However the simulation is significantly longer for higher density geometries
 - Due to larger number of molecules to track for the chemical simulation
- For all energies there is approximately a 6 times increase of total strand breaks for a 20 times increase in simulation time



Summary and Future Work

- Aim 1: Calculate DNA damage due to α -particles with kinetic energies in the DaRT decay chain
 - Number of individual damages per Gy caused by direct damage is constant
 - Number of individual damages per Gy caused by indirect damage decreases
 - Indirect damage differs for kinetic energies above and below the maximum LET
 - More complex DSB at higher LET
- Aim 2: Calculate impact of DNA density on DNA damage
 - More DNA damage occurs for a denser DNA geometry
 - Approximately linear
 - Simulation time increases significantly for higher density geometries
- Future work:
 - Compare to a more realistic cell geometry
 - Calculate cell survival
 - Calculate the DNA damage distribution for DaRT taking into account the whole decay chain and diffusion of radon
 - Compare to photon simulations for a better understanding of the radiobiological effectiveness of DaRT
- Initial results are promising for simulating the full DaRT process and assessing the radiobiological effectiveness of this treatment



Thank you

Any questions?

Kinetic energy variation across the target

- Maximum kinetic energy variation across the target as a percentage of the mean kinetic energy
- Maximum variation 5%



Charge decrease at low kinetic energies



ICRU90