

Rulemaking Comments

From: Linda Mikkelsen [LMikkelsen@mcvh-vcu.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2008 9:24 AM
To: Rulemaking Comments
Subject: Letter from Dr. Anscher
Attachments: vietti-cook - NRC.pdf

Dr. Vietti-Cook - Attached is a letter from Dr. Mitchell Anscher, Chairman, Department of Radiation Oncology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond VA.

Thank you.

DOCKETED
USNRC

October 29, 2008 (12:45pm)

Linda Mikkelsen
Department of Radiation Oncology
VCU Medical Center
Richmond, VA 23298
(804)828-7238

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

NOTE: The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

VCU Health System
<http://www.vcuhealth.org>

Template = SECY-067

SECY-02

MCV Campus

V i r g i n i a C o m m o n w e a l t h U n i v e r s i t y

Medical Center

In the tradition of the Medical College of Virginia

Department of Radiation Oncology

401 College Street
P.O. Box 990058
Richmond, VA 23298-0058

804 828-7238
Fax: 804-827-1670
TDD: 800-828-1120

Mitchell S. Anscher, MD, FACR, FACRO
Professor
Florence and Hyman Meyers Chair
Department of Radiation Oncology

October 24, 2008

Ms. Annette L. Vietti-Cook
Secretary of the Commission
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff

Re: Comments on Proposed Rule for Medical Use of Byproduct Material—Amendments/Medical Event Definitions (RIN 3150-A126, NRC-2008-0071) [See 73 FR 45635 (August 6, 2008)]

Dear Ms. Vietti-Cook:

I am the chair of the Department of Radiation Oncology at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, VA. Our department provides radiation oncology services at 6 hospitals throughout the region, and our practice includes a volume of more than 100 transperineal interstitial permanent prostate brachytherapy procedures per year. My personal practice focuses on treating patients with prostate cancer, and I am actively involved in our brachytherapy program. Currently, we preplan all of our implants, but we do occasionally modify the plans in the operative suite based on the anatomic realities encountered at the time of the procedure.

I am writing to you to express my concern that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposed modifications to 10 CFR 35.40 and 35.3045 to establish separate medical event criteria and written directive requirements for permanent implant brachytherapy would result in inappropriately categorizing some medically acceptable implants as "medical events".

The proposed rule language for § 35.40(b)(6) and § 35.3045(a)(2) does not take into account clinical practice realities. Many authorized users perform real-time, adaptive, interactive planning, whereby the written directive and the source strength to be implanted are based on the actual volume dynamically determined during the procedure rather than based on the pre-implant volume.

Real-time planning is a valid method of implantation. It allows the physician to take into account any alterations in the organ volume and shape that occur between the time of the pre-plan and the implant procedure. For those performing real-time adaptive planning implantation, the total source strength to be implanted is determined intraoperatively during the implantation procedure and not pre-implant. Further, even those performing permanent brachytherapy using preplanned techniques will often modify their plan if intraoperatively they find major discrepancies in the gland or organ volume from the volumes determined during the preplan.

I support ASTRO's suggested revisions to the proposed regulations, and I urge the NRC to adopt these modifications. I believe this modification will clarify that the source strength implanted as stated in the written directive refers to the source strength implanted after administration but before the patient leaves the post-treatment recovery area.

The definition of "treatment site" described in § 35.2 as "the anatomical description of the tissue intended to receive a radiation dose, as described in a written directive" leads to some ambiguity regarding the exact volume that "treatment site" refers to in § 35.3045(a)(2)(ii). There are various standard volumes already defined in radiation oncology, including the gross tumor volume, which is the volume that contains tumor. Two other margins are added to the gross tumor volume during the brachytherapy planning process. One margin is added to account for the subclinical spread of tumor, which is termed the "clinical target volume," and a second margin is added to account for uncertainties in source positioning, tumor boundaries, isodose constrictions, etc., which is termed the "planning target volume."

These expansion margins are not constant but change for different clinical situations. Radiation oncologists use a larger margin if there is high degree of uncertainty and/or if there are no adjacent critical structures. Conversely, the margins are smaller if the boundary is distinct and/or if there are adjacent critical structures.

I believe that the proposed regulations cross into clinical decision-making by specifying margin parameters and the source strength to be placed in the margin. The NRC will be interfering into medical judgment if it dictates the amount of source strength the authorized user can place in the margins. Using the definition found at § 35.2 of "treatment site" as "the anatomical description of the tissue intended to receive a radiation dose, as described in a written directive" raises ambiguities in terms of the proposed medical event reports and notifications as it is unclear whether the "treatment site" refers to the gross tumor volume or includes the margins in the clinical target volume or those in the planning target volume.

I support ASTRO's recommended changes to the definition of "treatment site" at § 35.2 be revised to reflect the distinct clinical areas - gross tumor, the clinical target volume, plus a variable planning target volume. Further, by following ASTRO's suggested alternative language, section § 35.3045 (a)(2)(iii) of the proposed rule would become superfluous and therefore could be eliminated.

I believe that these suggested modifications to the proposed rule language are necessary because in the normal course of some medically acceptable brachytherapy implant procedures, a few seeds may come to rest beyond 3 cm (1.2 in) from the outside boundary of the treatment site. For example, in the case of prostate implants, seeds may become lodged in veins immediately adjacent to the prostate, in regions that must be implanted to ensure adequate coverage of areas suspected to harbor cancer. These few seeds that are implanted in periprostatic veins can migrate considerable distances from the prostate. This phenomenon has been well described in the literature, but does not appear to have clinical consequences.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to provide comments on the NRC's proposed rule changes to 10 CFR 35.40 and 35.3045 related to medical events in permanent implant brachytherapy. Please contact me at 804-828-7238 or email me at manscher@mcvh-vcu.edu if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mitchell S. Anscher".

Mitchell S. Anscher, MD, FACR, FACRO
Professor
Florence and Hyman Meyers Chair
Department of Radiation Oncology

Received: from mail2.nrc.gov (148.184.176.43) by TWMS01.nrc.gov
(148.184.200.145) with Microsoft SMTP Server id 8.1.291.1; Fri, 24 Oct 2008
09:23:02 -0400

X-Ironport-ID: mail2

X-SBRS: 5.3

X-MID: 22736767

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Filtered: true

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Result:

An8AANloAU nOaXmf mWdsb2JhbACCRjGRAQEBAQEBCAsKBxGmDQEJhjRcglV7

X-IronPort-AV: E=Sophos;i="4.33,477,1220241600";

d="pdf?scan'208";a="22736767"

Received: from zixvpm01.mcvh-vcu.edu ([206.105.121.159]) by mail2.nrc.gov
with ESMTP; 24 Oct 2008 09:23:01 -0400

Received: from zixvpm01.mcvh-vcu.edu (ZixVPM [127.0.0.1]) by
Outbound.mcvh-vcu.edu (Proprietary) with ESMTP id 0F06C2E80CE for
<rulemaking.comments@nrc.gov>; Fri, 24 Oct 2008 08:57:19 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from mcv-hub.mcvh-vcu.edu (ncchub.mcvh-vcu.edu [206.105.121.24]) by
zixvpm01.mcvh-vcu.edu (Proprietary) with ESMTP id 6A87E2038A1 for
<rulemaking.comments@nrc.gov>; Fri, 24 Oct 2008 08:57:17 -0400 (EDT)

X-Disclaimed: 19798

To: rulemaking.comments@nrc.gov

Subject: Letter from Dr. Anscher

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 7.0.2 September 26, 2006

Message-ID: <OF54482655.56C212FD-ON852574EC.0049394A-
852574EC.0049833E@MCVH-VCU.EDU>

From: Linda Mikkelsen <LMikkelsen@mcvh-vcu.edu>

Date: Fri, 24 Oct 2008 09:23:51 -0400

X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on MCV-Hub/MCVH(Release 7.0.2|September 26, 2006) at
10/24/2008

09:23:08 AM

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=_mixed_00498339852574EC_="

Return-Path: lmikkelsen@mcvh-vcu.edu