Biological Effects of Antiprotons

Are Antiprotons a Candidate for Cancer Therapy?

Michael H. Holzscheiter For the ACE Collaboration

Jan Alsner, Angelo Angelopoulos, Niels Bassler, Gerd Beyer, Rebecca Boll, Massimo Caccia, Fred Currell, John DeMarco, Michael Doser, Dragan Hajdukovic, Oliver Hartley, Rochus Herrmann, Michael Holzscheiter, Kei Iwamoto, Oliver Jäkel, Ted Kalogeropoulos, Ioannis Kantemiris, Franz Joachim Kaiser, Joy Kavanagh, Helge Knudsen, Roy Keyes, Carl Maggiore, Søren Pape Møller, Loretta Negrini, Jens Overgaard, Jørgen Petersen, Osman Ratib, Giuseppe Schettino, Stefan Sellner, Bill Smathers, Lloyd Skarsgard, Tina Straße, Sara Tegami, David Timson, Heikki Tölli, Brita Singers-Sørensen, Timothy Solberg, Brad Wouters

Aarhus University, Aarhus University Hospital, University of Athens, Queen's University Belfast, CERN, Hôpital Universitaire de Geneve, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Universita d'Insubria, Como, University of Maastricht, Max Planck Inst. Nuclear Physics, Heidelberg, TRIUMF, UCLA, University of Montenegro, Podgorica, University of New Mexico, University of Umeå, University of Texas



Rationale for Conformal Radiotherapy



Physical Advantage of Antiprotons





Antiprotons?



The Good Fragments The (not so) Bad Pions The (probably not really) Ugly Neutrons

Initial Proposal: L. Gray, T. Kalogeropoulos, Radiation Research 97 (1984) 246-252



Not exactly a new idea.....

Dose enhancement expected from pion annihilation (star formation) led to active research in several centers (PSI, Los Alamos, TRIUMF) and was used in clinical applications on more than 1000 patients



Stanley B. Curtis and Mudundi R. Raju; Radiation Research 34, 239-255 (1968)



The AD-4 Experiment at CERN



INGREDIENTS:

C-214-71

 V-79 Chinese Hamster cells embedded in gelatin
Antiproton beam from AD



V79

Developed by Ford and Yerganian in 1958 from lung tissue of a young male Chinese Hamster (Cricetulus griseus)



AD-4/ACE Phase I



Antiprotons at **46.7 MeV** Energy Penetration Depth in H₂O of **20 mm** 3 Thickness 2D Ridge Filter for "SOBP"

Plating Efficiency > 60% for 50+ hours

Reference Measurement with ⁶⁰Co for both proton and antiproton experiments at TRIUMF and CERN





AD-4/ACE Phase I Raw Data





AD-4/ACE Phase I Results





Antiproton RBE Estimate

 $\frac{BEDR(p^{-})}{BEDR(p^{+})} = \frac{F(p^{-})}{F(p^{+})} \cdot \frac{RBE(p^{-})_{peak}/RBE(p^{-})_{plateau}}{RBE(p^{+})_{peak}/RBE(p^{+})_{plateau}}.$

$$\mathsf{RBE}(p^{-})_{\mathsf{peak}} = \frac{\mathsf{BEDR}(p^{-})}{\mathsf{BEDR}(p^{+})} \cdot \frac{F(p^{+})}{F(p^{-})} \cdot \frac{\mathsf{RBE}(p^{-})_{\mathsf{plateau}}}{\mathsf{RBE}(p^{+})_{\mathsf{plateau}}} \cdot \mathsf{RBE}(p^{+})_{\mathsf{peak}}.$$





AD-4 ACE Phase II

Beam Energy increased to 126 MeV (502 MeV/c) allowingclear Separation of Plateau Region and Bragg Peakconstruction of a clinical relevant SOBP (Spread Out Bragg Peak) of 12 mm depth

Increased Efforts in Beam Monitoring and Dosimetry through Benchmarking Experiments with Ionization Chambers and extensive Alanine studies

Absolute Dose Estimation using FLUKA
Determination of absolute RBE



Carbon Ions – SOBP at GSI



note: clinical beams with precise dosimetry and fast dose delivery Energy to achieve same clinical relevant depth and form SOBP as at CERN....



RBE for Carbon Ions







Some remaining issues with SOBP build low statistics



CERN DATA 2007 – RBE Analysis



Extract survival vs. dose plot for each depth slice and calculate $RBE_{SF=10\%}$ $RBE_{plateau} = 1.0$ $RBE_{peak} = 1.57$





Dose planning for SOBP successfulfinal doses need recalculations





Complete data set





Two independent experimentsunder identical conditions!



5 Years of Running –

5 Depth Dose Distributions





Biological Stability





Cell Micro-Environment



Cells are found to be fully oxygenated



Cell Survival vs. Dose for 2010 Data





Combined RBE_{plateau} for 2007 and 2010







Comparison of Effective Biological Dose

Depth in Gel [cm]





Comparison of Effective Biological Dose

Depth in Gel [cm]





Comparison of Effective Biological Dose

Depth in Gel [cm]



Comparison of Effective Biological Dose





Remaining Work

- (re)do "forensic" dose calculations with latest (recommended) version of FLUKA (beta release)
- Combine data 2010 2012 and study inclusion of 2008 and 2009 data (changing set-up effects beam)
- Calculate RBE for antiprotons at every point along depth dose curve



Treatment Plan based on Physical Dose only.....



PROTONS

ANTIPROTONS

....shows reduction of normal tissue volume receiving low to medium dose



X-RAY PROTON CARBON-ION NIR ANTIPROTON PΡ Ρ βP Р 쀽 P h2ax dapi+h2ax Ъ h2ax 26 dapi+h2ax ⊐

Antiproton annihilation causes spatially correlated DNA damage

Figure 1 | Initial and residual γ -H2AX foci were observed in charged particle irradiated fibroblasts. (a) γ -H2AX foci (green) were imaged at 1 and 26 h after irradiation with antiprotons (top), carbon ions, protons or 225 kVp X-rays. (b) 'Cut-view' images taken from compiled Z-stack images through irradiated cells show stacks of foci along antiproton paths in SOBP irradiated cells that were fixed 1 h after irradiation. (c) Restoration deconvolution was applied to images of cell nuclei from antiproton-irradiated fibroblasts. Antiproton SOBP irradiated nuclei (top) contained large clustered foci that were smaller and less frequent in antiproton plateau irradiated fibroblasts (bottom).

SCIENTIFIC REPORTS





SUBJECT AREAS: RADIOTHERAPY CELL BIOLOGY PHYSICS DNA

Received 10 January 2013 Accepted

12 April 2013 Published 3 May 2013

Antiproton induced DNA damage: proton like in flight, carbon-ion like near rest

J. N. Kavanagh¹, F. J. Currell^{1,2}, D. J. Timson³, K. I. Savage¹, D. J. Richard⁴, S. J. McMahon¹, O. Hartley⁵, G. A. P. Cirrone⁶, F. Romano⁶, K. M. Prise¹, N. Bassler^{7,8}, M. H. Holzscheiter⁹ & G. Schettino¹

¹Centre for Cancer Research and Cell Biology, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK, ²Centre for Plasma Physics, School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK, ³School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK, ⁴Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia, ⁵Department of Structural Biology and Bioinformatics, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland, ⁶INFN-LNS, Catania, Italy, ⁷Department of Experimental Clinical Oncology, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark, ⁸Department of Physics and Astronomy, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark, ⁹Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA.

Biological validation of new radiotherapy modalities is essential to understand their therapeutic potential.



Thank You

CERN the AD-Team the AD-Users

And You for your attention

