Industrial Engineering Journal
ISSN: 0970-2555
Volume : 53, Issue 4, No. 5, April : 2024

MATHEMATICAL OPTIMIZATION IN IMRT: AI AND ML ENHANCEMENTS

Keshav Kumar K., Research Scholar, Department of Mathematics, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad-500085, Telangana, India. Email Id: keshav.jntuh@gmail.com
Dr. NVSL Narasimham, Associate Professor, Department of Humanities & Mathematics, G. Narayanamma Institute of Technology and Science (for Women), Hyderabad-500104, Telangana, India. Email Id: nvsl.narasimham@gnits.ac.in
Dr. A. Ramakrishna Prasad, Rtd.Professor, Department of Mathematics, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad-500085, Telangana, India. Email Id: prof.prasadark@gmail.com

Abstract:
Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT) plays a critical role in modern cancer treatment, allowing for precise targeting of tumors while minimizing damage to healthy tissues. Mathematical optimization techniques are essential in IMRT planning to generate optimal treatment plans based on various clinical objectives and constraints. This research paper explores the advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) techniques applied to mathematical optimization in IMRT, aiming to enhance treatment plan quality, efficiency, and patient outcomes. We discuss the key challenges in IMRT planning and how AI and ML techniques can address these challenges. We also review recent studies and applications of AI and ML in IMRT optimization, including data-driven models, deep learning approaches, and reinforcement learning algorithms. Furthermore, we explore the potential benefits, limitations, and future directions of integrating AI and ML techniques into IMRT optimization algorithms.

Keywords: IMRT Optimization, Mathematical Optimization, Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Treatment Plan Quality

1. Introduction:
In recent years, significant advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) have revolutionized various fields, including healthcare. In the domain of cancer treatment, one area that has witnessed remarkable progress is the optimization of Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT) planning (Webb (2015)). IMRT plays a crucial role in delivering radiation doses to cancerous tumors while minimizing harm to surrounding healthy tissues. Mathematical optimization techniques have long been employed to generate optimal treatment plans that adhere to clinical objectives and constraints. However, with the advent of AI and ML, new opportunities have emerged to enhance the efficacy, efficiency, and precision of IMRT planning. This research paper explores the integration of AI and ML techniques into mathematical optimization in IMRT, focusing on their potential to address the challenges faced in treatment planning, improve plan quality, and ultimately enhance patient outcomes.

IMRT planning is a complex task that involves striking a delicate balance between achieving adequate tumor coverage and minimizing radiation expo- sure to critical structures. This trade-off according to Dutta and Kumar, (2022) between target coverage and healthy tissue sparing poses a significant challenge in treatment planning. Moreover, the optimization problem in IMRT planning is multifaceted, and characterized by multiple competing objectives and constraints. Clinical objectives, such as achieving homogeneous dose distribution within the tumor (Kataria et al., 2012) and limiting the dose to nearby organs at risk, need to be carefully considered. Additionally, constraints related to dose limits, organ tolerances, and planning guidelines must be adhered to. Addressing these challenges necessitates sophisticated optimization algorithms capable of navigating the high-dimensional treatment planning space to find optimal solutions.

The incorporation of AI (Dutta et al., 2023a) and ML (Dutta et al., 2023d) techniques holds great promise for advancing (Dutta et al., 2023b) IMRT optimization. Data-driven models (Solomatine and Ostfeld, 2008)) provide a valuable tool for predicting treatment plan parameters or optimizing plans based on historical patient data. These models leverage large datasets to learn patterns and relationships, enabling accurate prediction of dose distributions and optimization of treatment plans. Deep learning approaches (Dutta et al., 2023e), in particular, offer the capability to automatically extract relevant features from medical images and generate treatment plans. By leveraging the power of neural networks, deep learning algorithms can learn complex representations and capture intricate patterns in the data, enhancing the quality and efficiency of IMRT planning. Furthermore, reinforcement learning algorithms provide a framework for adaptive and personalized treatment planning, where algorithms learn optimal strategies through interactions with the treatment planning environment and patient-specific feedback.

The application of AI and ML in IMRT optimization has led to various tangible benefits and advancements. Patient-specific dose prediction models enable personalized treatment planning by estimating patient-specific radiation dose distributions based on individual characteristics. Automated treatment plan generation reduces the burden on radiation oncologists by automating the plan creation process, saving time, and improving plan quality. Adaptive treatment planning, facilitated by AI and ML, allows for real-time adjustments to treatment plans based on evolving patient conditions and feedback, ensuring treatment plans remain optimal throughout treatment. Knowledge-based planning, achieved through large-scale data analysis and AI techniques, leverages the collective experience of radiation oncologists to provide recommendations and improve treatment plan quality.

However, alongside these benefits, it is crucial to acknowledge the limitations and challenges of integrating AI and ML in IMRT optimization. Model generalization and interpretability remain important concerns, as models trained on specific patient populations may struggle to generalize to new cohorts. Moreover, the interpretability of AI and ML models in radiation oncology is crucial for establishing trust, understanding decision-making processes, and ensuring the safety and ethical considerations of treatment planning.

In conclusion, this research paper delves into the advancements and potential of AI and ML techniques in the mathematical optimization of IMRT planning. By addressing the challenges inherent in IMRT optimization and exploring the applications of AI and ML, this research aims to shed light on how these technologies can enhance treatment plan quality, efficiency, and patient outcomes. By leveraging the power of AI and ML, the field of IMRT optimization holds great promise for revolutionizing cancer treatment and improving the lives of patients worldwide.

1.1 Background on IMRT and its importance in cancer treatment

Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT) is a radiation therapy technique used in cancer treatment. It involves delivering varying radiation intensities to different regions of a tumor, allowing for precise targeting while minimizing damage to surrounding healthy tissues. IMRT utilizes an intensity modulation function, typically represented as $M(x, y, z)$, which specifies the intensity of radiation at each point (x, y, z) within the treatment volume. The intensity modulation function (Lang (2004)) is multiplied by the prescribed dose, $D(x, y, z)$, resulting in the actual radiation intensity at that point

$$I(x, y, z) = D(x, y, z) \times M(x, y, z) \quad (1)$$

The goal of IMRT is to optimize the intensity modulation function $M(x, y, z)$ to achieve the desired dose distribution within the tumor while minimizing the dose to critical structures, thus maximizing treatment efficacy and minimizing side effects.

1.2 Overview of mathematical optimization in IMRT planning

IMRT planning involves mathematical optimization techniques to generate optimal treatment plans that satisfy clinical objectives and constraints. The optimization problem in IMRT planning can be formulated using an objective function, typically denoted as $f(D)$, which quantifies the quality of the treatment plan based on the dose distribution D. The objective function can be designed to balance different treatment goals, such as target coverage, dose conformity, and sparing of organs at risk. The objective function (Feist and Palsson, 2010) can be defined as a minimization or maximization problem, $\min(f(D))$ or $\max(f(D))$. The treatment plan optimization is subject to con- straints (Morrill et al., 1991), which specify dose limits to organs at risk and other clinical requirements, ensuring that the plan is feasible and meets the necessary safety guidelines.

1.3 Motivation for incorporating AI and ML techniques in IMRT optimization

The motivation for integrating AI and ML techniques in IMRT optimization arises from their potential to improve treatment plan quality, efficiency, and patient outcomes. AI and ML algorithms can learn from historical treatment data (Viele et al., 2014), patient-specific information, and large-scale datasets to develop models that capture complex relationships and patterns within the data.

These models can be utilized to enhance IMRT optimization by predicting treatment plan parameters, automatically generating treatment plans, adapting plans based on real-time feedback, and providing decision support to radiation oncologists.

The application of AI and ML techniques in IMRT optimization involves various mathematical models and algorithms, such as regression models, neural networks, deep learning architectures, reinforcement learning algorithms, and data-driven optimization methods.

2. Challenges in IMRT Optimization

IMRT optimization in radiation therapy presents several challenges that need to be addressed to achieve optimal treatment plans. This section delves into the key challenges faced in IMRT optimization, namely the trade-offs between target coverage and healthy tissue sparing, the complexity of the optimization problem with multiple objectives and constraints, and the uncertainties in patient-specific data and anatomical variations. These challenges pose significant hurdles in achieving high-quality treatment plans that effectively deliver radiation to the tumor while minimizing damage to surrounding healthy tissues (Barnett et al., 2009). By understanding and addressing these challenges, researchers and clinicians can advance the field of IMRT optimization and improve patient outcomes.

2.1 Trade-offs between target coverage and healthy tissue sparing

IMRT optimization involves finding a delicate balance between delivering an effective radiation dose to the tumor (target coverage) while minimizing the radiation dose to surrounding healthy tissues (healthy tissue sparing). This trade-off is crucial to ensuring successful cancer treatment outcomes and minimizing potential side effects. Mathematically, this trade-off can be represented using an objective function that incorporates both target coverage and healthy tissue sparing. A common approach is to use a weighted sum of the dose delivered to the tumor (D_{target}) and the dose delivered to organs at risk (D_{OAR}) as the objective function:

$$f(D) = \alpha \times D_{target} + \beta \times D_{OAR} \qquad (2)$$

In this equation, α and β are weighting factors that determine the relative importance of target coverage and healthy tissue sparing. The objective function aims to find a treatment plan that achieves the desired target coverage (Zanoli and Dobsıcek Trefn, 2022) while keeping the dose to organs at risk within acceptable limits. Adjusting the weighting factors allows radiation oncologists to prioritize one objective over the other based on the specific clinical scenario and the patient's individual characteristics.

To find an optimal balance, sophisticated optimization algorithms are employed to explore the trade-off space and identify treatment plans that achieve the desired compromise. These algorithms use mathematical techniques such as gradient-based optimization, evolutionary algorithms, or mathematical programming approaches to iteratively refine the treatment plan and converge toward an optimal solution. The challenge lies in determining appropriate weighting factors and defining the desired trade-off between target coverage and healthy tissue sparing. This often requires clinical expertise and careful consideration of the specific tumor characteristics, surrounding critical structures, and the potential impact on patient outcomes. Different clinical scenarios may require different trade-offs, and customization based on individual patient needs is crucial. Moreover, advancements in IMRT optimization include the integration of advanced techniques such as multi-objective optimization. Instead of using a single objective function, multiple conflicting objectives, such as target coverage (Schlaefer and Schweikard, 2008), healthy tissue sparing, and dose homogeneity, can be simultaneously optimized. This results in a set of treatment plans, known as the Pareto front, representing the trade-off between these objectives. The radiation oncologist can then choose the most appropriate plan based on clinical judgment and patient-specific considerations.

Understanding and managing the trade-offs between target coverage and healthy tissue sparing is essential to IMRT optimization. By carefully designing the objective function, adjusting weighting factors, and employing advanced optimization algorithms, radiation oncologists can strike an optimal balance that maximizes the potential for tumor control while minimizing the risk of side effects.

2.2 Complex optimization problem with multiple objectives and constraints

IMRT optimization poses a complex problem due to the presence of multiple objectives and constraints. While target coverage and healthy tissue sparing are often the primary objectives, other factors such as dose homogeneity within the target or conformity of the dose distribution to the tumor shape need to be considered. Mathematically, the optimization problem can be formulated as a multi-objective optimization problem, $\min(f_1(D), f_2(D), ..., f_n(D))$, or $\max(f_1(D), f_2(D), ..., f_n(D))$ subject to constraints, In this formulation, $f_1(D), f_2(D), ..., f_n(D)$ represent the individual objective functions capturing various treatment goals. Each objective function quantifies a specific aspect of the treatment plan quality. For example, $f_1(D)$ may represent target coverage, $f_2(D)$ may represent healthy tissue sparing, and so on. The optimization process aims to find a set of treatment plans that achieve a good trade-off among these objectives. The constraints in the optimization problem ensure that the treatment plan satisfies dose limits and other clinical requirements (Mohan et al., 1992). These constraints may include maximum dose limits for organs at risk, minimum dose requirements for the target, or other constraints related to the specific clinical scenario. Incorporating these constraints into the optimization process ensures that the treatment plan is feasible and complies with safety guidelines. Solving a multi-objective optimization problem involves finding a set of solutions known as the Pareto front. This front represents the trade-off between different objectives, where improving one objective may require sacrificing another. The radiation oncologist can then select a treatment plan from the Pareto front based on clinical judgment and patient-specific considerations. Addressing the complexity of the optimization problem requires the use of advanced optimization algorithms and mathematical techniques. Evolutionary algorithms, such as genetic algorithms or particle swarm optimization, are commonly employed to explore the solution space and identify the Pareto front. These algorithms utilize a population of candidate solutions that evolve iteratively through generations (Douguet et al., 2000), aiming to converge towards a set of optimal or near-optimal solutions. The challenge lies in effectively formulating the objective functions to capture the desired treatment goals and defining appropriate constraints that reflect the clinical requirements. Clinical expertise and knowledge play a crucial role in determining the objectives and constraints and their relative importance. Furthermore, techniques like preference-based optimization allow the incorporation of user preferences to guide the optimization process, enabling a more patient-centric treatment planning approach.

2.3 Uncertainties in patient-specific data and anatomical variations:

IMRT optimization encounters challenges due to uncertainties in patient- specific data and anatomical variations. Patient anatomy can vary, and there may be uncertainties in imaging data, which can impact the accuracy of dose calculations and treatment plan predictions. To address these uncertainties, stochastic or probabilistic optimization techniques can be employed. These techniques account for the uncertainty in patient-specific data and incorporate it into the optimization process. They consider multiple scenarios or probabilistic distributions of parameters to generate robust treatment plans that perform well across a range of possible variations. Stochastic optimization approaches aim to optimize the treatment plan considering a set of possible scenarios. These scenarios can represent variations in patient anatomy, imaging data uncertainties, or other sources of uncertainty. The optimization process generates a set of treatment plans that are robust across these scenarios, ensuring that the plan's quality is maintained despite uncertainties.

Robust optimization techniques take a slightly different approach. Instead of explicitly considering multiple scenarios, robust optimization aims to develop a treatment plan that is robust against a range of uncertainties. These uncertainties are often modeled using uncertainty sets that represent the potential variations in parameters or data. The optimization process seeks a plan that satisfies the constraints and performs well under the worst-case scenarios within the uncertainty set. The challenge lies in appropriately mod- eling and quantifying uncertainties in patient-specific data and anatomical variations (Paganelli et al., 2018). This requires considering statistical information, incorporating image registration techniques to account for anatomical changes, and analyzing data from multiple patients or imaging modalities to capture the variability within the patient population. Moreover, advancements in uncertainty modeling, such as interval optimization, chance-constrained optimization, or robust optimization with distributional robust approaches, continue to enhance the ability to handle uncertainties effectively.

By accounting for uncertainties in patient-specific data and anatomical variations, stochastic and robust optimization techniques provide more reliable treatment plans that can adapt to real-world clinical scenarios and potential changes in patient conditions.

3. AI and ML Techniques in IMRT Optimization

AI and ML techniques have emerged as powerful tools in the field of Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT) optimization. By leveraging the capabilities of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML), researchers and clinicians aim to enhance treatment plan quality, efficiency, and patient outcomes. This section explores the application of AI and ML techniques in IMRT optimization, focusing on three key subpoints: data-driven models for treatment plan prediction and optimization, deep learning approaches for automatic feature extraction and plan generation, and reinforcement learning algorithms for adaptive and personalized treatment planning. These advancements hold great promise in revolutionizing IMRT optimization, addressing the complexities of treatment planning and enabling more effective and tailored radiation therapy for cancer patients.

3.1 Data-driven models for treatment plan prediction and optimization

Data-driven models play a crucial role in IMRT optimization by leveraging historical treatment data to predict treatment plan parameters or optimize treatment plans based on patient-specific information. These models capture complex relationships and patterns within the data to improve treatment plan quality and efficiency.

Regression models are commonly used in data-driven approaches (Dutta et al., 2023e) to predict treatment plan parameters based on patient character- istics. The mathematical equation takes the form, $y = f(x)$, where y represents the predicted treatment plan parameter, x represents patient-specific input variables, and **f** represents the regression function. The regression function can be a linear equation, polynomial equation, or a more complex non-linear function, depending on the relationship between the input variables and the predicted parameter. Given below is the Pseudo code for the RegressionModel.

function Regression ModeL (x, y)
  Initialize θ
  Set α, num_iterations
  for each iteration do
    $y_{\text{pred}} = f(x; \theta)$
    $\text{loss} = \frac{1}{N}\sum(y_{\text{pred}} - y)^2$
    $\text{gradients} = \frac{2}{N}\sum(y_{\text{pred}} - y) \cdot x$
    $\theta = \theta - \alpha \cdot \text{gradients}$
  end for
  Given x_{new}
  $y_{\text{pred}} = f(x_{\text{new}}; \theta)$
  return y_{pred}
end function

Machine learning algorithms (Dutta et al., 2023d), such as support vector machines (SVMs) or random forests, can also be utilized to predict treatment plan parameters. SVMs find a

Industrial Engineering Journal
ISSN: 0970-2555
Volume : 53, Issue 4, No. 5, April : 2024

hyperplane that best separates the data into different classes or regression lines. The mathematical equation for SVMs involves finding the optimal hyperplane:

$$w^T \times x + b = 0, \quad (3)$$

where w represents the weight vector, x represents the input variables, and b represents the bias term. Given below is the Pseudo code for the SVM.

function SVM (x, y)
  Choose kernel: $K(x_i, x_j)$
  Set regularization parameter: C
  Train SVM:
    Compute kernel matrix: $K_{\text{matrix}} = [[K(x_i, x_j)]]$
    Initialize Lagrange multipliers: $\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_N]$
    Repeat until convergence:
      $\alpha = \alpha + \text{learning\_rate} \cdot (1 - \sum \alpha)$
      $\text{grad} = K_{\text{matrix}} \cdot \alpha - y$
      $\alpha = \alpha\text{-learning\_rate} \cdot \text{grad}$
  Given x_{new}
  $y_{\text{pred}} = \sum \alpha \cdot y \cdot K(x_{\text{new}}, x_i)$
  return y_{pred}
  end function

Random forests combine an ensemble of decision trees (Dutta et al., 2023b,d) to make predictions. Each decision tree partitions the feature space into regions and assigns a prediction value based on the majority class or average value of the samples within each region.

For optimization, data-driven models can be further extended to perform plan optimization directly. This involves formulating an objective function that quantifies the quality of the treatment plan and optimizing it using mathematical optimization techniques. Linear programming, for example, can be employed to solve optimization problems with linear constraints (Dutta et al., 2023a) and a linear objective function. Quadratic programming is useful when the objective function and constraints are quadratic in nature. The objective function in linear programming can be represented as, $\min(c^T \times x)$, or $\max(c^T \times x)$ subject to $A \times x \leq b$, $G \times x = h$, where c is the vector of coefficients for the objective function, x is the vector of decision variables representing the treatment plan, A and b represent the inequality constraints, and G and h represent the equality constraints. The goal is to find the values of the decision variables that minimize or maximize the objective function while satisfying the given constraints.

3.2 Deep learning approaches for automatic feature extraction and plan generation

Deep learning techniques, such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs) (Dutta et al., 2023f) or generative adversarial networks (GANs), have revolutionized IMRT optimization by enabling automatic feature extraction (Mierswa and Morik, 2005) and plan generation. These approaches utilize deep neural networks to process medical images and generate treatment plans based on learned patterns and representations.

Industrial Engineering Journal
ISSN: 0970-2555
Volume : 53, Issue 4, No. 5, April : 2024

CNNs are commonly used for automatic feature extraction from medical images. The mathematical equations involve the convolutional and pooling operations (Dutta et al., 2023b,a) performed by the network layers. The convolution operation can be represented as:

$$y = f(W \times x + b) \qquad (4)$$

where x represents the input image, W represents the learned weights (filters), b represents the biases, and f represents the activation function. The output of the convolution operation captures relevant local patterns in the input image. The pooling operation downsamples the feature maps, reducing their spatial dimensions while retaining important features. Max pooling, for instance, selects the maximum value within each pooling region, resulting in a more condensed representation. Given below is the Pseudo code for the CNN.

function CNN(x, y)
  Initialize: $W_{conv}, b_{conv}, W_{fc}, b_{fc}$
  Set: α, batch_size, num_epochs
  for each epoch do
    Shuffle data
    for each batch do
      $x_{batch} = x[i : i + \text{batch\_size}]$
      $y_{batch} = y[i : i + \text{batch\_size}]$
      Forward pass:
        $h_{conv} = \phi_{act}(\text{convolve}(x_{batch}, W_{conv}) + b_{conv})$
        $h_{pool} = \text{pool}(h_{conv})$
        $h_{flat} = \text{flatten}(h_{pool})$
        $h_{fc} = \phi_{act}(\text{matmul}(h_{flat}, W_{fc}) + b_{fc})$
        $y_{pred\_batch} = \phi_{act}(h_{fc})$
      $\text{Loss} = \frac{1}{\text{batch\_size}} \sum \left(y_{prod\_batch} - y_{batch}\right)^2$
      Gradients = compute_gradients(Loss)
      update_parameters($W_{conv}, b_{conv}, W_{fc}, b_{fc}$, Gradients)
    end for
  end for
  Given x_{new}
  $y_{pred} = \phi_{act}(\text{matmul}(\text{flatten}(\text{pool}(\phi_{act}(\text{convolve}(x_{new}, W_{conv}) + b_{coav})))), W_{fc}) + b_{fc})$
  return y_{pred}
end function

where, ϕact is the Activation Function.

Generative adversarial networks (GANs) (Creswell et al., 2018) are used for generating treatment plans. The GAN framework involves two components: a generator and a discriminator. The generator aims to generate treatment plans that resemble real plans, while the discriminator tries to distinguish between real and generated plans. The generator's objective is to minimize the following equation:

$$V(D, G) = E(x{\sim}P_{data})(log(D(x))) + E(z{\sim}P(z))(log(1 - D(G(z)))) \qquad (5)$$

where G represents the generator, D represents the discriminator, x represents real treatment plans, z represents random noise input, and P_{data} and P (z) represent the data and noise distributions, respectively. The minimization of V (D, G) is done following minimum value of G, and maximum value of D. During the training process, the generator and discriminator iteratively update their parameters to achieve a Nash equilibrium, where the generator produces realistic treatment plans that can deceive the discriminator. Given below is the Pseudo code for the GAN.

```
function GAN (x)
  Initialize: θ_g, θ_d
  Set: α, batch_size, num_iterations
  for each iteration do
    z_batch = random_noise(batch_size)
    x_fake_batch = generate_data (z_batch ; θ_g)
    x_real_batch = x[ : batch_size ]
    Train discriminator:
      loss_real = −mean (log (discriminate (x_real_batch ; θ_d)))
      loss_fake = −mean (log (1 − discriminate (x_fake_batch ; θ_d)))
      loss_d = loss_real + loss_fake
      gradients_d = compute_gradients(loss_d)
      θ_d = update_parameters (θ_d, gradients_d )
    Train generator:
      x_fake_batch = generate_data (z_batch ; θ_g)
      loss_g = −mean (log (discriminate (x_fake_batch ; θ_d)))
      gradients_g = compute_gradients(loss_g)
      θ_g = update_parameters (θ_g, gradients_g )
  end for
  Given x_new
  y_pred = generate_data (x_new ; θ_g)
  return y_pred
end function
```

3.3 Reinforcement learning algorithms for adaptive and personalized treatment planning

Reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms (Oh et al., 2020) have shown promise in adaptive and personalized treatment planning. RL enables an agent to learn optimal treatment strategies through interactions with the treatment planning environment and receiving feedback on the quality of the treatment plans. RL involves mathematical equations that represent the agent's learning and decision-making process. The equations include

1. State (S): The current representation of the treatment planning environment.
2. Action (A): The treatment plan or intervention chosen by the agent.
3. Reward (R): The feedback or evaluation of the treatment plan's quality.
4. Policy (π): The strategy or decision-making function that maps states to actions.
5. Value function (V or Q): The expected cumulative reward or value of being in a particular state or taking a particular action.

The value function can be represented by the Bellman equation:

$$\mathrm{V}(S) = E\,(R + \gamma \times \mathrm{V}(S')) \quad (6)$$

where V (S) represents the value of state S, R represents the reward obtained, γ represents the discount factor, and V (S′) represents the value of the next state.

Q-learning is a widely used RL algorithm that estimates the action-value function Q(S, A). The Q-learning equation for updating the Q-value is:

$$Q(S, A) = Q(S, A) + \alpha \times (R + \gamma \times \max(Q(S', A')) - Q(S, A)) \quad (7)$$

where α represents the learning rate, R represents the reward, γ represents the discount factor, and max(Q(S′, A′)) represents the maximum Q-value over all possible actions in the next state. Given below is the Pseudo code for the QLearning.

function QLEARNING
Initialize Q-table: $Q(s, a)$
Set: α, γ, ϵ, num_episodes
for each episode **do**
$s =$ initial_state
while episode is not done **do**
$a =$ select_action (s, ϵ)
$r, s_{next} =$ take_action (s, a)
$Q(s,a) = Q(s,a) + \alpha \cdot \left(r + \gamma \cdot \max(Q(s_{next}, a_{next})) - Q(s,a) \right)$
$s = s_{next}$
end while
end for
Given s
$a = \arg\max(Q(s, a))$
return a
end function

Policy gradient methods (Peters, 2010), another class of RL algorithms, optimize the policy directly by estimating the gradient of the expected cumulative reward with respect to the policy parameters. These mathematical equations, combined with exploration-exploitation strategies and learning algorithms, enable RL agents to learn and adapt treatment plans based on patient-specific conditions and the quality of the treatment plans. Given below is the Pseudo code for the Policy Gradient.

function POLICYGRADIENT
Define policy network with parameters: θ
Set: α, γ, num_episodes
for each episode **do**
$s =$ initial_state
Initialize empty lists: S, A, R
while episode is not done do
$P =$ policy_network $(s; \theta)$
$a =$ sample_action (P)
$r, s_{next} =$ take_action (s, a)
S.append (s), A append (a), R append (r)
$s = s_{next}$

```
    end while
    G = compute_discounted_rewards (R, γ)
    gradients = compute_gradients (θ, S, A, G)
    θ = θ + α · gradients
  end for
  Given s
  P = policy_network (s; θ)
  a = select_action (P)
  return a
end function
```

4 Applications of AI and ML in IMRT Optimization

Applications of AI and ML techniques have revolutionized the field of intensity- modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) optimization, enabling more precise and personalized treatment planning. These advanced computational approaches address various challenges and offer innovative solutions (Dutta et al., 2023c) for improving treatment outcomes. In this section, we will explore the applications of AI and ML in IMRT optimization, focusing on three key areas: biological modeling and dose response, treatment plan optimization with biological objectives, and adaptive radiotherapy and online plan adaptation. Biological modeling and dose response play a crucial role in IMRT optimization by incorporating the complex biological effects of radiation on tissues and organs. One prominent model used is the Linear-Quadratic (LQ) model, which predicts cell survival based on the radiation dose received. The LQ model takes into account the linear and quadratic coefficients (α&β) to estimate cell survival probability. To enhance the accuracy of modeling, the LQ model can be extended to include repair terms that capture the recovery of cells from radiation damage over time. Repair models integrate repair rates (γ) and time- dependent repair functions (R(t, D)) into the cell survival equation, enabling a more comprehensive representation of the biological response (Danos and Laneve., 2004). AI and ML techniques can be employed to optimize the parameters of these models and personalize the dose-response relationship for individual patients. Treatment plan optimization with biological objectives is another crucial aspect of IMRT optimization. Here, AI and ML methods facilitate the development of treatment plans that balance tumor control probability (TCP) and normal tissue complication probability (NTCP). TCP represents the likelihood (Witte et al., 2017) of eradicating the tumor, while NTCP reflects the probability of complications in surrounding healthy tissues. Optimization algorithms leverage sophisticated mathematical formulations that incorporate the LQ model, probability distributions of dose to the tumor (p(D)), and volume effects of normal tissue (v(D)). These formulations encompass multi-objective optimization, aiming to maximize TCP while minimizing NTCP. Constraints such as dose limits and clinical requirements further guide the optimization process. By leveraging AI and ML techniques, treatment plans can be tailored to individual patients, accounting for unique biological characteristics, tumor properties, and constraints specific to each case. Adaptive radiotherapy and online plan adaptation are areas where AI and ML excel in improving treatment accuracy and response to changes during the course of treatment. Deformable image registration techniques, using finite element methods, enable the alignment of daily CT images with reference images, facilitating the estimation of accumulated dose distributions. These deformations involve complex systems of equations and matrices, ensuring precise mapping of anatomical changes. Reinforcement learning algorithms, such as the popular Q-learning and policy gradient methods, provide strategies for online plan adaptation. By interacting with the treatment planning environment and receiving feedback based on plan quality and patient outcomes, these algorithms learn to dynamically adjust treatment plans. The Q-learning algorithm optimizes treatment plans by iteratively updating the action-value

Industrial Engineering Journal
ISSN: 0970-2555
Volume : 53, Issue 4, No. 5, April : 2024

function, while the policy gradient method directly updates the policy parameters. These adaptive strategies, driven by AI and ML, enable personalized treatment plans that account for changing patient anatomy and tumor response, enhancing treatment efficacy. In conclusion, the applications of AI and ML in IMRT optimization have significantly advanced the field of radiation therapy. By integrating biological modeling, optimizing treatment plans based on biological objectives, and enabling adaptive radiotherapy, these techniques enhance the precision and personalization of treatment planning. Through the development and refinement of complex mathematical models and algorithms, AI and ML empower clinicians with powerful tools to deliver more effective and tailored radiation therapy to patients.

4.1 Biological Modeling and Dose Response

4.1.1 Biological Modeling and Dose Response

The LQ model can be extended to include a repair term, which accounts for the recovery of cells from radiation damage over time. The equation is

$$S = \exp\left(-\alpha D - \beta D^2 + \int \ (\gamma(t) R(t, D) dt)\right) \qquad (8)$$

Here, S represents the cell survival probability, D represents the total radiation dose, α and β represent the linear and quadratic coefficients of the LQ model, $\gamma(t)$ represents the repair rate as a function of time, and $R(t, D)$ represents the repair term that depends on both time and dose.

4.1.2 Sublethal Damage Repair Model

The sublethal damage repair model captures the repair of sublethal radiation damage over time. The equation is

$$S = \sum \left(C(n) \sum \left((-1)^m \frac{(\lambda D)^m}{m!} \right) \right) \qquad (9)$$

Here, S represents the cell survival probability, $C(n)$ represents the probability of having n sublethal damage sites, λ represents the repair rate, D represents the radiation dose, and the series involves a summation over m.

4.2 Treatment Plan Optimization with Biological Objectives

4.2.1 Multi-Objective Optimization with Constraints

In multi-objective optimization, treatment plans are optimized while considering multiple conflicting objectives such as tumor control probability (TCP) and normal tissue complication probability (NTCP), subject to dose constraints. The mathematical formulation is given below:

Industrial Engineering Journal
ISSN: 0970-2555
Volume : 53, Issue 4, No. 5, April : 2024

$$\text{Maximize:} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{TCP} \\ \text{NTCP} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \iint (1 - S(D,\alpha,\beta))^N p(D) dD \\ \iint (1 - S(D,\gamma,\delta))^M v(D) dD \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Subject to:} \quad D \cdot w \geq D_{\min}$$
$$D \cdot w \leq D_{\max}$$
$$C \cdot D \cdot w \leq b$$

Here, TCP and NTCP represent the tumor control probability and normal tissue complication probability, respectively. D represents the dose matrix, α, β, γ, and δ represent the LQ model parameters, N and M represent the number of tumor and normal tissue cells, $p(D)$ represents the dose probability distribution, $v(D)$ represents the volume effect of normal tissue, w represents the weight vector, $D_{\min}$ and $D_{\max}$ represent lower and upper dose constraints, C represents the constraint matrix, and b represents the constraint vector.

4.3 Adaptive Radiotherapy and Online Plan Adaptation

4.3.1 Deformable Image Registration using Finite Element Method

Deformable image registration involves aligning daily CT images with the reference image using the finite element method. The mathematical equation is

$$\mathrm{K}.u = f \qquad (10)$$

Here, K represents the stiffness matrix, u represents the displacement vector, and f represents the force vector. This equation represents the equilibrium between the internal forces (K × u) and the external forces (f).

4.3.2 Reinforcement Learning with Policy Gradient Method

Reinforcement learning for online plan adaptation can employ the policy gradient method to optimize treatment plans. The mathematical equation is

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \nabla_\theta \left(\log\left(\pi(a \mid s)\right) Q(s,a) \right) \qquad (11)$$

Here, θ represents the policy parameters, α represents the learning rate, π(a|s) represents the probability of taking action a given state s according to the policy, Q(s, a) represents the action-value function, and ∇θ represents the gradient with respect to the policy parameters.

5 Benefits and Limitations of AI and ML in IMRT Optimization

In the field of IMRT optimization, the integration of AI and ML techniques brings forth several benefits and limitations. On one hand, AI and ML methods contribute to improved treatment plan quality by optimizing radiation dose distribution, reducing the differences between calculated and desired doses. This is achieved through the use of mathematical equations involving integrals, minimizing the squared differences. Additionally, AI and ML offer the advantage of reduced treatment planning time by training deep neural networks to predict dose distributions based on patient-specific anatomical features, thereby eliminating the need for time-consuming dose calculation algorithms. On the other hand, limitations arise from the availability and quality of training data, which greatly impact the accuracy and reliability of AI and ML models. Assessing data quality requires statistical metrics, such as mean absolute error, to ensure representativeness. Furthermore, the interpretability and transparency of complex models pose a challenge, warranting the use of mathematical techniques such as saliency maps or sensitivity analysis to shed light on model decisions. Understanding these benefits and limitations is essential for the safe and effective integration of AI and ML in IMRT optimization.

5.1 Benefits

AI and ML techniques offer the potential to improve treatment plan quality by optimizing the radiation dose distribution. This optimization can be achieved by solving a mathematical equation,

$$\min imize \int (D(x) - D_{target}(x))^2 \, dx \qquad (12)$$

Here, D(x) represents the calculated dose at a particular location x, and $D_{target}(x)$ represents the desired dose at that location. The integral accounts for the summation of the squared differences between the calculated and desired doses over the entire treatment volume.

AI and ML techniques can significantly reduce the time required for treatment planning. One approach involves training a deep neural network to predict dose distributions based on patient-specific anatomical features. This eliminates the need for computationally expensive dose calculation algorithms, resulting in faster planning times. The mathematical equation for training the neural network involves minimizing the mean squared error (MSE) between the predicted dose, ($D_{predicted}$), and ground truth dose, ($D_{ground\ truth}$).

$$minimize \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (D_{predicted}(x_i) - D_{ground\ truth}(x_i))^2 \quad (13)$$

Here, N represents the number of training samples, x_i represents the anatomical features of the i^{th} sample, and the sum calculates the average of the squared differences between the predicted and ground truth doses.

5.2 Limitations

One limitation is the availability and quality of data for training AI and ML models. The accuracy and reliability of these models heavily rely on the quality and representativeness of the training data. In IMRT optimization, there is a need for high-quality data that captures various patient anatomies and treatment scenarios. The mathematical equation to assess data quality can involve statistical metrics such as mean absolute error (MAE) or coefficient of determination (R-squared). However, the specific equations will depend on the context and the specific metrics used to evaluate the data quality. One limitation is the availability and quality of data for training AI and ML models. The accuracy and reliability of these models heavily rely on the quality and representativeness of the training data. In IMRT optimization, there is a need for high-quality data that captures various patient anatomies and treatment scenarios. The mathematical equation to assess data quality can involve statis- tical metrics such as mean absolute error (MAE) or coefficient of determination (R-squared). However, the specific equations will depend on the context and the specific metrics used to evaluate the data quality.

6 Conclusion

In conclusion, the application of AI and ML techniques in IMRT optimization has shown great promise in improving treatment outcomes and streamlining the treatment planning process. As we look to the future, several key areas offer exciting opportunities for further advancement. First, the integration of advanced biological models with AI and ML algorithms holds tremendous potential. By incorporating intricate dose-response relationships and tissue-specific sensitivities, these models can enhance treatment plan optimization by considering personalized patient characteristics. Second, the development of real-time adaptive radiotherapy systems using online plan adaptation tech- niques represents a significant frontier. The ability to adapt treatment plans based on up-to-date patient data, such as deformable image registration and dose accumulation, can lead to more precise and personalized radiation therapy. Third, the combination of AI and ML with multi-objective optimization approaches can enable the simultaneous consideration of multiple clinical objectives, such as tumor control probability and normal tissue sparing, to achieve better treatment plan trade-offs. Additionally, the integration of large-scale data repositories and collaborative efforts among institutions can facilitate the creation of comprehensive datasets for training robust AI models. This can address challenges related to data availability and quality, fostering the development of more accurate and generalizable algorithms. Furthermore, exploring interpretability techniques and model explainability in the context of AI and ML can enhance trust and adoption by clinicians. By shedding light on the decision-making process of complex models, clinicians can better understand and validate the treatment plans generated. Lastly, the establishment of rigorous validation frameworks and regulatory guidelines will be essential to ensure the safe and effective deployment of AI and ML algorithms in clinical practice. Through continuous evaluation, refinement, and validation, we can maximize the potential of AI and ML in IMRT optimization and pave the way for personalized, data-driven radiation therapy. As we move forward, collaborative research, interdisciplinary partnerships, and ongoing technological advancements will be vital in realizing the full benefits of AI and ML in improving cancer treatment outcomes and patient care.

Referencs

[1] Barnett GC, West CM, Dunning AM, et al. (2009), "Normal tissue reactions to radiotherapy: towards tailoring treatment dose by genotype", Nature Reviews Cancer 9(2), pp 134–142.
[2] Creswell A, White T, Dumoulin V, et al (2018) , "Generative adversarial networks: An overview", IEEE signal processing magazine 35(1):pp 53–65.
[3] Danos V, Laneve C (2004), "Formal molecular biology", Theoretical Computer Science 325(1): pp 69–110.
[4] Douguet D, Thoreau E, Grassy G (2000), "A genetic algorithm for the automated generation of small organic molecules: drug design using an evolutionary algorithm", Journal of computer-aided molecular design 14: pp 449–466
[5] Dutta A, Kumar PK (2022), "Space–time continuum metric", Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Computing, Communication and Information Security, Springer, pp 421–434
[6] Dutta A, Harshith J, Kumar PK, et al (2023a), "Tagging of quarks to particle shower imagery vis-a-vis intelligent learning", Third International Conference on Secure Cyber Computing and Communication (ICSCCC), IEEE, pp 128–132.
[7] Dutta A, Harshith J, Ramamoorthy A, et al (2023b), "A proposition to advance martian manned mission", Third International Conference on Secure Cyber Computing and Communication (ICSCCC), IEEE, pp 385–390.
[8] Dutta A, Harshith J, Soni Y, et al (2023c), "Computational time complexity for sorting algorithm amalgamated with quantum research", International Conference for Advancement in Technology (ICONAT), IEEE, pp 1–6.
[9] Dutta A, Kumar PK, De A, et al (2023d), "Maneuvering machine learning algorithms to presage the attacks of fusarium oxysporum on cotton leave", 2nd Edition of IEEE Delhi Section Flagship Conference (DELCON), IEEE, pp 1–7
[10] Dutta A, Negi A, Harshith J, et al (2023e), "Evaluation modelling of asteroids' hazardousness using chaosnet",IEEE 8th International Conference for Convergence in Technology (I2CT), IEEE, pp 1–5.
[11] Dutta A, Raj ASA, Ramamoorthy A, et al (2023f), "Stellar classification vis-à-vis convolutional neural network", International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Knowledge Economy (ICCIKE), IEEE, pp 74–79.
[12] Feist AM, Palsson BO (2010, "The biomass objective function", Current opinion in microbiology, Vol 13(3): pp. 344–349.

[13] Kataria T, Sharma K, Subramani V, et al. (2012), "Homogeneity index: An objective tool for assessment of conformal radiation treatments", Journal of medical physics/Association of Medical Physicists of India 37(Vol. 4), 2012, pp:207.
[14] Lang B (2004), "Laser intensity modulation method (limm): review of the fundamentals and a new method for data analysis", IEEE transactions on dielectrics and electrical insulation 11(1):pp 3–12.
[15] Mierswa I, Morik K (2005), "Automatic feature extraction for classifying audio data", Machine learning 58: pp 127–149.
[16] Mohan R, Mageras G, Baldwin B, et al (1992), "Clinically relevant optimization of 3-d conformal treatments", Medical physics 19(4):pp. 933–944.
[17] Morrill S, Lane R, Jacobson G, et al (1991), "Treatment planning optimization using constrained simulated annealing.", Physics in Medicine & Biology 36(10),2020, 1341.
[18] Oh J, Hessel M, Czarnecki WM, et al (2020), "Discovering reinforcement learning algorithms", Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33:pp. 1060–1070
[19] Paganelli C, Meschini G, Molinelli S, et al (2018), "Patient-specific validation of deformable image registration in radiation therapy: overview and caveats", Medical physics 45(10):, 2018, e908–e922
[20] Peters J (2010), "Policy gradient methods.", Scholarpedia 5(11):3698
[21] Schlaefer A, Schweikard A (2008), "Stepwise multi-criteria optimization for robotic radiosurgery", Medical physics 35(5):pp. 2094–2103
[22] Solomatine DP, Ostfeld A (2008), "Data-driven modelling: some past experiences and new approaches", Journal of hydroinformatics 10(1):pp. 3–22
[23] Viele K, Berry S, Neuenschwander B, et al (2014), "Use of historical control data for assessing treatment effects in clinical trials.", Pharmaceutical statistics 13(1), 2014, pp:41–54
[24] Webb S (2015), "Intensity-modulated radiation therapy",CRC Press, New York.
[25] Witte MG, Sonke JJ, Siebers J, et al (2017), " Beyond the margin recipe: the probability of correct target dosage and tumor control in the presence of a dose limiting structure", Physics in Medicine & Biology, 62(19), 2017: pp. 787
[26] Zanoli M, Dobšíček Trefna H (2022), "The hot-to-cold spot quotient for sar-based treatment planning in deep microwave hyperthermia", International Journal of Hyperthermia 39(1):pp. 1421–1439.