### Curso de Radiobiología UDELAR Facultad de Ciencias Unidad de Física Médica

Dr. Eduardo Francisco Larrinaga Cortina



Curvas de supervivencia Modelos matemáticos

> Créditos: Dr. Jerry Battista



Chapter 1 and everywhere else !

# CELL SURVIVAL CURVES (AND TARGET THEORY)

J. Battista (Scott Karnas, H. Fakir)



# Learning Objectives

- Be able to sketch a typical cell survival curve with variable parameters
- Define the key characteristics of survival curves
- Apply different mathematical models to fit and interpret cell survival curves
- Use cell survival data to predict tumour control probability

# Structure of the Lecture

### **Quick review**

- Cell and DNA structure
- Radiation effects on cells (DNA damage)

### **Cell survival curves**

- Definition, measurements, interpretations
- **Explanation and modeling of survival curves**
- Target Theory
- Linear quadratic model (dual radiation action)
   Biophysical models (repair models)

### **Tumour control probability (TCP)**

Calculations from survival data

### My Famous Flow Chart



# Radiobiology Timing



You are

Here

e

Physics (10<sup>-18</sup> sec) photoelectric, Compton effects, etc. Fast electrons in motion Radiation Chemistry (10<sup>-6</sup> sec) ■ Ionization of H<sub>2</sub>O m DNA damage Radiation Biology (  $> 10^5$  sec) 

- cell survival
- "4 R's" of radiobiology

# **Radiobiology Sizing**

- Physics (fm)
  - photoelectric, Compton effects
  - electrons in motion
- Radiation Chemistry (nm)
  - Ionization of H<sub>2</sub>O
  - DNA damage
- Radiation Biology( >μm)
  - cell survival
  - "4 R's" of radiobiology
- Pathology and Physiology (cm to m)
  - organ, whole body, progeny





And here

### Cellular targets susceptible to radiation damage



The DNA contains the genetic information needed for the replication and the functioning of cells.

The **loss** or modification of some **specific genes** may lead to the loss of specific functions essential to cell survival

DNA is the part of a cell most susceptible to radiation damage

# Evidence that DNA is a key Target



- DNA is sensitive to many types of chemical damage
  - Why not to radiation-induced radicals ?
- Micro-Irradiation of cell nucleus (alone) kills cells
  - micro-irradiation of cytoplasm is fare less effective
- Assays of DNA and chromosomes show clear damage
- Cell killing correlates with some types of chromosome aberrations
  - cell survival correlates with absence of such aberrations
- □ IUdR/BUdR experiments DNA Base manipulation
  - Auger electrons within DNA space enhances damage
  - LET of radiation plays a role in "compacting" energy into DNA
- Computer simulations of radiation physics (tracks), chemistry, DNA damage predict experimental data

#### SSB's and DSB's

**FIGURE 2.2** Diagrams of single- and double-strand DNA breaks caused by radiation. **A:** Two-dimensional representation of the normal DNA helix. The base pairs carrying the genetic code are complementary (i.e., adenine pairs with thymine, guanine pairs with cytosine). **B:** A break in one strand is of little significance because it is repaired readily, using the opposite strand as a template. **C:** Breaks in both strands, if well separated, are repaired as independent breaks. **D:** If breaks occur in both strands and are directly opposite or separated by only a few base pairs, this may lead to a double-strand break in which the chromatin snaps into two pieces. (Courtesy of Dr. John Ward.)



E. J. Hall and A. J. Giaccia. Radiobiology for the radiobiologist

# **Observing DNA Breaks**



Small DNA fragments travel farther than large

**FIGURE 16.11** Illustration of agarose gel electrophoresis. DNA is negatively charged, so that under the influence of an electrical field, it migrates toward the anode. During electrophoresis, DNA fragments sort by size, small molecules moving farther than larger molecules. Because smaller molecules move farther than larger molecules in a given time, polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis often is employed to separate smaller DNA fragments with greater resolution than with agarose.



**FIGURE 2.4 A:** The effect of ionizing radiation on DNA strand break induction as measured by pulsed-field gel electrophoresis. As the dose of ionizing radiation increases from 5 to 100 Gy, the size of the DNA fragments as detected by ethidium brodime staining decreases. Thus, more DNA enters the gel with increasing dose of ionizing radiation. In these experiments, cells were embedded in agarose and irradiated on ice to eliminate the effects of repair. The number above each lane refers to the dose in Gy to which each group of cells was exposed. (Courtesy of Dr. Nicholas Denko.) **B:** Photomicrograph of control and 8-Gy irradiated cells as detected by the comet assay. Unirradiated cells possess a near-spherical appearance, whereas the fragmented DNA in irradiated cells gives the appearance of a comet when stained with ethidium bromide. (Courtesy of Drs. Ester Hammond and Mary Jo Dorie.)



Α

С

# Chromosome aberrations resulting from DNA damage



E. J. Hall and A. J. Giaccia. Radiobiology for the radiobiologist





# What is Cell Death?

Proliferating cells (stem cells and *in-vitro*),

Death = loss of reproductive ability

(cells loose the ability to exhibit unlimited cell division)

Non-proliferating cells (differentiated cells)

Death = loss of specific function

(interphase death)

# Mechanisms of Cell Death

- Mitotic death: death of cells while attempting to divide. (Dominant after radiation, 2 Gy)
- Apoptosis (programmed cell death): programmed sequence of events controlled by specific genes. Part of the normal process.
- Other mechanisms: necrosis, senescence,...

# What is Cell Survival?



### **In-Vitro Definition:**

- The ability of a single cell to expand into a population of cells through repeated cell divisions and surpass the arbitrary colony size limit (e.g. 50 cells).
  - ~ 6 full generations of descendents

Definition can vary according to the end point of the assay (e.g. *in vivo tumour size*)

# What is a Cell Survival Curve ?

 A survival curve describes the relationship between the radiation dose (x-axis) and the <u>fraction of cells (S) (y-axis) that survive that</u> dose level.

SF<sub>2</sub>
 Survival Fraction
 for a dose of 2 Gray



### What does it look like?

A survival curve describes the relationship between the surviving fraction of cells (fraction of cells that maintain their reproductive integrity) and the dose of "insult"



W. K. Weyrather, G. Kraft. RBE of carbon ions: Experimental data and the strategy of RBE calculation for treatment planning, Radiother Oncol. 2004 Dec;73 Suppl 2:S161-9.

Fig. 1

# HOW IS CELL SURVIVAL MEASURED?

Clonogenic assays

### **Basic Method**

Remove cells from the tumor (or any tissue), place them in a defined growth environment, and test their ability to produce a viable colony of descendents

- Start with actively growing culture of cells. (1)
- Prepare single cell suspension by adding trypsin (enzyme) to detach cells from the surface of the flask. (2)
- Count the number of cells per unit volume. (2)
- Seed a known number of cells into new Petri dishes.
- Flasks are irradiated at different doses, including a control with no dose. (3)
- Incubate for 1-2 weeks to allow colony formation. Each single cell may divide several times and ultimately form a macroscopic colony that can be counted if it exceeds a threshold size. (4)
- Count colonies containing  $\geq$  50 cells (5-6 generations of proliferation) (5)



Actively growing culture of cells.

- Prepare single cell suspension by adding trypsin (enzyme) to detach cells from the surface of the flask.
- Count the number of cells per unit volume.

Seed a known number of cells into new Petri dishes. Some flasks are irradiated at different doses and others are used as control.

Allow for growth. Each single cell may divide several times and ultimately form a macroscopic colony that can be counted.

Count colonies containing  $\geq$  50 cells (5-6 generations of proliferation)

#### In-Vitro Colonies are "spots" of Specified Size



Fig. 3.1. Colonies of V79-1 Chinese hamster cells (9 cm Pyrex petri dishes) stained with methylene blue ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ml of a 1% water solution per 10 ml of growth medium; 45 minutes at room temperature): upper left, 0 rad (12-days growth); upper right, 542 rad (14-days growth); lower left, 1083 rad (16-days growth); lower right, two 542 rad exposures separated by 8 hours at 37°C (16-days growth). (Courtesy of Elkind and Sutton, *Radiation Res.*, Ref. 3.)

# **Cell Colony Math**



Colonies obtained with Chinese hamster cells cultured in vitro.

**A:** In this unirradiated control dish, 100 cells were seeded and allowed to grow for 7 days before being stained. There are 70 colonies; therefore, the plating efficiency is 70/100, or 70%.

**B:** Two thousand cells were seeded and then exposed to 8 Gy of x-rays. There are 32 colonies on the dish. Thus: Surviving fraction = Colonies counted/[Cells seeded × (PE/100)] =  $32/(2,000 \times 0.7) = 0.023$ 

# **Plating Efficiency Correction**

Ideal case: If we seed 100 cells (not irradiated) into each dish, how many colonies should we expect?

### 100 ???

In practice, we don't measure a 100% growth efficiency. Not all cells plated out will form colonies.

Cells can die for several reasons (independent on radiation): growth medium, damage and stress during trypsinization,.... "Plating efficiency" is a coefficient that accounts for this extraneous effect

Plating Efficiency =  $PE = 100 \times \frac{Number of colonies counted (@ ZeroDose)}{Number of cells seeded}$ 

### Net Survival Fraction as a function of Dose

Seed different dishes with different number of starting cells exposed to a range of radiation The survival fraction as a function of dose is given by:

$$SF(D) = \frac{Colonies \ counted}{Cells \ seeded \times (PE / 100)}$$

NOTE: Number of starting cells seeded per dish needs to be adjusted so that a countable number of colonies is obtained with statistical significance.



### Quiz

#### What is the plating efficiency?

90%

What is the surviving fraction?

### **Cell survival curve Plotting**





#### Why a logarithmic scale?

Handbook of radiotherapy physics: theory and practice

- 1. Effects at very low survival levels can be shown and compared.
- 2. The cure of a tumor requires many orders of magnitude of cell killing.
- 3. If cell kill is the result of a single-hit radiation event, then survival will be exponential function of dose

#### Practical uses of cell survival curves - RBE

⇒ measurement of LET effects

⇒relative biological effectiveness (same cell line, different radiations)



 Densely irradiated cells (high LET): Exponential function of dose

Sparsely irradiated cells (low LET): Initial slope followed by a shoulder region and a straight line at high doses

Fig. 1 Survival of CHO cells as a function of dose measured for x-rays and 11 MeV/u carbon ions. RBE values calculated from these curves as indicated depend strongly on the survival level [3].

### Practical uses of cell survival curves - OER

⇒ Compare sensitivities of different or altered cell lines (same radiation source)



Example: investigate the effect of oxygenation. The response of cells to ionizing radiation is strongly dependent upon oxygen.

**OER**: oxygen enhancement ratio = ratio of the radiation dose in hypoxia to dose in air needed to achieve **the same biological effect** 

 $OER = \frac{D_{hypoxic}}{D}$ 

measurement of effects of radio-sensitizers/ protectors (same radiation)

SER: Sensitizer Enhancement Ratio

SER =

### Practical uses of cell survival curves - Sensitizers



Karnas et al.

# **Cell Survival Observations**

- Survival (or clonogenic) assays examine the effect of radiation (or drugs) on the ability of a cell to proliferate.
- Thus survival is defined as the ability of a cell to retain long term proliferative potential.
- Conversely cell killing is regarded as inhibition of proliferative potential. It may or may not result in cell death (i.e. lysis) and removal from the population.
- Following low doses of irradiation (< 15-20 Gy single dose) many cells do not show morphological evidence of damage unless they attempt mitosis.
- At higher doses cells may die in interphase (usually by apoptosis)
- Exceptions include lymphocytes, spermatocytes, oocytes, endothelial cells which undergo apoptosis following lower doses (1-2 Gy for lymphocytes)

#### R. Hill, PMH

### "Law" of Bergonie and Tribondeau

"The radiosensitivity of a tissue is directly proportional to its reproductive capacity and inversely proportional to its degree of differentiation" 1906

Cells tend to be more radiosensitive if they have some key properties:

• High division rate (Proliferation).

- Long dividing future (Longevity).
- Undifferentiated type (Young, Stem).
- High metabolic rate (Active).
  - Access to nutrition.

### Radiosensitive Tissues:

- Germinal cells of the ovary and testis.
- Haematopoietic tissues: red bone marrow, spleen, lymph nodes and thymus.
- Epithelium of the skin.
- Epithelium of the GIT.

### Radioresistant Tissues:

- Bone Liver Kidney
- Cartilage Muscle Nervous System

# Linking Survival back to Chromosome Damage



This plot clearly corelates the number of unstable CA (n) and cell survival (S)

 $\mathbf{S} = \mathrm{Exp}\left(-\mathbf{n}\right)$ 

### **RECAP on Linear Quadratic (LQ) Model**



$$S(D) = e^{-\alpha D - \beta D^2}$$



- α Initial slope at low Dose
   susceptibility to single-track damage
- β Adds curvature to the final slope (larger Dose) susceptibility to dual-track damage.
   affected by dose rate and *interim* chromosome Repair

#### α/β – Dose at which the two cell-killing effects are equal. Measure of "Insensitivity" to dose fractionation/rate scheme

### LQ Parameters



- There are two components to cell kill by radiation: linear and quadratic.
   α describes the initial slope.
- $\beta$  is a smaller constant describing the quadratic component.
- $\alpha/\beta$  gives the dose at which the linear and quadratic components are equal

 $\alpha/\beta \approx 10$  Gy for Tumour Cells;  $\alpha/\beta \approx 3$  Gy for Normal Cells - curvier

<u>Advantage</u>: Only a couple of parameters to fit <u>Disadvantage</u>: Continuous downturn does not fit experimental data at large D

| α/ړ<br>(Fron   | ratios from lab dat<br>n Thames and Henc | a<br>Iry)   |
|--|--|---|
| Early Reactions  | High α/β: ~10                            | α/β   |
| skin<br>hair follicles<br>lip mucosa<br>jejunum<br>colon<br>testis<br>spleen |  | 9.4 - 21.0<br>5.5 - 7.7<br>7.9<br>7.1<br>8.4<br>13.9<br>8.9 |
| Late Reactions   | Low $\alpha/\beta$ : mostly ~3           |   |
| spinal cord<br>brain<br>eve  |  | 2.1 - 5.2<br>2.1<br>1.2                                     |
| kidney<br>bladder<br>lung<br>bowel   |  | 0.4 - 4.1<br>7.2 - 7.8<br>2.1 - 4.3<br>3.0 - 5.0            |

| Tissue/organ             | Endpoint              | lpha/eta (Gy) | 95% CL (Gy) | Source                                   |   |  |  |       |  |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|--|---|--|--|-------|--|
| Early reactions          |                       |               |             |  |   |  |  |       |  |
| Skin                     | Erythema              | 8.8           | 6.9; 11.6   | Turesson and Thames (1989)               |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Erythema              | 12.3          | 1.8; 22.8   | Bentzen <i>et al.</i> (1988)             |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Dry desguamation      | ~8            | N/A         | Choqule and Supe (1993)                  |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Desquamation          | 11.2          | 8.5: 17.6   | Turesson and Thames (1989)               |   |  |  |       |  |
| Oral mucosa              | Mucositis             | 9.3           | 5.8; 17.9   | Denham et al. (1995)                     | 1 |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Mucositis             | 15            | - 15: 45    | Rezvani etal. (1991)                     |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Mucositis             | ~8            | N/A         | Chogule and Supe (1993)                  |   |  |  |       |  |
| Late reactions           |                       |               |             |  |   |  |  |       |  |
| Skin/vasculature         | Telangiectasia        | 2.8           | 1.7; 3.8    | Turesson and Thames (1989)               |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Telangiectasia        | 2.6           | 2.2; 3.3    | Bentzen et al. (1990)                    |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Telangiectasia        | 2.8           | -0.1; 8.1   | Bentzen and Overgaard (1991)             |   |  |  |       |  |
| Subcutis                 | Fibrosis              | 1.7           | 0.6; 2.6    | Bentzen and Overgaard (1991)             |   |  |  |       |  |
| Breast                   | Cosmetic change       | 3.4           | 2.3; 4.5    | START Trialists Group (2008)             |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | in appearance         |               | -           | •  |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Induration (fibrosis) | 3.1           | 1.8; 4.4    | Yarnold et <i>al.</i> (2005)             |   |  |  |       |  |
| Muscle/vasculature/      | Impaired shoulder     | 3.5           | 0.7; 6.2    | Bentzen <i>et al.</i> (1989)             |   |  |  |       |  |
| cartilage                | movement              |               |             |  |   |  |  |       |  |
| Nerve                    | Brachial plexopathy   | <3.5*         | N/A         | Olsen <i>et al.</i> (1990)               |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Brachial plexopathy   | ~2            | N/A         | Powell et al. (1990)                     |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Optic neuropathy      | 1.6           | -7; 10      | Jiang et al. (1994)                      |   |  |  |       |  |
| Spinal cord              | Myelopathy            | <3.3          | N/A         | Dische <i>et al.</i> (1981)              |   |  |  |       |  |
| Eye                      | Corneal injury        | 2.9           | -4; 10      | Jiang e <i>t al.</i> (1994)              |   |  |  |       |  |
| Bowel                    | Stricture/perforation | 3.9           | 2.5; 5.3    | Deore <i>et al.</i> (1993)               |   |  |  |       |  |
| Bowel                    | Various late effects  | 4.3           | 2.2; 9.6    | Dische <i>et al.</i> (1999)              |   |  |  |       |  |
| Lung                     | Pneumonitis           | 4.0           | 2.2; 5.8    | Bentzen <i>et al.</i> (2000)             |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | Lung fibrosis         | 3.1           | -0.2; 8.5   | Dubray et al. (1995)                     |   |  |  |       |  |
|                          | (radiological)        |               |             |  |   |  |  |       |  |
| Head and neck            | Various late effects  | 3.5           | 1.1; 5.9    | Rezvani e <i>t al.</i> (1991)            |   |  |  |       |  |
| Head and neck            | Various late effects  | 4.0           | 3.3; 5.0    | Stuschke and Thames (1999)               |   |  |  |       |  |
| Supraglottic larynx      | Various late effects  | 3.8           | 0.8; 14     | Maciejewski <i>et al.</i> (1986)         |   |  |  |       |  |
| Oral cavity + oropharynx | Various late effects  | 0.8           | -0.6; 2.5   | Maciejewski e <i>t al</i> . (1990)       |   |  |  |       |  |
| Tumours                  |                       |               |             |  |   |  |  |       |  |
| Head and neck            |                       |               |             | <b>a 11 17</b> (1997)                    |   |  |  | · · · |  |
| Various                  |                       | 10.5          | 6.5; 29     | Stuschke and Ihames (1999)               |   |  |  |       |  |
| Larynx                   |                       | 14.5          | 4.9; 24     | Rezvani et al. (1993)                    |   |  |  |       |  |
| Vocal cord               |                       | ~13           | 'wide'      | Robertson et al. (1993)                  |   |  |  |       |  |
| Buccal mucosa            |                       | 6.6           | 2.9;∞       | Maciejewski <i>et al.</i> (1989)         |   |  |  |       |  |
| Ionsii                   |                       | 7.2           | 3.6;∞       | Maciejewski et di. (1989)                |   |  |  |       |  |
| Nasopharynx              |                       | 16            | - 11; 43    | Lee et dl. (1995)<br>Tratt at al. (1994) |   |  |  |       |  |
| Directotot               |                       | 8.5           | 4.5; 11.3   | Poptron and Pitter (2005)                |   |  |  |       |  |
| Prostalet                |                       | 1.1           | -3.3; 5.6   | START Trialists Course (2005)            | I |  |  |       |  |
| Dreast                   |                       | 4.6           | 1.1; 8.1    | START Trialists Group (2008)             |   |  |  |       |  |
| Melanoma                 |                       | 4.9           | 1.5; 17     | Bentzen et al. (2006)                    |   |  |  |       |  |
| linesereeme              |                       | 0.6           | -1.1; 2.5   | Thomas and Suit (1989)                   |   |  |  |       |  |
| Liposarcoma              |                       | 0.4           | - 1.4; 5.4  | mames and sult (1986)                    |   |  |  |       |  |

Table 9.1 Fractionation sensitivity of human normal tissues and tumours

CL, confidence limit.

\*Re-analysis of original published data.

+Several more estimates are available from comparisons of outcome after brachytherapy versus external-beam therapy. Reference details are available from Søren Bentzen. See also Thames *et al.* (1990) and Table 13.2.



The alfa and beta of tumours: a review of parameters of the linear-quadratic model, derived from clinical radiotherapy studies. van Leeuwen et al. Radiation Oncology (2018) 13:96

# Ski Analogy







http://www.hicker-stockphotography.com/images/600/alpine-skier-whistlermountain-bc-316.jpg

http://images.google.ca/imgres?imgurl=http://www.silverliningchalets.co.uk/userimages/downhillskiing-1.jpg&imgrefurl=http://

# Nailing Down the $\alpha/\beta$ Concept





 $\alpha/\beta = 10$ 



 $\alpha/\beta = 3$ 

#### Introduction to Tumor Control Probability (TCP)

Objective of radiation therapy:

Eradicate the tumor without causing complications in the normal tissue

#### Idealized model:

- No variability between tumours and between patients, no host response (e.g. immunology, inflammation) against residual cancer cells.
- Tumor control is achieved when the last clonogenic cell is sterilized.
- Poisson statistics apply:

TCP models are used to make outcome predictions and to optimize treatment plans based on biological models

#### We need to understand:

The effect of varying tumor characteristics on outcome (radiosensitivity, heterogeneity,...).
 The effect of different treatment modalities on outcome (prescribed dose, fractionation,....)
 Example: investigate the therapeutic advantage of increasing dose

$$TCP = e^{-m}$$

*m*: mean number of clonogenic cells that survive the treatment.

How does m relate to our previous sections?

#### Can Survival Predict Tumour Cure?

■ For a "cure", we need cell survival to be <<<1 cell

• What is the probability of this occurring ? TCP



### **TCP Curves**



- Dose response curve is <u>sigmoidal</u> in shape.
- At lower doses, the curve is shallow and there is only a slow increase in the effects with radiation dose.
- The steepness reaches a max at 50% (0.5) response.
- The same is true at high doses (saturation).

http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/9/98/Sigmoid\_curve\_for\_an\_autocatalytical\_reaction.JPG44

### Two tumours with the same number of cells (N<sub>0</sub>) and different sensitivity ( $\alpha$ ) values

 $TCP = e^{-N_0 S}$ 



 $N_0 = 10^9, \beta = 0$ 

# Same $\alpha$ and $\beta$ values, but tumors of different sizes



α=0.3, β=0.03

### Multi-Fraction Cell Survival Curves: Dose Fractionation – Assignment #2



Figure 3.9

- α Initial linear slope at small D
   Greater for tumours
   Early-reacting tissue
- β Curviness parameter
   Greater for Normal Tissue
   Late-reacting tissue
  - $\alpha/\beta = 10$  for Tumours (typical)  $\alpha$  bigger,  $\beta$  smaller
  - 3 for Normal Tissue
     α smaller, β bigger

This differential in , plus the ability to give a lower Dose per fraction to Normal Tissues vs Tumour, yields the therapeutic advantage.

# Summary

- Double Strand DNA breaks lead to a break in chromosome "arms" / "legs"
- Pairs of chromosome breaks lead to rearrangements that can be stable (cell transformation) or unstable (cell death)
- Cell survival curves provide insight into the effects of radiation ± drugs
- The Linear Quadartic (LQ) Model links chromosome damage to cell survival nicely !

# Part II - Mathematical models of cell survival

Why do we need mathematical models?

- Understand and explain the shape of survival curves
- Predict survival for exposure situations for which no data are available

Two types of mathematical models have been developed:

#### **Target theory models: Physics**

- Single-Hit Multi-target model
- Linear quadratic model (Dual Action)

#### **Biophysical models: Biology**

- include bioprocesses (4Rs)
- e.g. DNA repair

### Target Theory

#### Assumptions:

- ≥1 sensitive volume in a cell
- Identical sensitivity
- A "Hit" causes cell inactivation
  - A Hit is a physical event in a sensitive volume (e.g. DNA space in nucleus)
- Method:

Cell Death is due to the **discrete** and **random** nature of radiation

Packets of Energy Along Track (~10's eV)



Binomial Distribution Of 'Hits' Following N 'trials' Poisson Distribution If Probability of "hits" is small, And the # of trials is Large.

**Track Statistics** 



#### Tracks and Lethal Lesions for different LET Radiation and Volumes

|  | Whole<br>tissue                      | Individual<br>cells                               | Chromatin fibre<br>(total ~5 cm per cell)   | DNA<br>(total ~2 m per cell)  | Mean number<br>lethal lesions<br>per cell |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| External<br>Yrays                        |                                      | 20<br>20<br>20<br>20<br>20<br>20                  | 25 nm   | 2 nm  | ~0.001                                    |
| Dose<br>uniformity                       | Uniform<br>Dose=1 cGy                | ~Uniform<br>Dose≈1cGy                             | Very large fluctuations<br>Doses= 0 to ~10 <sup>3</sup> Gy                        | 2 nm segment<br>Very large fluctuations<br>Doses=0 to ~10 <sup>6</sup> Gy       |   |
| Mean number<br>of tracks                 | 10 <sup>9</sup> gram <sup>-1</sup>   | ~ 50 cell <sup>-1</sup><br>No cells unirradiated  | ~10 <sup>-6</sup> segment <sup>-1</sup><br>~20 segments hit cell <sup>-1</sup>    | ~ 10 <sup>-8</sup> segment <sup>-1</sup><br>~10 segments hit cell <sup>-1</sup> |   |
| Internal<br><sup>220</sup> Rn<br>(3 «'s) |                                      | 20)~20<br>µm                                      | 25 pm segment   |   | ~0.01                                     |
| Dose<br>uniformity                       | Variable<br>Doses=0 to ~2 cGy        | Large fluctuations<br>Doses=0 to~30cGy            | Very large fluctuations<br>Doses = 0 to~10 <sup>4</sup> Gy                        | Very large fluctuations   |   |
| Mean number<br>of tracks                 | ~10 <sup>7</sup> gram <sup>-1</sup>  | ~0.1 cell <sup>-1</sup><br>~90% of cells unirrad. | ~6 x 10 <sup>-7</sup> segment <sup>-1</sup><br>~1 segment hit cell <sup>-1</sup>  | ~ 10 <sup>-8</sup> segment <sup>-1</sup><br>~10 segments hit cell <sup>-1</sup> |   |
| <u>External</u><br>10 MeV<br>neutrons    |                                      | -20<br>J~20<br>Jmm                                | 25 nm segment   | 2 nm segment  | ~0.005                                    |
| Dose<br>uniformity                       | Uniform<br>Dose = 1 cGv              | Large fluctuations                                | Very large fluctuations   | Very large fluctuations   |   |
| Mean number<br>of tracks                 | ~ 10 <sup>7</sup> gram <sup>-1</sup> | ~1 cell <sup>-1</sup><br>~37% of cells unirrad.   | ~4 x 10 <sup>-6</sup> segment <sup>-1</sup><br>~8 segments hit cell <sup>-1</sup> | ~10 <sup>-8</sup> segment <sup>-1</sup><br>~10 segments hit cell <sup>-1</sup>  |   |

nm's

cm's

# DNA damage depends on the "intersection" of chromatin structure and the radiation track structure.





D. T. Goodhead. *Mechanisms for the biological effectiveness of high-LET radiations*. J. Radiat. Res., 40: Suppl., 1-13 (1999).

# **Target Theory**

Assumptions:

- 1. Sensitive volumes (targets) are uniformly distributed within the cell nucleus
- 2. Targets have identical sensitivity to radiation damage
- 3. A hit in a given number of targets causes cell inactivation
- A "Hit" is defined as a physical event (energy transfers) in a sensitive target volume leading for instance to the inactivation of a gene critical to cell survival



FIG. 2. Schematic diagram of a cell and its nucleus taken as the gross sensitive volume. The lightly dotted regions represent the sensitive matrix, i.e., the volume collectively occupied by the loci. The heavy dots represent energy transfers due to a charged particle.

### **General Model**

Consider an exposure of a tissue to a given type of radiation. D [Gy] is the dose.
 The exposure yields N "energy deposition events" per unit volume and unit dose

 $\rho_e = N \times D$  [ions/cm<sup>3</sup>]: density of "events"

The targets are uniformly distributed. The probability to "hit" a target is:

What is the chance that a sensitive volume in the cell is hit "h" times?

The number of events in the cell (Trials) is  $\rho_e V_G$ If the target is hit "h" times, then it is missed ( $\rho_e V_G - h$ ) times. Assuming independent events, the chance of getting hit exactly "h" times, <u>in any order</u>, is:

$$P_{h} = p^{h} (1-p)^{\rho_{e}V_{G}-h} \frac{\rho_{e}V_{G}!}{h!(\rho_{e}V_{G}-h)!}$$

**Binomial Distribution** 

#### **Case of Single Target, Single Hit**

Assume that cell death can be caused if a single target is hit just once.

 $\Rightarrow$  Cell survival is only possible when the sensitive volume (target) cell is <u>NOT</u> hit (set h=0) at all.

Therefore: 
$$S = P_0 = p^0 (1-p)^{\rho_e V_G - 0} \frac{\rho_e V_G !}{0! (\rho_e V_G - 0)!} = (1-p)^{\rho_e V_G}$$
$$S = \exp[\ln[(1-p)^{\rho_e V_G}]] = \exp[\rho_e V_G \ln(1-p)]$$

For small values of p (use Taylor Expansion)  $S = e^{-\rho_e V_G p}$   $S = e^{-NV_S D} = e^{-KD} = e^{-D/D_0}$ 

 $S = e^{-KD} = e^{-D/D_0}$ 

#### Example

Consider a sample irradiation  $1cGy = 10^{-2}J/kg = 10^{-2}mJ/g = 6.2x10^{13}eV/g$ 

An average ionization event ~30eV

 $N = 2 \times 10^{12}$  [ionizations /gram per cGy]

 $\rho = 2 \times 10^{12} \text{ D}$  [ionizations /gram]

If we assume  $10^9$  cells/gram and ~6µm cell radius

N' = 2000 ionizations/cell per cGy

#### Dose=1cGy



2000 Ionizations in cell !

#### If you measure K or D<sub>0</sub>, can estimate the size of the target volume V<sub>s</sub>

Survival curves (Experimental data)  $\Rightarrow K \Rightarrow$  Then  $V_S = K / N'$ 

What is the biophysical interpretation of K?

Expected average number of hits in the cell per unit dose

Alternatively, for rare events and many trials, you can use **Poisson statistics** where the probability of "h" hits is given by:

*h* Expected number of hits=  $K \times D = D/D_0$ 

$$P_h = \frac{\overline{h}^h e^{-\overline{h}}}{h!}$$

$$S = P_0 = e^{-h}$$



#### Note: If h = 1 (i.e. average of 1 hit/target)

Then:  $S = e^{-1} = 0.37$ =  $e^{-Do/Do}$  -> 1 hit/target on average when D = Do

#### How do we go from exponential curve to an observed curve?



Dose

#### <u>Multi-target</u> single-hit theory: multiple targets must be hit a least once in order to induce cell inactivation



#### **Single Hit of Multiple Targets**



n targets hit  $\Rightarrow$  1 cell kill

The probability of a target not being hit is equivalent to the single target/single hit survival.

 $S = e^{-kD}$ 

Therefore, the probability of being hit is:  $1-e^{-kD}$ And the probability of all "n" targets being hit is:  $(1-e^{-kD})^n$ 

#### Therefore, survival is the probability of NOT all targets being hit:



Disadvantage: predicts zero initial slope, which is not observed.





Single hit, single target

$$S = e^{-D/D_0}$$

Single hit, multiple targets  $S = 1 - (1 - e^{-D/D_0})^n$ 

 $S = ne^{-D/D_0}$  for Large D

The multi-target single-hit model describes the slop of the survival curve by:

**D**<sub>0</sub> characteristic dose (mean lethal dose): reduces the population of cells from N<sub>cells</sub> to  $0.37N_{cells}$  (1/e) on parts of the survival curve that are exponential. **D**<sub>0</sub> = dose required to deliver one inactivating event (on average) per cell. **Extrapolation number n**: extrapolated point of intersection of the final slope onto the log survival axis



The shoulder portion can be described either by the extrapolation number (n targets) or the quasi-threshold,  $D_{\alpha}$ .

$$D_q = D_0 \ln(n)$$

 $D_q$ : quasi-threshold dose is obtained as the offset at intersection of  $S_0$  line with the final slope line (Do).

For D >> Dq,

$$S \approx e^{-(D-Dq)/D_0}$$

### Adding Biology: a Repair/Recovery Term

DNA repair term added to single-hit, single-target model  $S = e^{-D/Do} e^{+ro[1-e(-D/r)]}$ kill repair

r<sub>0</sub> = maximal survival gain due to repair (saturation)
r = repair "rate" constant
r<sub>0</sub>



# More about the dual action: spatial distributions

#### A Generalized Formulation of Dual Radiation Action<sup>1</sup>

Albrecht M. Kellerer and Harald H. Rossi

Institut für Medizinische Strahlenkunde der Universität Würzburg, Würzburg, Federal Republic of Germany and Radiobiological Research Laboratories, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027

KELLERER, A. M., AND ROSSI, H. H. A Generalized Formulation of Dual Radiation Action. *Radiat. Res.* 75, 471–488 (1978).

Dual radiation action is a process in which cellular lesions are produced as a result of the interaction of pairs of sublesions that are molecular alterations produced by ionizing radiation. Previous formulations of this process have employed a number of simplifying assumptions that limit the accuracy and the range of application of theoretical analysis. The formulation presented here removes some of these restrictions by introducing three functions that describe the geometry of the sensitive material in the cell, the geometry of the pattern of energy deposition, and the interaction probability of sublesions as a function of their separation. The relation derived is similar to that obtained previously, in that lesion production is found to depend on two terms that are proportional to the first and the second power of the absorbed dose. However, the coefficients of these terms are now derived on the basis of a more realistic treatment.

### Back to Linear Quadratic (LQ) Model



FIGURE 2.11 • The frequency of chromosomal aberrations (dicentrics and rings) is a linearquadratic function of dose because the aberrations are the consequence of the interaction of two separate chromosome breaks (a pair of DSBs). At low doses, both breaks may be caused by the same electron; the probability of an exchange aberration is proportional to dose (D). At higher doses, the two chromosome breaks are more likely to be caused by separate electron tracks. The probability of an exchange aberration is proportional to the square of the dose (D<sup>2</sup>).



 $S = e^{-\#of\_lethal\_aberrations}$ 

**FIGURE 3.5** • Relationship between chromosome aberrations and cell survival. Cells that suffer exchange-type chromosome aberrations (such as dicentrics) are unable to survive and continue to divide indefinitely. The survival curve bends if the quadratic component dominates as the dose increases

### **Original Dual Action Idea**

(Lea, Action of Radiation on living cells)

Single track event

Two uncorrelated track events Close in time-space

 $S(D) = e^{-\alpha D - \beta D}$ 

**Basic Concept :** 

Two energy deposition events are involved. A sublesion is produced by one energy deposit. A pair of sublesions could interact to produce a lesion - if within a given permissible distance for interaction The yield of sublesions is proportional to D The yield of lesions is proportional to D<sup>2</sup>

More Refined Models:

More specific definitions of "sublesion" and "lesion" (observables)
The interactions of sublesions related to temporal and spatial energy distributions (distance models). *It's all a complex matter of "space and time"*Compound dual radiation action theory

### Mathematical Models

#### Reality is:

All models except the single-hit, single-target fit the experimental data reasonably well within error bars.

The biological data are not sufficiently precise nor are the predictive theoretical curves sufficiently different to allow the selection of a 'CORRECT' model. It is curve-fitting !

They do not directly and uniquely identify the underlying physical or biological mechanisms !

# **Overall Summary**

Cell Survival Curves can be measured

For mammalian cells, the curves are not simply exponential

The LQ Model fits most observation very well

- lethal unstable chromosome yield linked to
- cell survival (on semi-log plot)

Underlying cell killing actions are described by target statistics and dual action theories

- sublesions, lesions
- what are these biological entities ?

*Tumour control can be predicted from cell survival* (*if* cell parameters are known *in vivo* !)