



 Research Article

Assessment of Physiological and Cellular Dose Thresholds Relative to Delivery Protocols in Focused External Beam Treatment

Journal Website:
<http://sciencebring.com/index.php/ijasr>

Submission Date: February 08, 2026, **Accepted Date:** March 05, 2026,

Published Date: April 01, 2026

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

Dr. Andi Pratama

Department of Scientific Research, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

Dr. Siti Rahmawati

Faculty of Applied Sciences, Bandung Institute of Technology, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The optimization of dose delivery in focused external beam radiotherapy remains a critical challenge due to the complex interplay between physical dose distribution and biological response at both physiological and cellular levels. This study presents a comprehensive analytical framework for assessing dose thresholds in relation to varying delivery protocols, particularly in stereotactic and intensity-modulated radiotherapy techniques. The research integrates radiobiological modeling, dosimetric evaluation, and clinical protocol comparisons to elucidate how treatment parameters influence tissue response, tumor control probability (TCP), and normal tissue complication probability (NTCP).

Drawing on established theoretical constructs such as the linear-quadratic (LQ) model and dose-volume histogram (DVH) analysis, the study examines the variability in dose thresholds across different fractionation schemes, including hypofractionated and high-dose stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT). Empirical evidence from clinical trials and retrospective analyses demonstrates that dose heterogeneity, organ motion, and treatment margins significantly affect biological outcomes. Furthermore, the investigation highlights the importance of advanced delivery techniques such as volumetric modulated arc therapy (VMAT) and image-guided radiotherapy (IGRT) in achieving precise dose localization while minimizing exposure to organs at risk (OARs).

A critical evaluation of protocol-dependent variations reveals that conventional uniform dose prescriptions may not adequately capture the complexity of cellular damage mechanisms, particularly under high-dose-per-fraction conditions. The study proposes a multi-scale assessment framework that integrates physiological tolerance thresholds with cellular radiosensitivity metrics, enabling more accurate prediction of therapeutic outcomes.

The findings underscore the necessity of personalized dose optimization strategies that account for inter-patient variability, tumor characteristics, and dynamic anatomical changes. Limitations related to model assumptions and data generalizability are also discussed. Ultimately, this research contributes to the advancement of precision radiotherapy by offering a robust analytical foundation for aligning dose delivery protocols with biological effectiveness.

KEYWORDS

Radiotherapy dosimetry; Biological dose threshold; External beam therapy; Stereotactic radiotherapy; Dose-volume analysis; Linear-quadratic model; Organ motion; Treatment planning; Radiation biology.

INTRODUCTION

The advancement of external beam radiotherapy has significantly transformed oncological treatment by enabling precise targeting of malignant tissues while preserving surrounding healthy structures. This evolution has been driven by innovations in imaging, computational modeling, and delivery techniques, particularly in the context of focused therapies such as stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT) and intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT). Despite these technological improvements, a fundamental challenge persists in accurately determining dose thresholds that correspond to both physiological tolerance and cellular-level response. The complexity arises from the interaction between physical dose distribution and the biological mechanisms governing radiation-induced damage (Bentzen et al., 2012).

Dose thresholds in radiotherapy are traditionally defined based on empirical observations of tissue response, often derived from clinical trials and retrospective studies. However, these thresholds are not static; they vary depending on fractionation schemes, treatment modalities, and patient-specific factors. For instance, hypofractionated regimens, which deliver higher doses per fraction over fewer sessions, have demonstrated improved tumor control in certain contexts but also pose increased risks of normal tissue toxicity (Fowler, 1989). This necessitates a deeper understanding of how delivery protocols influence both macroscopic physiological outcomes and microscopic cellular processes.

The biological effects of radiation are primarily governed by DNA damage mechanisms, including double-strand breaks and subsequent repair

pathways. The linear-quadratic (LQ) model has long served as a theoretical foundation for quantifying these effects, providing a mathematical representation of cell survival as a function of dose (Fowler, 1989). However, the applicability of the LQ model under high-dose conditions, such as those employed in SBRT, remains a subject of ongoing debate. This limitation highlights the need for more comprehensive frameworks that incorporate both physical and biological dimensions of dose assessment.

In parallel, advancements in treatment planning systems have enabled the use of dose–volume histograms (DVHs) to evaluate dose distribution across target volumes and organs at risk. While DVHs offer valuable insights into spatial dose heterogeneity, they do not inherently account for biological variability. Consequently, integrating radiobiological parameters into dosimetric analysis has become a critical area of research (van Herk et al., 2000). This integration is particularly relevant in the context of modern delivery techniques such as VMAT and IGRT, which allow for highly conformal dose वितरण but also introduce new variables related to motion management and temporal dose वितरण (Chan et al., 2011; Shirato et al., 2004).

Clinical studies have demonstrated that physiological responses to radiation are influenced by multiple factors, including organ sensitivity, vascular dynamics, and systemic health conditions. For example, tolerance levels for lung tissue in SBRT differ significantly from

those observed in conventional fractionation, reflecting differences in dose वितरण and biological repair mechanisms (Onimaru et al., 2003). Similarly, tumor control outcomes are affected by factors such as hypoxia, cellular proliferation rates, and genetic variability, further complicating the determination of optimal dose thresholds (Nagata et al., 2005).

The increasing adoption of image-guided and adaptive radiotherapy techniques has introduced new opportunities for dynamic dose optimization. These approaches enable real-time adjustments based on anatomical changes, thereby enhancing treatment accuracy and reducing uncertainties associated with patient positioning and organ motion (Waghorn et al., 2014). However, they also require robust models for predicting biological response under varying delivery conditions.

This study aims to address these challenges by developing a comprehensive analytical framework for assessing physiological and cellular dose thresholds in relation to delivery protocols. The research integrates theoretical modeling, clinical evidence, and technical considerations to provide a holistic understanding of dose–response relationships in focused external beam treatment.

The primary objectives of this study are threefold. First, to examine the theoretical foundations underlying dose–response relationships in radiotherapy, including the limitations of existing models. Second, to analyze the impact of different delivery protocols on dose distribution and

biological outcomes. Third, to propose an integrated framework for optimizing dose thresholds based on both physiological and cellular considerations.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to enhance the precision and effectiveness of radiotherapy. By bridging the gap between physical dosimetry and biological response, the study contributes to the development of personalized treatment strategies that maximize therapeutic benefit while minimizing adverse effects. The scope of the research encompasses both theoretical analysis and practical implications, making it relevant for clinicians, medical physicists, and researchers in the field of radiation oncology.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The assessment of dose thresholds in radiotherapy has been extensively explored across clinical, theoretical, and technological dimensions. Existing literature highlights the multidimensional nature of dose-response relationships, encompassing physical dose वितरण, biological effects, and treatment delivery protocols. A synthesis of the provided references reveals key themes related to radiobiological modeling, clinical outcomes of stereotactic techniques, and advancements in dosimetric analysis.

Radiobiological modeling forms the theoretical backbone of dose threshold analysis. The linear-quadratic (LQ) model remains the most widely

used framework for describing cell survival following radiation exposure. Fowler (1989) demonstrated the utility of the LQ model in predicting outcomes under fractionated radiotherapy, emphasizing its role in optimizing dose वितरण. However, Bentzen et al. (2012) highlighted the limitations of this model, particularly in high-dose scenarios where non-linear biological effects become more pronounced. This limitation is especially relevant in modern treatment approaches such as SBRT, where high doses per fraction challenge traditional assumptions.

The concept of equieffective dose has been introduced to address variability across fractionation schemes. By converting different dose regimens into a common biological equivalent, clinicians can compare treatment protocols more effectively (Bentzen et al., 2012). Nevertheless, this approach relies heavily on model assumptions and may not fully capture patient-specific biological variability.

Clinical studies provide empirical insights into the relationship between dose thresholds and treatment outcomes. Early investigations by Blomgren et al. (1995) demonstrated the feasibility of high-dose stereotactic treatments for extracranial tumors, establishing a foundation for subsequent research. Timmerman et al. (2003, 2006) further validated the efficacy of SBRT in treating inoperable lung cancer, reporting high local control rates with acceptable toxicity profiles. These findings underscore the potential of hypofractionated regimens but also highlight

the importance of accurately defining dose thresholds to avoid complications.

Comparative studies of different delivery techniques have also contributed to the understanding of dose वितरण. Chan et al. (2011) showed that VMAT provides superior dose conformity compared to traditional 3D-conformal radiotherapy, enabling better sparing of normal tissues. Similarly, Kartutik et al. (2016) analyzed dosimetric differences among 3D-CRT, IMRT, and SBRT, demonstrating that advanced techniques offer improved precision but require careful calibration to maintain biological effectiveness.

The role of treatment margins in ensuring adequate dose coverage has been extensively examined. Van Herk et al. (2000) introduced a probabilistic framework for determining margins based on dose-population histograms, accounting for uncertainties in patient positioning and organ motion. This approach has been widely adopted in clinical practice, although it primarily addresses physical rather than biological variability. Waghorn et al. (2014) further explored the impact of motion on dose वितरण, emphasizing the need for dynamic margin adaptation in IMRT planning.

Organ motion represents a significant challenge in radiotherapy, particularly for thoracic and abdominal tumors. Shirato et al. (2004) provided a detailed analysis of intrafractional motion, demonstrating its impact on dose वितरण and treatment accuracy. Subsequent studies have

incorporated motion management techniques such as respiratory gating and image guidance to mitigate these effects.

Biological tolerance of normal tissues is another critical aspect of dose threshold assessment. Onimaru et al. (2003) investigated the tolerance of organs at risk under hypofractionated conditions, revealing that smaller treatment volumes allow for higher dose thresholds without increasing toxicity. This finding supports the use of focused techniques such as SBRT but also highlights the need for precise targeting.

Recent research has emphasized the integration of biological parameters into dosimetric analysis. Kawahara et al. (2020) proposed methods for assessing biological dosimetric margins, incorporating factors such as tissue sensitivity and repair mechanisms. This approach represents a shift toward more comprehensive models that account for both physical and biological dimensions.

Clinical outcome studies further illustrate the importance of dose threshold optimization. Nagata et al. (2005) and Taremi et al. (2012) reported favorable outcomes for SBRT in lung cancer treatment, with high local control rates and manageable toxicity. These studies highlight the potential of focused delivery protocols but also underscore the variability in patient response.

Guidelines such as ICRU Report 50 (Douglas, 1993) and ICRU Report 91 (Wilke et al., 2019) provide standardized frameworks for dose prescription and reporting. While these

guidelines have improved consistency in clinical practice, they primarily focus on physical dose metrics and do not fully address biological variability.

Overall, the literature reveals a clear trend toward integrating physical and biological considerations in dose threshold assessment. However, significant gaps remain, particularly in the context of high-dose, hypofractionated treatments. Existing models often fail to capture the complexity of cellular response, and clinical protocols may not fully account for inter-patient variability. This study aims to address these gaps by developing an integrated framework that aligns delivery protocols with both physiological and cellular dose thresholds.

METHOD

Theoretical Foundations of Dose-Response Relationships in Radiotherapy

The relationship between radiation dose and biological response is governed by complex interactions occurring at multiple scales, ranging from molecular DNA damage to tissue-level functional impairment. The foundational model for understanding this relationship is the linear-quadratic (LQ) model, which mathematically represents cell survival as a function of dose through linear (α) and quadratic (β) components (Fowler, 1989). The α component reflects damage from single-track events, whereas the β component corresponds to double-track interactions, representing accumulated sublethal damage.

While the LQ model has proven effective in conventional fractionation scenarios, its applicability under high-dose-per-fraction conditions is limited. In stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT), where doses per fraction can exceed 10 Gy, biological responses deviate from the assumptions embedded within the LQ formulation (Bentzen et al., 2012). This discrepancy arises due to enhanced vascular damage, immune response activation, and saturation of DNA repair mechanisms, which are not fully captured by traditional models.

To address these limitations, extensions of the LQ model and alternative frameworks such as biologically effective dose (BED) have been developed. BED allows comparison of different fractionation schemes by incorporating total dose, dose per fraction, and tissue-specific radiosensitivity parameters. However, these models rely on estimated α/β ratios, which vary across tissue types and individuals, introducing uncertainty into dose threshold determination.

At the physiological level, dose-response relationships are further complicated by organ-specific tolerance. For example, lung tissue exhibits a relatively low tolerance to radiation due to its structural and functional characteristics, necessitating stringent dose constraints (Onimaru et al., 2003). Conversely, certain tumor types demonstrate radioresistance, requiring higher doses to achieve effective control. This divergence underscores the necessity of balancing tumor control probability (TCP) against normal tissue complication

probability (NTCP), a central principle in radiotherapy planning.

The integration of TCP and NTCP models provides a probabilistic framework for evaluating treatment outcomes. TCP models estimate the likelihood of eradicating all clonogenic tumor cells, while NTCP models predict the probability of adverse effects in healthy tissues. The interplay between these models defines the therapeutic window, within which optimal dose thresholds must be established.

Influence of Delivery Protocols on Dose Distribution and Biological Outcomes

Radiotherapy delivery protocols significantly influence both spatial dose distribution and biological effectiveness. Conventional fractionation typically involves daily doses of 1.8–2 Gy, allowing sufficient time for normal tissue repair between sessions. In contrast, hypofractionated protocols, including SBRT, deliver higher doses over fewer fractions, thereby increasing biological impact on tumor cells while potentially elevating toxicity risks.

Clinical evidence demonstrates that SBRT achieves high local control rates in early-stage lung cancer, particularly in medically inoperable patients (Timmerman et al., 2006; Nagata et al., 2005). This efficacy is attributed to the delivery of ablative doses that exceed the threshold required for tumor cell eradication. However, the success of such protocols depends heavily on precise targeting and accurate dose वितरण.

Advanced delivery techniques such as intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) and volumetric modulated arc therapy (VMAT) enable highly conformal dose वितरण, reducing exposure to surrounding healthy tissues (Chan et al., 2011). These techniques utilize inverse planning algorithms to optimize dose वितरण based on predefined constraints. While they enhance spatial precision, they also introduce complexity in dose वितरण patterns, potentially affecting biological response.

Image-guided radiotherapy (IGRT) further refines delivery accuracy by incorporating real-time imaging to account for anatomical variations and organ motion. This is particularly critical for thoracic tumors, where respiratory motion can lead to significant deviations from planned dose वितरण (Shirato et al., 2004). Failure to account for such motion may result in underdosing of the target or overdosing of adjacent tissues.

Treatment margins are employed to compensate for uncertainties in patient positioning and organ motion. Van Herk et al. (2000) proposed a margin recipe based on probabilistic considerations, ensuring adequate target coverage for a specified proportion of patients. However, margin expansion increases the volume of irradiated healthy tissue, potentially elevating toxicity risks.

The selection of delivery protocols must therefore consider both physical and biological factors. For instance, protocols employing smaller margins and higher precision may allow escalation of dose

thresholds without increasing toxicity. Conversely, less precise techniques may require conservative dose limits to maintain safety.

Dosimetric Evaluation and Margin Optimization

Dosimetric evaluation plays a central role in determining the effectiveness of radiotherapy delivery. Dose-volume histograms (DVHs) are widely used to quantify dose distribution within target volumes and organs at risk. DVHs provide cumulative information about the percentage of tissue receiving a given dose, enabling assessment of treatment plan quality.

However, DVHs are inherently limited in their ability to represent spatial heterogeneity and temporal dynamics of dose वितरण. Two treatment plans with identical DVHs may produce different biological outcomes due to variations in dose वितरण patterns. This limitation necessitates the integration of additional metrics, such as equivalent uniform dose (EUD) and biologically effective dose (BED), to capture biological relevance.

Margin optimization is closely linked to dosimetric evaluation. The determination of appropriate margins requires balancing the need for target coverage against the risk of normal tissue exposure. Motion-related uncertainties, particularly in lung and liver tumors, necessitate dynamic margin strategies that adapt to patient-specific conditions (Waghorn et al., 2014).

Recent advancements in motion management, including respiratory gating and tumor tracking, have enabled reduction of treatment margins. These techniques synchronize radiation delivery with patient breathing cycles, minimizing the impact of intrafractional motion. As a result, higher dose thresholds can be safely administered to the target while preserving surrounding tissues.

The integration of imaging modalities such as computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) further enhances dosimetric accuracy. These modalities provide detailed anatomical information, enabling precise delineation of target volumes and organs at risk. However, uncertainties in image registration and segmentation may still affect dose वितरण.

Biological Thresholds: Cellular and Tissue-Level Considerations

Biological dose thresholds are determined by the capacity of cells and tissues to withstand radiation-induced damage. At the cellular level, radiation primarily induces DNA damage, leading to cell death through apoptosis, necrosis, or mitotic catastrophe. The extent of damage depends on factors such as dose, dose rate, and cellular radiosensitivity.

Different cell types exhibit varying levels of radiosensitivity, influenced by factors such as cell cycle phase, oxygenation status, and genetic characteristics. Hypoxic tumor cells, for instance, are more resistant to radiation due to reduced oxygen-mediated DNA damage. This resistance

necessitates higher dose thresholds or the use of sensitizing agents to achieve effective treatment.

At the tissue level, physiological responses to radiation involve complex interactions among cellular components, vascular structures, and immune processes. Acute effects, such as inflammation, occur shortly after exposure, while late effects, including fibrosis, may manifest months or years later. These temporal dynamics complicate the assessment of dose thresholds.

The concept of tolerance dose is commonly used to define the maximum dose that a tissue can receive without significant complications. However, tolerance doses are not absolute values; they vary based on treatment volume, fractionation, and patient-specific factors. Onimaru et al. (2003) demonstrated that smaller irradiated volumes allow for higher tolerance doses, highlighting the importance of spatial considerations.

Biological modeling approaches, such as NTCP models, attempt to quantify the probability of tissue complications based on dose distribution and tissue characteristics. These models provide valuable insights but are limited by uncertainties in parameter estimation and inter-patient variability.

Integration of Physiological and Cellular Thresholds in Treatment Planning

The integration of physiological and cellular dose thresholds represents a critical advancement in radiotherapy planning. Traditional approaches often treat these dimensions separately, focusing

either on physical dose वितरण or biological response. However, effective treatment requires a unified framework that accounts for both aspects.

One approach involves the incorporation of radiobiological parameters into treatment planning systems. By integrating TCP and NTCP models with dosimetric data, clinicians can evaluate the trade-offs between tumor control and normal tissue toxicity. This enables more informed decision-making and personalized treatment strategies.

Adaptive radiotherapy further enhances this integration by allowing real-time adjustments based on patient-specific changes במהלך treatment. For example, tumor shrinkage or changes in organ position may necessitate modification of dose वितरण to maintain optimal thresholds. Such adaptability is particularly important in long treatment courses.

Emerging techniques, including machine learning and predictive modeling, offer new opportunities for optimizing dose thresholds. By analyzing large datasets of clinical outcomes, these approaches can identify patterns and correlations that inform treatment planning. Although not explicitly covered in traditional radiobiological models, these methods complement existing frameworks by providing data-driven insights.

The integration of multi-scale data—from molecular biomarkers to imaging features—represents a promising direction for future research. Such approaches could enable more

accurate prediction of individual patient response, thereby refining dose threshold determination.

RESULTS

The analytical evaluation of physiological and cellular dose thresholds in relation to delivery protocols reveals several critical findings that underscore the complexity of radiotherapy optimization. First, it is evident that dose thresholds are not fixed parameters but dynamic values influenced by fractionation schemes, delivery precision, and biological variability. High-dose-per-fraction protocols, such as SBRT, consistently demonstrate enhanced tumor control probability due to their ability to exceed critical cellular damage thresholds. However, this benefit is accompanied by increased sensitivity to spatial inaccuracies and biological heterogeneity.

The analysis of delivery techniques indicates that advanced modalities such as IMRT and VMAT significantly improve dose conformity and reduce exposure to organs at risk. This improvement allows for escalation of tumor dose thresholds without proportionally increasing normal tissue complications. Nevertheless, the complexity of dose वितरण in these techniques introduces variability in biological response, particularly in regions with steep dose gradients.

Motion management emerges as a decisive factor in achieving accurate dose delivery. Intrafractional motion, especially in thoracic and abdominal regions, can lead to substantial

deviations from planned dose वितरण. Techniques such as IGRT and respiratory gating effectively mitigate these uncertainties, enabling more reliable attainment of intended dose thresholds. Consequently, the incorporation of motion-aware protocols is essential for maintaining treatment efficacy.

The evaluation of dosimetric models reveals limitations in conventional metrics such as DVHs, which fail to fully capture spatial and temporal variations in dose वितरण. The integration of biologically informed metrics, including BED and NTCP models, provides a more comprehensive assessment of treatment outcomes. These models demonstrate that identical physical dose distributions may yield متفاوت biological effects, emphasizing the importance of incorporating radiobiological considerations into planning प्रक्रियाएँ.

At the cellular level, radiosensitivity variability significantly influences dose threshold determination. Tumor hypoxia, genetic factors, and cellular repair क्षमता contribute to differential responses to radiation. This variability necessitates personalized treatment approaches that account for patient-specific characteristics. Similarly, tissue-level responses are influenced by organ संरचना and functional reserve, further complicating threshold assessment.

Finally, the integration of physiological and cellular perspectives highlights the importance of

multi-scale modeling in radiotherapy. By combining dosimetric data with biological parameters, clinicians can achieve a more accurate prediction of treatment outcomes. This integrated approach supports the development of adaptive and personalized protocols that optimize therapeutic लाभ while minimizing adverse effects.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide critical insights into the interplay between physical dose वितरण and biological response, reinforcing the necessity of integrated approaches in radiotherapy planning. One of the central implications is that traditional reliance on fixed dose thresholds is insufficient for modern treatment paradigms, particularly those involving high-dose, hypofractionated protocols. The variability observed in both cellular and physiological responses suggests that dose निर्धारण must be contextualized within patient-specific and protocol-specific frameworks.

The limitations of the linear-quadratic model, as identified in both theoretical and empirical analyses, highlight the need for more sophisticated radiobiological models. While the LQ model remains a valuable tool for conventional fractionation, its assumptions break down under extreme dosing conditions characteristic of SBRT. This limitation aligns with observations in the literature that emphasize the inadequacy of existing models in capturing

complex biological phenomena (Bentzen et al., 2012). Consequently, future research must focus on developing models that incorporate additional biological factors, such as immune response and vascular damage.

The role of advanced delivery techniques in enhancing treatment precision is unequivocal. IMRT, VMAT, and IGRT have collectively transformed the landscape of radiotherapy by enabling highly conformal dose वितरण. However, these advancements also introduce new challenges, including increased योजना complexity and sensitivity to uncertainties. The findings suggest that technological improvements must be accompanied by robust quality assurance and verification mechanisms to ensure consistent treatment outcomes.

The significance of motion management, as highlighted in the results, underscores the dynamic nature of radiotherapy delivery. Intrafractional motion remains a प्रमुख source of uncertainty, particularly in thoracic treatments. While current techniques mitigate these effects, they do not eliminate them entirely. This limitation points to the need for continued innovation in motion tracking and adaptive delivery systems.

From a clinical perspective, the integration of biological metrics into treatment planning represents a paradigm shift toward personalized medicine. By incorporating parameters such as TCP and NTCP, clinicians can better وزن the trade-off between tumor control and toxicity. This

approach is supported by evidence in the literature demonstrating the benefits of biologically आधारित planning strategies (Kawahara et al., 2020).

Despite these advancements, several limitations must be acknowledged. The reliance on model-based predictions introduces uncertainty, particularly in the absence of patient-specific biological data. Additionally, the variability in clinical protocols and patient populations limits the generalizability of findings. These challenges highlight the importance of large-scale डेटा collection and validation studies.

In comparison with existing literature, the findings of this study align with the growing emphasis on integrated radiobiological approaches. However, they extend current knowledge by providing a comprehensive framework that bridges the gap between physical and biological perspectives. This contribution is particularly relevant in the context of emerging technologies and evolving clinical practices.

CONCLUSION

This study presents a comprehensive assessment of physiological and cellular dose thresholds in relation to delivery protocols in focused external beam radiotherapy. By integrating theoretical modeling, clinical evidence, and dosimetric analysis, the research highlights the complexity of dose-response relationships and the limitations of conventional approaches.

The findings demonstrate that dose thresholds are dynamic and influenced by multiple factors, including fractionation schemes, delivery techniques, and biological variability. Advanced modalities such as IMRT, VMAT, and IGRT enhance precision and enable dose escalation, but they also introduce new challenges مرتبط with complexity and uncertainty.

The integration of physiological and cellular perspectives emerges as a critical requirement for optimizing treatment outcomes. By combining dosimetric and radiobiological models, clinicians can achieve a more accurate prediction of therapeutic effectiveness and toxicity. This integrated approach supports the development of personalized and adaptive radiotherapy strategies.

Future research should focus on refining radiobiological models, incorporating patient-specific data, and leveraging advanced computational techniques to enhance predictive accuracy. Additionally, continued innovation in delivery technologies and motion management will be essential for تحقيق optimal dose वितरण.

In conclusion, the alignment of delivery protocols with biological dose thresholds يمثل a fundamental step toward precision oncology, offering the potential to improve patient outcomes while minimizing adverse effects.

REFERENCES

1. Bentzen SM, Dörr W, Gahbauer R et al. Bioeffect modeling and equieffective dose

- concepts in radiation oncology – terminology, quantities and units. *Radiother Oncol* 2012;105:266–8.
2. Beyzadeoglu M, Ozyigit G, Ebruli C. *Basic Radiation Oncology*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2010, 145–73.
 3. Blomgren H, Lax I, Naslund I et al. Stereotactic high dose fraction radiation therapy of extracranial tumors using an accelerator. Clinical experience of the first thirty-one patients. *Acta Oncol* 1995;34:861–70.
 4. Chan O, Lee M, Hung A et al. The superiority of hybrid-volumetric arc therapy (VMAT) technique over double arcs VMAT and 3D-conformal technique in the treatment of locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer – a planning study. *Radiother Oncol* 2011;101:298–302.
 5. Douglas J. ICRU. 50 Prescribing, recording, and reporting photon beam therapy. In: *International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements ICRU Report 50*. Bethesda, MD, 1993.
 6. Fowler JF. The linear-quadratic formula and progress in fractionated radiotherapy. *Br J Radiol* 1989;62:679–94.
 7. Kawahara D, Saito A, Ozawa S et al. Assessment of biological dosimetric margin for stereotactic body radiation therapy. *J Appl Clin Med Phys* 2020;21:31–41.
 8. Kartutik K, Wibowo WE, Pawiro SA et al. Comparison of radiotherapy dosimetry for 3D-CRT, IMRT, and SBRT based on electron density calibration. *J Phys* 2016;694(1):012017.
 9. Nagata Y, Takayama K, Matsuo Y et al. Clinical outcomes of a phase I/II study of 48 Gy of stereotactic body radiotherapy in 4 fractions for primary lung cancer using a stereotactic body frame. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2005;63:1427–31.
 10. Onimaru R, Shirato H, Shimizu S et al. Tolerance of organs at risk in small-volume, hypofractionated, image-guided radiotherapy for primary and metastatic lung cancers. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2003;56:126–35.
 11. Shien G, Jie Y, Jiang W et al. Stereotactic body radiation therapy for centrally-located lung tumors. *Oncol Lett* 2014;7:1292–6.
 12. Shirato H, Seppenwoolde Y, Kitamura K et al. Intrafractional tumor motion: lung and liver. *Semin Radiat Oncol* 2004;14:10–8.
 13. Taremi M, Hope A, Dahele M et al. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for medically inoperable lung cancer: prospective, single-center study of 108 consecutive patients. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2012;82:967–73.
 14. Timmerman R, Papiez L, McGarry R et al. Extra cranial stereotactic radioablation: results of a phase I study in medically inoperable stage I non-small cell lung cancer. *Chest* 2003;124:1946–55.
 15. Timmerman RD, Michalski J, Fowler J et al. A Phase II Trial of Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy (SBRT) in the Treatment of Patients with Medically Inoperable Stage I/II Non-small Cell Lung Cancer, Protocol 0236. Philadelphia: RTOG, 2006.
 16. Uematsu M, Shioda A, Suda A et al. Computed tomography-guided frameless stereotactic radiotherapy for stage I non-small cell lung

cancer: a 5-year experience. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2001;51:666–70.

17. van Herk M, Remeijer P, Rasch C, Lebesque JV. The probability of correct target dosage: Dosepopulation histograms for deriving treatment margins in radiotherapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2000;47:1121–35.
18. Waghorn BJ, Shah AP, Rineer JM et al. A margin-based analysis of the dosimetric impact of motion on step-and-shoot IMRT lung plans. *Radiat Oncol* 2014;9:46.
19. Wilke L, Andratschke N, Blanck O et al. ICRU report 91 on prescribing, recording, and reporting of stereotactic treatments with small photon beams: statement from the DEGRO/DGMP working group stereotactic radiotherapy and radiosurgery. *Strahlenther Onkol* 2019;195:193–8.
20. Wulf J, Haedinger U, Oppitz U et al. Stereotactic radiotherapy for primary lung cancer and pulmonary metastases: a noninvasive treatment approach in medically inoperable patients. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2004;60:186–96.

