

The American College of Radiology, with more than 30,000 members, is the principal organization of radiologists, radiation oncologists, and clinical medical physicists in the United States. The College is a nonprofit professional society whose primary purposes are to advance the science of radiology, improve radiologic services to the patient, study the socioeconomic aspects of the practice of radiology, and encourage continuing education for radiologists, radiation oncologists, medical physicists, and persons practicing in allied professional fields.

The American College of Radiology will periodically define new practice parameters and technical standards for radiologic practice to help advance the science of radiology and to improve the quality of service to patients throughout the United States. Existing practice parameters and technical standards will be reviewed for revision or renewal, as appropriate, on their fifth anniversary or sooner, if indicated.

Each practice parameter and technical standard, representing a policy statement by the College, has undergone a thorough consensus process in which it has been subjected to extensive review and approval. The practice parameters and technical standards recognize that the safe and effective use of diagnostic and therapeutic radiology requires specific training, skills, and techniques, as described in each document. Reproduction or modification of the published practice parameter and technical standard by those entities not providing these services is not authorized.

Revised 2014 (Resolution 17)\*

## **ACR–SIR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR RADIOEMBOLIZATION WITH MICROSPHERE BRACHYTHERAPY DEVICE (RMBD) FOR TREATMENT OF LIVER MALIGNANCIES**

---

### **PREAMBLE**

This document is an educational tool designed to assist practitioners in providing appropriate radiologic care for patients. Practice Parameters and Technical Standards are not inflexible rules or requirements of practice and are not intended, nor should they be used, to establish a legal standard of care<sup>1</sup>. For these reasons and those set forth below, the American College of Radiology and our collaborating medical specialty societies caution against the use of these documents in litigation in which the clinical decisions of a practitioner are called into question.

The ultimate judgment regarding the propriety of any specific procedure or course of action must be made by the practitioner in light of all the circumstances presented. Thus, an approach that differs from the guidance in this document, standing alone, does not necessarily imply that the approach was below the standard of care. To the contrary, a conscientious practitioner may responsibly adopt a course of action different from that set forth in this document when, in the reasonable judgment of the practitioner, such course of action is indicated by the condition of the patient, limitations of available resources, or advances in knowledge or technology subsequent to publication of this document. However, a practitioner who employs an approach substantially different from the guidance in this document is advised to document in the patient record information sufficient to explain the approach taken.

The practice of medicine involves not only the science, but also the art of dealing with the prevention, diagnosis, alleviation, and treatment of disease. The variety and complexity of human conditions make it impossible to always reach the most appropriate diagnosis or to predict with certainty a particular response to treatment. Therefore, it should be recognized that adherence to the guidance in this document will not assure an accurate diagnosis or a successful outcome. All that should be expected is that the practitioner will follow a reasonable course of action based on current knowledge, available resources, and the needs of the patient to deliver effective and safe medical care. The sole purpose of this document is to assist practitioners in achieving this objective.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Iowa Medical Society and Iowa Society of Anesthesiologists v. Iowa Board of Nursing*, \_\_\_ N.W.2d \_\_\_ (Iowa 2013) Iowa Supreme Court refuses to find that the ACR *Technical Standard for Management of the Use of Radiation in Fluoroscopic Procedures* (Revised 2008) sets a national standard for who may perform fluoroscopic procedures in light of the standard's stated purpose that ACR standards are educational tools and not intended to establish a legal standard of care. See also, *Stanley v. McCarver*, 63 P.3d 1076 (Ariz. App. 2003) where in a concurring opinion the Court stated that "published standards or guidelines of specialty medical organizations are useful in determining the duty owed or the standard of care applicable in a given situation" even though ACR standards themselves do not establish the standard of care.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The practice parameter was revised collaboratively by the American College of Radiology (ACR) and the Society of Interventional Radiology (SIR).

Radioembolization with a microsphere brachytherapy device (RMBD) is the embolization of the hepatic arterial supply of hepatic primary tumors or metastases via delivery of radioactive beta emitters approximately 25 to 32 micrometers ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) in size. Terms relevant to this practice parameter include intra-arterial therapy and selective internal radiation therapy.

Hepatic arterial therapy takes advantage of the liver's dual blood supply and the fact that tumors larger than 3 mm in diameter receive 80% to 90% of their blood supply from the hepatic artery [1,2]. In contrast, the majority of the normal hepatic parenchyma receives its supply from the portal vein. For 30 years, this difference has been exploited to deliver chemotherapy via intra-arterial pumps, embolic agents to occlude the tumoral arteries, and various combinations of both chemotherapy and embolic agents (chemoembolization) to blend the effects to more fully treat the tumors with both ischemic and antineoplastic effects.

The newest addition to intra-arterial therapies is the use of radioactive particulates using yttrium-90 to perform intra-arterial brachytherapy. Yttrium-90 is a pure beta emitter with a half-life of 64.2 hours (2.67 days). The maximum energy of the emitted beta particles is 2.27 MeV, with an average energy of 0.94 MeV. This corresponds to a maximum range in tissue of 1.1 cm with a mean path of 2.5 mm and an effective path length of 5.3 mm. Yttrium-90 is produced by neutron bombardment of yttrium-89, and upon beta emission, decays to a stable isotope of Zr (Zr-90). In one kilogram of tissue, 1 GBq of uniformly dispersed yttrium-90 delivers an absorbed radiation dose of approximately 50 Gy.

Currently 2 yttrium-90 products are commercially available. Both contain yttrium-90 as the therapeutic agent.

1. Glass spheres (TheraSphere®) were approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 1999 with a humanitarian device exemption (HDE). These products are approved for use in patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). These microspheres arrive a few days before the implant procedure, and all of the spheres contained within the vial are implanted. The spheres have a median size of 25  $\mu\text{m}$  and specific activity of 2,500 Bq/sphere.
2. Resin spheres (SIR-Spheres®) received FDA approval in 2002 for premarket approval (PMA) for unresectable liver metastases from primary colorectal cancer. The spheres have a median size of 32  $\mu\text{m}$  and specific activity of 50 Bq/sphere. SIR-Spheres are delivered on either the day before or the day of implantation.

Brachytherapy is the use of radioisotopes as sealed sources to treat malignancies or benign conditions by means of a radioactive source placed close to or into the tumor. Brachytherapy alone or combined with external beam therapy plays an important role in the management and treatment of patients with cancer.

The use of brachytherapy requires detailed attention to personnel, equipment, patient and personnel safety, and continuing staff education. As brachytherapy is performed in a variety of environments, the authorized user (AU), usually an interventional radiologist, radiation oncologist, or nuclear medicine physician, and a Qualified Medical Physicist (QMP) should apply these practice parameters to individual practices (see section IV.D for the definition of a QMP).

The licensing of radioactive sources used in medicine and the safety of the general public and health care workers are regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) or by agreement states.<sup>2</sup> Medical use of isotopes for

---

<sup>2</sup>An agreement state is any state with which the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission or the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission has entered into an effective agreement under Subsection 274.b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (73 Stat. 689).

therapeutic procedures must adhere to the constraints set forth by these regulatory agencies. Detailed descriptions of NRC licensing and safety issues can be found in the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 20 and Part 35. State requirements for the agreement states are found in the respective state statutes.

The treatment goal of RMBD, whether palliative, curative, or a bridge to transplant, should be defined and communicated to the patient and treatment team. The goal of RMBD is to achieve intrahepatic tumor control. Appropriately selected patients with no or minimal extrahepatic metastases may have improved outcomes following treatment with RMBD. RMBD can induce a partial tumor response, allowing for subsequent surgical excision or liver transplantation. RMBD therapy has been used for both palliative therapy for hepatic metastases and for treatment of paraneoplastic syndromes. See Appendix A for a literature review. Response to RMBD is typically assessed with multidetector triple-phase contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT) of the liver or with magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) with contrast and, when appropriate, via fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET/CT) [3,4].

## II. INDICATIONS AND CONTRAINDICATIONS

A. Indications include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The presence of unresectable and/or inoperable primary or secondary liver malignancies. The tumor burden should be liver dominant, not necessarily exclusive to the liver. Patients should also have a performance status that will allow them to benefit from such therapy, ie, an ECOG performance status of 0 or 1 or KPS of 70 or more.<sup>3</sup>
2. A life expectancy of at least 3 months

B. Relative contraindications include the following:

1. Excessive tumor burden in the liver with greater than 70% of the parenchyma replaced by tumor. Tumor burden may be even more extensive if synthetic function is preserved.
2. Total bilirubin greater than 2 mg/dL (in the absence of obstructive cause), which indicates severe liver function impairment. Nonobstructive bilirubin elevations generally indicate that liver metastases have caused liver impairment to a degree at which risks outweigh benefits for this therapy. In contrast, patients with HCC and elevated bilirubin may be treated with radioembolization if a segmental or subsegmental infusion can be performed.
3. Pretreatment hepatic arterial perfusion embolization with technetium-99m macroaggregated albumin (MAA) demonstrative of unfavorable (or unacceptable) shunt fraction between the liver and the pulmonary parenchyma. This shunt fraction must not be greater than acceptable limits specific to each brachytherapy device.
4. Prior radiation therapy to the liver or upper abdomen that included a significant volume of the liver (clinical judgment by the authorized user required).
5. Chemotherapy agents in the preceding 4 weeks known to be unsafe when used with RMBD. Caution is recommended when treating these patients.
6. If the patient is known to be pregnant, the potential radiation risks to the fetus and the clinical benefits of the procedure required before, during, and after RMBD, and any scatter radiation from the hepatic implant should be considered before proceeding with treatment.

---

<sup>3</sup>ECOG – Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; KPS – Karnofsky Performance Status

C. Absolute contraindications include the following:

1. Inability to catheterize the hepatic artery
2. Fulminant liver failure
3. Technetium-99m MAA hepatic arterial perfusion scintigraphy demonstrating significant reflux or nontarget deposition to the gastrointestinal organs that cannot be corrected by angiographic techniques Portal vein thrombosis

### III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

Physicians from various medical specialties are involved at different times in the evaluation and management of patients receiving RMBD. Multidisciplinary expertise is essential and includes interventional radiology, radiation oncology, nuclear medicine, medical physics, radiation safety, hepatology, gastroenterology, medical oncology, and surgical oncology. Interventional radiologists are responsible for performing the screening angiogram and subsequently placing the delivery catheter.

The responsibilities of the AU and the QMP (and sometimes with a combination of other specialists responsible for the care of the patient) include the following:

1. Selecting the patient for RMBD. This includes history, physical examination, and review of imaging examinations and laboratory reports [5].
2. Obtaining informed consent for RMBD. Complete explanations of the entire RMBD process, including necessary imaging, laboratory, and treatment procedures, typical side effects, and potential complications. The team member completing this portion should be the physician coordinating the activities of the entire team [6].
3. Reviewing the hepatic angiogram, technetium-99m MAA scan, and laboratory reports to make the final determination of eligibility for RMBD
4. Determining treatment parameters: (a) single or fractionated (staged) treatment, (b) intended activity to be administered, (c) target volume (whole liver, lobar, or segment), and (d) vessel(s) to be used for delivery of activity
5. Delivering radioactivity. During treatment, the AU should monitor for stasis and/or reflux of microspheres and end the procedure as needed.
6. Monitoring the patient during the periprocedural period to provide support and clinical management and radiation safety information
7. Following patient after the day of treatment to monitor for side effects, complications, and response to therapy

The AU should write a written directive for the source administration and is responsible for administering the radiation once the interventional radiologist (who may also be the AU) has placed the delivery catheter [7]. The nuclear medicine specialist evaluates the technetium-99m MAA scan to quantify the lung shunt fraction and to evaluate for potential unintended deposition in other gastrointestinal organs.

#### A. Physician

The interventional radiologists are responsible for placement of the catheter for angiogram, technetium-99m MAA injection, protective embolization of gastric and gastroduodenal artery (GDA), and catheter placement for yttrium-90 treatment. He or she may also be the AU at the treating facility. This individual should meet the following qualifications:

1. Certification in Radiology or Diagnostic Radiology by the American Board of Radiology (ABR), American Osteopathic Board of Radiology, the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, or the Collège des Médecins du Québec and has performed (with supervision) a sufficient number of RMBD procedures to demonstrate competency as attested by the supervising physician(s).

or

2. Completion of a radiology residency program and/or interventional/vascular radiology fellowship approved by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada (RCPSC), the Collège des Médecins du Québec, or the American Osteopathic Association (AOA) and has performed (with supervision) a sufficient number of RMBD procedures to demonstrate competency as attested by the supervising physician(s).  
or
3. Completion of an ACGME-approved nonradiology residency or fellowship training and a minimum of 12 months of training in a service that is primarily responsible for the performance of percutaneous visceral arteriography and vascular/interventional radiology during which the physician was supervised. Documented formal training in the performance of invasive catheter arteriographic procedures must be included. During this training the physician should have performed 50 RMBD procedures, 25 of them as primary operator, performing (with supervision) a sufficient number of RMBD procedures to demonstrate competency as attested by the supervising physician(s).

### Maintenance of Competence

Physicians must perform a sufficient number of procedures to maintain their skills, with acceptable success and complication rates as laid out in this practice parameter. Continued competence should depend on participation in a quality improvement program that monitors these rates.

Interventional Radiologists may become AUs. In order to do so, interventional radiologists must meet all of the necessary training requirements as described by the NRC and by their own radiation safety officer (RSO) and state. This includes training in physics, as well as completion of the necessary training and proctoring by the yttrium-90 manufacturers.

### B. Radiation Oncologists

Radiation oncologists are experts on liver tolerance to radiation therapy and radiation complications in normal tissues. He or she may be the AU at the treating facility. The radiation oncologist should have the following qualifications and certification:

1. Satisfactory completion of a residency program in radiation oncology approved by the ACGME, the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada (RCPSC), the Collège des Médecins du Québec, or the American Osteopathic Association (AOA).  
or
2. Certification in Radiology by the American Board of Radiology (ABR) of a physician who confines his or her professional practice to radiation oncology or certification in Radiation Oncology or Therapeutic Radiology by the ABR, the American Osteopathic Board of Radiology, the RCPSC, or the Collège des Médecins du Québec may be considered proof of adequate physician qualifications.

And, in addition to certification, education, and other credentials

3. Completion of the manufacturer's training program, which typically includes a certain number of cases performed under supervision of a proctor provided by the company or under the supervision of an AU who is authorized for the type of microsphere for which the individual is seeking authorization.

The continuing education of a radiation oncologist should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Parameter for Continuing Medical Education \(CME\)](#).

### C. Nuclear Medicine Physician

The nuclear medicine physician is responsible for the technetium-99m MAA scintigraphy, including calculation of shunt fraction, and may be the AU at the facility. He or she also interprets the positron emission tomography (PET) scan and the bremsstrahlung scan. (See the [ACR–SNM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Procedures Using Radiopharmaceuticals](#).)

The physician providing nuclear medicine services must meet all of the following criteria:

#### 1. Qualifications and certification

- a. Certification in either Radiology, Diagnostic Radiology, Nuclear Radiology, or Nuclear Medicine by one of the following organizations: the ABR, the American Osteopathic Board of Radiology, the RCPSC, Le Collège des Médecins du Québec, the American Board of Nuclear Medicine, and/or the American Osteopathic Board of Nuclear Medicine.

or

- b. At a minimum, completion of a general nuclear medicine program approved by the ACGME, the RCPSC, the Collège des Médecins du Québec, or the AOA that must include training in radiation physics, instrumentation, radiochemistry, radiopharmacology, radiation dosimetry, radiation biology, radiation safety and protection, and quality control. In addition, clinical training in general nuclear medicine is required, which must cover technical performance, calculation of administered activity, evaluation of images, correlation with other diagnostic modalities, interpretation, and formal reporting. Physicians trained prior to the availability of formal instruction in nuclear medicine-related sciences may be exempted from this paragraph, provided they have been actively involved in providing nuclear medicine services.
2. Have documented regular participation in continuing medical education (CME) specifically related to diagnostic procedures using radiopharmaceuticals, in accordance with the [ACR Practice Parameter for Continuing Medical Education \(CME\)](#).
  3. Be listed as an AU on the radioactive materials license of his or her institution. When required by the NRC or by the state, at least one physician member of the facility must be a participating member of the committee that deals with radiation safety.
  4. A physician who will administer yttrium-90 must have the credentials described in section IV and must complete the manufacturer's training program. This program may include: 1) on-site proctoring or technical support or 2) a training course.
  5. Have a thorough understanding of each procedure with which he or she is involved. The physician is further responsible for ensuring appropriate utilization of services, quality of procedures, and all aspects of patient and facility safety and compliance with applicable government and institutional regulations regarding the use of radiopharmaceuticals.
  6. Be responsible for developing and maintaining a program of quality control and continued quality improvement (see sections IV and V) or accept responsibility for adhering to such an established program.

### D. Qualified Medical Physicist

A Qualified Medical Physicist is an individual who is competent to practice independently one or more of the subfields in medical physics. The American College of Radiology (ACR) considers certification, continuing education, and experience in the appropriate subfield(s) to demonstrate that an individual is competent to practice one or more of the subfields in medical physics and to be a Qualified Medical Physicist. The ACR strongly recommends that the individual be certified in the appropriate subfield(s) by the American Board of Radiology (ABR), the Canadian College of Physics in Medicine, or by the American Board of Medical Physics (ABMP).

A Qualified Medical Physicist should meet the [ACR Practice Parameter for Continuing Medical Education \(CME\)](#). (ACR Resolution 17, 1996 – revised in 2012, Resolution 42)

The appropriate subfields of medical physics for this standard are Nuclear Medical Physics, and Therapeutic Medical Physics. (Previous medical physics certification categories including Radiological Physics, Therapeutic Radiological Physics, and Medical Nuclear Physics are also acceptable.)

The Qualified Medical Physicist or other qualified scientist performing services in support of nuclear medicine facilities should meet all of the following criteria:

1. Advanced training directed at the specific area of responsibility (eg, radiopharmacy, medical physics, health physics, or instrumentation)
2. Licensure, if required by state regulations
3. Documented regular participation in continuing education in the area of specific involvement to maintain competency
4. Knowledge of radiation safety and protection and of all rules and regulations applying to the area of practice

#### E. Radiologic Technologists

1. Interventional technologist
  - a. Radiologic technologists properly trained in the use of the arteriographic equipment should assist in performing and imaging the procedure. They should be able to demonstrate appropriate knowledge of patient positioning, arteriographic image recording, angiographic contrast injectors, angiographic supplies, and the physiologic monitoring equipment. Certification as a vascular and interventional radiologic technologist is one measure of appropriate training. Technologists should be trained in basic cardiopulmonary resuscitation and in the function of the resuscitation equipment.
  - b. If the patient is to undergo moderate sedation, a nurse or other appropriately trained individual should monitor the patient as his or her primary responsibility. This person should maintain a record of the patient's vital signs, time and dose of medications given, and other pertinent information. Nursing personnel should be qualified to administer moderate sedation (see the [ACR–SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/ Analgesia](#)).
  - c. Although complications of arteriography only rarely require urgent surgery, these procedures should be performed in an environment where operative repair can be instituted promptly. This could be performed in an acute-care hospital with adequate surgical, anesthesia, and ancillary support. When these procedures are performed in a free-standing center, detailed protocols for the rapid transport or admission of the patient to an acute-care hospital should be formalized in writing.

#### F. Nuclear Medicine Technologist

See the [ACR–SNM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Procedures Using Radiopharmaceuticals](#).

### IV. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE PROCEDURE

#### A. Preliminary Angiographic Evaluation

The indications for elective arteriographic studies should be documented as described below. A note should be written summarizing the indications for the study, the pertinent history and physical findings, if available, and the proposed procedure, including:

1. Clinically significant history, including indications for the procedure
2. Clinically significant physical examination, including an awareness of clinical or medical conditions that may necessitate specific care

3. Laboratory evaluation if indicated, including liver function tests, appropriate tumor markers (eg, CEA, AFP), hemoglobin, hematocrit, creatinine, electrolytes, and coagulation parameters
4. Review of appropriate anatomic and/or functional imaging studies, such as cross-sectional CT, MR, and PET scans

#### B. Establishing Treatment Goals with Patient and Treatment Team

The goal of yttrium-90 RMBD is to achieve intrahepatic tumor control. It is likely that patients with no or minimal extrahepatic metastases (appropriately selected patients) will have increased disease-free and possibly increased overall survival as a result of improved hepatic control. Multidetector triple-phase contrast-enhanced CT of the liver and PET-CT are used to evaluate response. Although Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST) criteria have been used to evaluate imaging response, it has been recently reported that FDG-PET response may be more indicative of the actual tumor response.

#### C. Obtaining Informed Consent

Consent for the interventional procedure should be obtained by the interventional radiologist after discussing the procedure in detail. The risks and complications of the procedure, as well as the treatment outcomes, should be completely and frankly discussed. The consent for radiation therapy should be obtained by the authorized user or his or her designee, which could include the interventional radiologist, the nuclear medicine physician, or the radiation oncologist. (See the [ACR Practice Parameter on Informed Consent – Radiation Oncology](#) [6].)

#### D. Pretreatment Evaluation

Pretreatment planning includes performance of a CT scan with determination of tumor volume. PET scanning should be performed for FDG avid tumors. Other functional imaging may be performed as appropriate.

#### E. Preliminary Angiographic Evaluation

Once a patient has been selected as a candidate for RMBD through multidisciplinary collaboration, an initial angiographic evaluation is performed. The proper sequence of vessels to be addressed and evaluated has been previously published [8-10]. This evaluation is done primarily to document the visceral anatomy, identify anatomic variants, isolate the hepatic circulation, and for consideration of occlusion or embolization of extrahepatic vessels.

Pretreatment visceral arteriography should include injection of the celiac, superior mesenteric, left gastric, gastroduodenal, proper hepatic, and right and left hepatic arteries. Embolization of the gastroduodenal artery as well as the right gastric or any other gastric arteries should be considered to redistribute the flow of blood away from the gastrointestinal tract. Other vessels that may require similar treatment include the falciform artery, supraduodenal, retroduodenal, left inferior phrenic, accessory left gastric and inferior esophageal. Care should be taken when considering embolization of the gastroduodenal artery (GDA), as accessory hepatic vessels feeding tumor may arise from this artery. Vascular anomalies should be identified and the relationship of these variants with the tumors determined so that all tumors may be treated. These vessels should be recognized and accessed, with consideration for embolization left to the discretion of the operator.

Prophylactic embolization of the above-mentioned vessels converts the hepatic blood flow into one that might be found when a surgically placed hepatic arterial port is placed. Usually, in surgical port placement, the common hepatic artery is skeletonized, the GDA and right gastric are ligated, and any other hepatic-mesenteric or extrahepatic vessels are ligated.

This is analogous to what is accomplished with the above-described angiographic technique. It is important that all hepatic vessels be interrogated during the angiographic assessment of the patient. Only direct catheterization and



interrogation of all appropriate vessels would demonstrate remote blood supply to the tumor. The lack of recognition of this phenomenon may result in incomplete treatment of the target tumor bed.

Once the anatomy has been established, selective arteriography is performed in the expected location of the yttrium-90 treatment. This may require use of a microcatheter.

At the conclusion of the vascular mapping arteriogram, and after all nontarget vessels have been embolized, technetium-99m MAA arterial injection is performed. 37 to 185 MBq (1.0 to 5.0 mCi) of technetium-99m MAA should be injected into the catheter for follow-up imaging of the liver and lungs to determine the amount of shunting to the lungs. In cases of metastases, injection can often be performed in the proper hepatic artery, given the low incidence of lung shunting in patients with metastatic disease to the liver. The approach to the technetium-99m MAA injection in patients with HCC is slightly different. If the patient has bilobar HCC, proper hepatic artery injection of technetium-99m MAA can be performed unless gross vascular shunting into the hepatic or portal vein is seen. The shunt fraction obtained is assumed to be representative of the bilobar tumors. In cases of bilobar disease where angiographic shunting is seen, a unilobar injection of technetium-99m MAA is performed, and only one lobe is assessed at a time. A repeat technetium-99m MAA injection is performed at a later date when the second lobe requires treatment. Both lobes can be evaluated during the initial technetium-99m MAA injection if the intent is to treat both lobes in a single treatment.

It is important to note that in cases where variant arterial anatomy exists, the technetium-99m MAA dose should be fractionated in order to cover the entire liver in one sitting if possible. For example, in cases where there is a replaced right hepatic artery, 2 to 3 mCi of technetium-99m MAA is given in that vessel, whereas the remaining 2 to 3 mCi is given in the left hepatic artery. In cases of a gastrohepatic trunk, 1 to 3 mCi of technetium-99m MAA are injected in the left hepatic artery, and the remainder is injected in the right hepatic artery.

#### F. Variant Mesenteric Anatomy

In 55% to 65% of cases, the celiac artery gives rise to the splenic artery, the left gastric artery, and the common hepatic artery. The dorsal pancreatic artery commonly arises from the celiac origin, although it may also arise off the common hepatic artery (CHA) or splenic artery. The common hepatic artery then gives rise to the GDA and becomes the proper hepatic artery, which divides into the right and left hepatic arteries. When a distinct vessel arising from the right hepatic artery provides flow to segment IV, it is referred to as the middle hepatic artery. In more than 40% of cases, the origin and course of the hepatic arteries vary, as does the vascular distribution of the vessel irrespective of its anticipated course. Vessels supplying one segment may be recruited to provide flow to other anatomic segments. The most common variants include a replaced or accessory right hepatic artery arising from the superior mesenteric artery (SMA) and a replaced or accessory left hepatic artery arising from the left gastric artery [11]. Other less common variants include a replaced common hepatic artery arising from the SMA or bifurcation of a short common hepatic artery into right and left hepatic arteries. The right and left hepatic arteries may arise separately from the celiac trunk or directly from the aorta. The caudate lobe most commonly receives its blood supply from a small branch off the left or right hepatic artery. This caudate artery is normally rather diminutive; however, in the setting of tumor, it can become prominent, thereby allowing selective catheterization and treatment.

#### G. RMBD Treatment Plan

1. It is recommended that a written directive be obtained from the AU before the source is ordered. The written directive will be in the patient chart and should include the following information:
  - a. Before implantation: treatment site, the radionuclide (yttrium-90 microspheres), dose (activity ordered in gigabequerels [GBq]) and medical end point (stasis to determine when to terminate implantation)
  - b. After implantation but before completion of the procedure: the radionuclide (yttrium-90 microspheres) treatment site and the total dose implanted

- c. In addition, the written directive often includes:
  - i. Mass or volume of the target
  - ii. Location of the target
  - iii. Lung shunt fraction
  - iv. Dose estimate for lung and gastrointestinal tract
  - v. Approximate time of administration
  - vi. Upon completion of the procedure, any deviations from the written directive

2. Dosimetry

Depending on the brachytherapy device being used, results of the studies (CT, technetium-99m MAA hepatic arterial scintigraphy, or angiogram), and the volume of liver to be irradiated (eg, whole liver versus lobar treatment) various dosimetry models may be used in calculating activity to be administered.

a. Glass sphere – Therasphere®

- i. The glass microsphere dosimetry is based on the MIRD (Medical Internal Radiation Dosimetry committee of the Society of Nuclear Medicine) model. Although sphere distribution is known to be nonuniform, MIRD dosimetry models assume uniform distribution of activity in mass. Activity calculation requires the patient’s liver mass and the nominal target dose.
- ii. The partition model is based on the MIRD model and involves implanting the highest possible activity to the tumor while maintaining radiation dose to sensitive tissues such as lung and normal liver at an acceptable level. This method can only be used where the tumor mass is localized in a discrete area within the liver and the tumor can be drawn as an “area of interest” on SPECT (single photon-emission CT) camera image.

b. Resin sphere – SIR-Spheres®

There are 3 methods for calculating the activity as recommended by the manufacturer:

- i. The body surface area (BSA) method uses the manufacturer’s formula to calculate the activity to be implanted. This formula requires the patient’s height, weight, and percentage of the liver that is replaced by the tumor as calculated from the CT scan.
- ii. The empiric method recommends a standard amount of activity based on estimated percentage of tumor burden in the liver as shown in the table below.

Estimated Tumor Involvement of Liver	Recommended Activity for Treatment
>50%	3 GBq
25% to 50%	2.5 GBq
<25%	2 GBq

- iii. The partition model is based on the MIRD model and involves implanting the highest possible activity to the tumor while maintaining radiation dose to sensitive tissues such as lung and normal liver at an acceptable level. This method can only be used where the tumor mass is localized in a discrete area within the liver and the tumor can be drawn as an “area of interest” on SPECT camera image.

Although all 3 methods have been mentioned in the literature, the BSA method is preferred and is most commonly utilized when a resin-based microsphere device is used.

## H. RMBD Treatment Delivery

1. Adherence to the Joint Commission's current Universal Protocol for Preventing Wrong Site, Wrong Procedure, Wrong Person Surgery™ is required for procedures in nonoperating room settings including bedside procedures. The organization should have processes and systems in place for reconciling differences in staff responses during the "time out."
2. All patients should have continuous cardiac monitoring during the procedure with intermittent blood pressure monitoring. A record of vital signs should be maintained.
3. All patients should have intravenous access for the administration of fluids and medications as needed.
4. If the patient is to receive moderate sedation, pulse oximetry should be used in addition to number 2 above. A registered nurse or other appropriately trained personnel should be present, and his or her primary responsibility should be to monitor the patient. A record should be kept of medication doses and times of administration.
5. The diagnostic angiography portion involves assessment of the vascular anatomy, any arterial variants, patency of the portal venous system, and any other vascular anomalies. In particular, therapy with radioembolization involves the identification of vessels that extend outside the anticipated treatment field (examples might include gastric, duodenal, or esophageal vessels). Appropriate precautions for vascular exclusions are undertaken at the time (such as distal catheter placement or coil embolization).
6. Hepatic arterial scintigraphy with technetium-99m MAA is done for treatment planning and for detecting patients who might be at risk for complications from extrahepatic deposition.
  - a. Perfusion of hepatic tumors
    - i. Technetium-99m MAA consists of particles of aggregated human serum albumin with a size range of 10 to 90 μm. Given intra-arterially via a hepatic artery perfusion catheter, the MAA particles will localize within the liver in a distribution similar to that of the radioembolization microspheres. The usual adult administered activity is 1.0 to 6.0 mCi (37 to 222 MBq).
    - ii. Planar images of the abdomen are obtained immediately in the following projections: anterior and posterior, left anterior oblique (LAO), and right anterior oblique (RAO), left lateral, and right lateral, followed by planar images of the chest and neck (to include the thyroid) in the anterior and posterior projections. SPECT imaging may be performed using a single-head, large-field-of-view SPECT gamma camera with these parameters: 64 x 64 matrix, 6 degree angle of sampling (60 images in a 360 degrees arc), 20 to 30 seconds per stop. For multiheaded gamma cameras, SPECT imaging with a 128 x 128 matrix with a 3 degree angle of sampling (60 images per head for a dual-head camera or 40 images per head for a 3-head camera) can be used.
  - b. Identify any extrahepatic radiotracer distribution and calculate the pulmonary shunt fraction by the geometric mean (GM). The GM is performed by drawing a region of interest (ROI) around the whole lung and the whole liver in the anterior and posterior projections. The square root of the product of the anterior and posterior counts is the GM. To quantitate the percentage of lung shunting, the following formula is used: % lung shunt = (GM lung/GM liver + GM lung) x 100. If the lung shunt fraction is >10%, a dose reduction is recommended to prevent radiation pneumonitis. If the lung shunt fraction is >20%, yttrium-90 therapy should not be performed. A dose reduction should also be considered if the patient has received prior chemotherapy [12,13].
7. A physician should be available during the immediate postprocedure period to ensure that there is adequate hemostasis at the puncture site and that the patient is stable prior to transfer to the postprocedure care area.

## I. Postprocedure Care

1. The room and staff should be surveyed at the end of the procedure, before they come off the floor pad. The area and all trash containers should also be surveyed for contamination. All contaminated materials must be placed in storage. A dose calibrator, or other system recommended by the manufacturer, should be used to determine residual postprocedure activity in order to verify activity administered to the patient.

2. A procedure note must be written in the patient's chart summarizing the major findings of the study and any immediate complications. This note may be brief if an official interpretation<sup>4</sup> is available within a few hours. The immediate note should include, at a minimum, the following: indications, operative procedure and imaging findings, date and time, operator(s)/surgeon(s), complications, medications and/or contrast used, and conclusions. However, if the official interpretation is not likely to be on the chart the same day, a more detailed summary of the procedure should be written in the chart at the conclusion of the procedure. In all cases, pertinent findings should be communicated to the referring physician in a timely manner.
3. All patients should be at bed rest and observed in the initial postprocedure period. The length of this period of bed rest will depend on the site and size of the arteriotomy and the patient's medical condition. Since a small amount of radioactivity may be excreted in the urine, it is advised that for the first 24 hours postprocedure, the patient should use a toilet and not a urinal. The toilet should also be doubled flushed during this time [12].
4. During the initial postprocedure period, skilled nurses or other appropriately trained personnel should periodically monitor the puncture site and the status of the distal vascular distribution.
5. The patient should be monitored for urinary output, cardiac symptoms, pain, and other indicators of systemic complications that may need to be addressed further.
6. The initial ambulation of the patient must be supervised. Vascular perfusion, puncture-site stability, and independent patient function and mobility must be ensured.
7. The operating physician or a qualified designee should evaluate the patient after the procedure, and these findings should be summarized in a progress note. If moderate sedation was administered prior to and during the procedure, recovery from moderate sedation must be documented. The physician or designee should be available for continuing care during hospitalization and after discharge. The designee may be another physician, a nurse, or other appropriately qualified and credentialed health care provider.

## J. Device Implant

Prior to device implantation all of the above procedures should have been completed, including review of appropriate studies, diagnostic angiography, MAA scanning, dosimetry calculations, and ordering of the brachytherapy device. There should be discussion among team members prior to patient treatment to address any unique or unusual characteristics that may affect patient safety or outcome.

The brachytherapy device should be assayed in the dose calibrator to verify the calibration activity of the source. For resin spheres the appropriate activity should be withdrawn from the source vial and transferred to the treatment vial. Everything that comes in contact with the radioactive source and could cause contamination should be placed in storage. Treatment room preparation should include placement of absorbent pads on the floor where patient/staff contact is anticipated. A "bail out" box should be available. In preparation for implantation the appropriate hepatic artery is accessed, the catheter is placed in the predetermined position and confirmed by angiography, the administration kit is assembled, and the infusion is initiated. Once treatment delivery starts, everything that comes into contact with the patient should stay on the table.

For glass microspheres, administration involves the injection of sterile saline through the treatment vial in order to suspend the microspheres for transcatheter delivery. Following complete administration, a postradioembolization angiogram is recommended.

For resin microspheres, administration involves the injection of sterile water through the treatment vial in order to suspend the microspheres for transcatheter delivery. Intermittent angiography should be performed to evaluate for antegrade flow. Once slowing or stasis is observed, no further activity should be administered. Following complete administration, a postradioembolization angiogram should be performed. However, to avoid dislodging microspheres, which can reflux into the GI tract, contrast injection should be performed gently and with a minimum amount of contrast that will still achieve an adequate image of the final vasculature, postimplant. Preferably, the microcatheter should be withdrawn to at least the proper, right or left hepatic artery prior to the final injection of contrast if super

---

<sup>4</sup>The ACR Medical Legal Committee defines official interpretation as that written report (and any supplements or amendments thereto) that attach to the patient's permanent record. In a health care facility with a privilege delineation system, such a written report is prepared only by a qualified physician who has been granted specific delineated clinical privileges for that purpose by the facility's governing body upon the recommendation of the medical staff.

selective placement has been performed.

## V. PATIENT AND PERSONNEL SAFETY

Patient protection measures include those related to medical safety and radiation protection.

A. Patient protection measures should include the following:

1. A radiation exposure monitoring program, as required by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and agreement states
2. Charting systems and forms for documenting all aspects of the treatment, including the prescription, definition and delivery of treatment parameters, and summaries of brachytherapy. In addition, any previous interventions such as chemotherapy, external beam radiation therapy, and surgeries should be documented.
3. A physics program for ensuring accurate dose delivery to the patient
4. A check system for the AU and QMP to verify independently all brachytherapy parameters to be used in each procedure (source, isotope and activity calculation, etc.) prior to the delivery of RMBD
5. Patients should be provided with written descriptions of the radiation protection guidelines, including, but not limited to, discussion of potential limitations of patient contact with minors and pregnant women. This description should be in compliance with state and federal regulations. The AU, QMP, and RSO should define the postimplant radiation safety guidelines for patients treated with RMBD.
6. Personnel in the angiography suite should all be surveyed for possible contamination.
7. The exposure rate from the contaminated waste should be measured to estimate the residual activity. 90-degree intervals around the contaminated waste chamber at 25 cm should be used according to the manufacturer's guidance. These readings should be averaged to determine the final activity.
8. Postprocedure bremsstrahlung planar imaging, SPECT and/or SPECT/CT can be used within 24 hours of the conclusion of the procedure to document the placement of the devices and assess for significant extrahepatic shunting.
9. Patients should be seen immediately following the procedure and at intervals consistent with good medical practice.
10. Imaging follow-up should be obtained at 1 to 3 months following the procedure to determine the effectiveness of the procedure.

It is recommended that patients be given a document on discharge stating that they have received a radioactive medical implant. Radiation from the implant can trigger sensitive security alarms in airports and public buildings. Appropriate hospital/clinic contact information for security personnel should be provided on such documents.

B. Personnel safety measures should include the following:

1. A radiation exposure monitoring program, as required by the institution's radioactive materials license
2. Appropriate safety equipment for storage of the sources

## VI. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Parameter for Communication: Radiation Oncology](#) or the [ACR-SIR Practice Parameter for the Reporting and Archiving of Interventional Radiology Procedures](#), with the addition of:

1. Specification of the activity of yttrium-90
2. Target volume: whole liver, right or left lobe, or segment
3. Final activity delivered
4. Any evidence of target embolization

5. Any evidence of nontarget embolization
6. Condition of patient on discharge
7. Follow-up clinical visits planned
8. Follow-up laboratory/radiological examinations
9. Final disposition of patient

## VII. RADIATION SAFETY

Radiologists, medical physicists, registered radiologist assistants, radiologic technologists, and all supervising physicians have a responsibility for safety in the workplace by keeping radiation exposure to staff, and to society as a whole, “as low as reasonably achievable” (ALARA) and to assure that radiation doses to individual patients are appropriate, taking into account the possible risk from radiation exposure and the diagnostic image quality necessary to achieve the clinical objective. All personnel that work with ionizing radiation must understand the key principles of occupational and public radiation protection (justification, optimization of protection and application of dose limits) and the principles of proper management of radiation dose to patients (justification, optimization and the use of dose reference levels) [http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/p1531interim\\_web.pdf](http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/p1531interim_web.pdf).

Facilities and their responsible staff should consult with the radiation safety officer to ensure that there are policies and procedures for the safe handling and administration of radiopharmaceuticals and that they are adhered to in accordance with ALARA. These policies and procedures must comply with all applicable radiation safety regulations and conditions of licensure imposed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and by state and/or other regulatory agencies. Quantities of radiopharmaceuticals should be tailored to the individual patient by prescription or protocol.

Nationally developed guidelines, such as the ACR’s Appropriateness Criteria<sup>®</sup>, should be used to help choose the most appropriate imaging procedures to prevent unwarranted radiation exposure.

Additional information regarding patient radiation safety in imaging is available at the Image Gently<sup>®</sup> for children ([www.imagegently.org](http://www.imagegently.org)) and Image Wisely<sup>®</sup> for adults ([www.imagewisely.org](http://www.imagewisely.org)) websites. These advocacy and awareness campaigns provide free educational materials for all stakeholders involved in imaging (patients, technologists, referring providers, medical physicists, and radiologists).

Radiation exposures or other dose indices should be measured and patient radiation dose estimated for representative examinations and types of patients by a Qualified Medical Physicist in accordance with the applicable ACR Technical Standards. Regular auditing of patient dose indices should be performed by comparing the facility’s dose information with national benchmarks, such as the ACR Dose Index Registry, the NCRP Report No. 172, Reference Levels and Achievable Doses in Medical and Dental Imaging: Recommendations for the United States or the Conference of Radiation Control Program Director’s National Evaluation of X-ray Trends. (ACR Resolution 17 adopted in 2006 – revised in 2009, 2013, Resolution 52).

The manufacturer-provided acrylic shielding effectively blocks the beta radiation and does not generate significant bremsstrahlung. Although the NRC classifies microspheres as sealed sources, in general they should be handled more like unsealed radiopharmaceutical sources. One area where particular care should be exerted is in the prevention and rapid cleanup of any spills. Unlike solutions of unsealed radiopharmaceuticals that dry in place after a spill, the microspheres can roll about and blow around after drying, thereby presenting a somewhat different hazard. Additionally, the microspheres can wedge themselves into tiny cracks and crevices, becoming practically impossible to remove from benchtops and equipment. Appropriate planning and care can reduce this risk.

Facilities, in consultation with the RSO, should have in place, and should adhere to, policies and procedures for the safe handling and administration of radiopharmaceuticals, in accordance with ALARA, and must comply with all applicable radiation safety regulations and conditions of licensure imposed by the NRC, state, and/or other regulatory

agencies. Quantities of radiopharmaceuticals should be tailored to the individual patient by prescription or protocol. See Appendix B for radiation safety discharge instructions.

## VIII. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

Several technical requirements are necessary to ensure safe and successful diagnostic arteriogram and RBMD procedures. These include adequate equipment, institutional facilities, physiologic monitoring equipment (including intravascular pressure measurement systems), and appropriately trained and qualified personnel.

For specific requirements for the arteriographic procedures, see the [ACR–SIR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Arteriography](#).

A gamma camera with a low-energy all-purpose (LEAP) or low-energy high-resolution (LEHR) collimator may be used for the nuclear medicine imaging.

The activity of yttrium-90 is determined by measurement using an appropriate dose calibrator, such as an ion chamber. The dose calibrator manufacturer's instructions regarding calibration for yttrium-90 sources should be followed.

Adjustments to the dose calibrator settings or a correction factor may be necessary to bring the measurement from the ion chamber to an acceptable level ( $\pm 10\%$  of the manufacturer-supplied measurement). These settings or correction factor should then be the standard used for activity measurements of microspheres. Other factors that can influence the activity measurements include the shape and material (glass versus plastic tubing versus polycarbonate) of the container holding the source.

## IX. QUALITY CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT, SAFETY, INFECTION CONTROL, AND PATIENT EDUCATION

Policies and procedures related to quality, patient education, infection control, and safety should be developed and implemented in accordance with the ACR Policy on Quality Control and Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education appearing under the heading *Position Statement on QC & Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education* on the ACR website (<http://www.acr.org/guidelines>).

Nuclear medicine equipment performance monitoring should be in accordance with the [ACR Technical Standard for Medical Nuclear Physics Performance Monitoring of Gamma Cameras](#).

The Medical Director of Radiation Oncology is responsible for the institution and ongoing supervision of continuing quality improvement (CQI) as described in the [ACR Practice Parameter for Radiation Oncology](#). It is the responsibility of the director to identify problems, see that actions are taken, and evaluate the effectiveness of the actions. The director will designate appropriate personnel to constitute the CQI committee that will review RBMD as part of the CQI meeting agenda. Refer to the [ACR Practice Parameter for Radiation Oncology](#) for a detailed description of CQI committee functions.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This practice parameter was revised according to the process described under the heading *The Process for Developing ACR Practice Parameters and Technical Standards* on the ACR website (<http://www.acr.org/guidelines>) by the Committee on Practice Parameters – Interventional and Cardiovascular Radiology, Committee on Practice Parameters – Radiation Oncology and Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards – Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging of the ACR Commissions on Interventional and Cardiovascular Radiology, Radiation Oncology, and Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging in collaboration with the SIR.

Collaborative Committee

Members represent their societies in the initial and final revision of this practice parameter.

ACR

Seth A. Rosenthal, MD, FACR  
Elizabeth Ying-Kou Yung, MD, FACR  
Bassem I. Zaki, MD

SIR

Riad Salem, MD, FSIR, Chair  
Douglas M. Coldwell, MD, PhD, FACR, FSIR  
Ravi Murthy, MD  
Charles W. Nutting, DO, FSIR

Committee on Practice Parameters – Interventional and Cardiovascular Radiology

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Aradhana M. Venkatesan, MD, Chair  
Stephen Balter, PhD, FACR  
Drew M. Caplin, MD  
Sean R. Dariushnia, MD  
Lawrence T. Dauer, PhD  
Robert G. Dixon, MD  
Jeremy L. Friese, MD, MBA  
Joshua A. Hirsch, MD, FACR, FSIR  
Sanjeeva P. Kalva, MD  
Wael Saad, MD, FSIR  
John D. Statler, MD  
Michael S. Stecker, MD, FSIR  
Timothy L. Swan, MD, FACR  
Raymond H. Thornton, MD, FSIR  
Joan C. Wojak, MD, FSIR

Committee on Practice Parameters – Radiation Oncology

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Alan C. Hartford, MD, PhD, Chair  
Patrick D. Conway, MD, FACR  
Neil B. Desai, MD  
Nancy A. Ellerbroek, MD, FACR  
Roger M. Gilbert, MD, FACR  
Geoffrey S. Ibbott, PhD, FACR, FAAPM  
Bill W. Loo, MD, PhD  
Tariq A. Mian, PhD, FACR, FAAPM  
Jeff M. Michalski, MD, MBA, FACR  
Suzanne L. Wolden, MD, FACR  
Bassem I. Zaki, MD

Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards – Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Bennett S. Greenspan, MD, MS, FACR, Co-Chair  
Christopher J. Palestro, MD, Co-Chair  
Thomas W. Allen, MD  
Murray D. Becker, MD, PhD  
Richard K.J. Brown, MD, FACR  
Gary L. Dillehay, MD, FACR



Shana Elman, MD  
Warren R. Janowitz, MD, JD, FACR  
Chun K. Kim, MD  
Charito Love, MD  
Joseph R. Osborne, MD, PhD  
Darko Pucar, MD, PhD  
Scott C. Williams, MD

Anne C. Roberts, MD, FACR, FSIR, Chair, Commission on Interventional & Cardio Radiology  
Seth A. Rosenthal, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Radiation Oncology  
M. Elizabeth Oates, MD, Chair, Commission on Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging  
Debra L. Monticciolo, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety  
Julie K. Timins, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

#### Comments Reconciliation Committee

Richard Strax, MD, FACR, Chair  
Alexander M. Norbash, MD, FACR, Co-Chair  
Kimberly E. Applegate, MD, MS, FACR  
Douglas M. Coldwell, MD, PhD, FACR  
Bennett S. Greenspan, MD, MS, FACR  
Alan C. Hartford, MD, PhD  
William T. Herrington, MD, FACR  
Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR  
Darlene F. Metter, MD, FACR  
Debra L. Monticciolo, MD, FACR  
Ravi Murthy, MD  
Boris Nikolic, MD, MBA  
Charles W. Nutting, DO  
M. Elizabeth Oates, MD  
Christopher J. Palestro, MD  
Anne C. Roberts, MD, FACR, FSIR  
Seth A. Rosenthal, MD, FACR  
Riad Salem, MD  
Michael A. Savin, MD  
Julie K. Timins, MD, FACR  
Aradhana M. Venkatesan, MD  
Joan C. Wojak, MD, FSIR  
Elizabeth Ying-Kou Yung, MD, FACR  
Bassem I. Zaki, MD

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Ackerman NB. The blood supply of experimental liver metastases. IV. Changes in vascularity with increasing tumor growth. *Surgery*. 1974;75(4):589-596.
2. Breedis C, Young G. The blood supply of neoplasms in the liver. *Am J Pathol*. 1954;30(5):969-977.
3. Szyszko T, Al-Nahhas A, Canelo R, et al. Assessment of response to treatment of unresectable liver tumours with 90Y microspheres: value of FDG PET versus computed tomography. *Nucl Med Commun*. 2007;28(1):15-20.
4. Wong CY, Salem R, Raman S, Gates VL, Dworkin HJ. Evaluating 90Y-glass microsphere treatment response of unresectable colorectal liver metastases by [18F]FDG PET: a comparison with CT or MRI. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2002;29(6):815-820.

5. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter for communication: radiation oncology. 2009; [http://www.acr.org/~media/ACR/Documents/PGTS/guidelines/Comm\\_Radiation\\_Oncology.pdf](http://www.acr.org/~media/ACR/Documents/PGTS/guidelines/Comm_Radiation_Oncology.pdf). Accessed May 10, 2013.
6. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter on informed consent - radiation oncology. 2012; [http://www.acr.org/~media/ACR/Documents/PGTS/guidelines/Informed\\_Consent\\_Rad\\_Onc.pdf](http://www.acr.org/~media/ACR/Documents/PGTS/guidelines/Informed_Consent_Rad_Onc.pdf). Accessed May 10, 2013.
7. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Microspheres Brachytherapy Sources and Devices. 2012; <http://pbadupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1217/ML12179A353.pdf>. Accessed October 23, 2013.
8. Lewandowski RJ, Sato KT, Atassi B, et al. Radioembolization with 90Y microspheres: angiographic and technical considerations. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2007;30(4):571-592.
9. Liu DM, Salem R, Bui JT, et al. Angiographic considerations in patients undergoing liver-directed therapy. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2005;16(7):911-935.
10. Salem R, Lewandowski RJ, Sato KT, et al. Technical aspects of radioembolization with 90Y microspheres. *Tech Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2007;10(1):12-29.
11. Nelson T, Pollak R, Jonasson O, Abcarian H. Anatomic variants of the celiac, superior mesenteric, and inferior mesenteric arteries and their clinical relevance. *Clinical Anatomy*. 1988;1(2):75-91.
12. Mettler FA, Guiberteau MJ. Essentials of Nuclear Medicine Imaging. 6th edition ed: Elsevier; 2012:358-359.
13. Sirtex Medical Inc. SIR-Spheres® microspheres (Yttrium-90 Microspheres). Available at: <http://www.sirtex.com/media/43080/ssl-us-09.pdf>. Accessed December 3, 2013.
14. Sangro B, Salem R, Kennedy A, Coldwell D, Wasan H. Radioembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: a review of the evidence and treatment recommendations. *Am J Clin Oncol*. 2011;34(4):422-431.
15. Salem R, Lewandowski RJ, Mulcahy MF, et al. Radioembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma using Yttrium-90 microspheres: a comprehensive report of long-term outcomes. *Gastroenterology*. 2010;138(1):52-64.
16. Sangro B, Carpanese L, Cianni R, et al. Survival after yttrium-90 resin microsphere radioembolization of hepatocellular carcinoma across Barcelona clinic liver cancer stages: a European evaluation. *Hepatology*. 2011;54(3):868-878.
17. Sangro B, D'Avola D, Inarrairaegui M, Prieto J. Transarterial therapies for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Expert Opin Pharmacother*. 2011;12(7):1057-1073.
18. Salem R, Lewandowski RJ, Kulik L, et al. Radioembolization results in longer time-to-progression and reduced toxicity compared with chemoembolization in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. *Gastroenterology*. 2011;140(2):497-507 e492.
19. Tsai AL, Burke CT, Kennedy AS, et al. Use of yttrium-90 microspheres in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma and portal vein thrombosis. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2010;21(9):1377-1384.
20. Lewandowski RJ, Kulik LM, Riaz A, et al. A comparative analysis of transarterial downstaging for hepatocellular carcinoma: chemoembolization versus radioembolization. *Am J Transplant*. 2009;9(8):1920-1928.
21. Atlanta: American Cancer Society. *Colorectal Cancer Facts and Figures 2008-2010*. 2008; <http://www.cancer.org/acs/groups/content/@nho/documents/document/f861708finalforwebpdf.pdf>. Accessed February 20, 2013.
22. Sasson AR, Sigurdson ER. Surgical treatment of liver metastases. *Semin Oncol*. 2002;29(2):107-118.
23. Scheele J, Stang R, Altendorf-Hofmann A, Paul M. Resection of colorectal liver metastases. *World J Surg*. 1995;19(1):59-71.
24. Tomlinson JS, Jarnagin WR, DeMatteo RP, et al. Actual 10-year survival after resection of colorectal liver metastases defines cure. *J Clin Oncol*. 2007;25(29):4575-4580.
25. Adam R, Aloia T, Levi F, et al. Hepatic resection after rescue cetuximab treatment for colorectal liver metastases previously refractory to conventional systemic therapy. *J Clin Oncol*. 2007;25(29):4593-4602.
26. Goldberg RM, Rothenberg ML, Van Cutsem E, et al. The continuum of care: a paradigm for the management of metastatic colorectal cancer. *Oncologist*. 2007;12(1):38-50.
27. Mulcahy MF, Lewandowski RJ, Ibrahim SM, et al. Radioembolization of colorectal hepatic metastases using yttrium-90 microspheres. *Cancer*. 2009;115(9):1849-1858.
28. Jakobs TF, Hoffmann RT, Dehm K, et al. Hepatic yttrium-90 radioembolization of chemotherapy-refractory colorectal cancer liver metastases. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2008;19(8):1187-1195.

29. Hendlisz A, Van den Eynde M, Peeters M, et al. Phase III trial comparing protracted intravenous fluorouracil infusion alone or with yttrium-90 resin microspheres radioembolization for liver-limited metastatic colorectal cancer refractory to standard chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28(23):3687-3694.
30. Sharma RA, Van Hazel GA, Morgan B, et al. Radioembolization of liver metastases from colorectal cancer using yttrium-90 microspheres with concomitant systemic oxaliplatin, fluorouracil, and leucovorin chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol*. 2007;25(9):1099-1106.
31. van Hazel GA, Pavlakis N, Goldstein D, et al. Treatment of fluorouracil-refractory patients with liver metastases from colorectal cancer by using yttrium-90 resin microspheres plus concomitant systemic irinotecan chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol*. 2009;27(25):4089-4095.
32. Granberg D, Garske U, Welin S, et al. Selective internal radiation therapy in patients with carcinoid liver metastases. *Acta Oncol*. 2008;47(6):1169-1171.
33. King J, Quinn R, Glenn DM, et al. Radioembolization with selective internal radiation microspheres for neuroendocrine liver metastases. *Cancer*. 2008;113(5):921-929.
34. Kennedy AS, Dezarn WA, McNeillie P, et al. Radioembolization for unresectable neuroendocrine hepatic metastases using resin 90Y-microspheres: early results in 148 patients. *Am J Clin Oncol*. 2008;31(3):271-279.
35. Rhee TK, Lewandowski RJ, Liu DM, et al. 90Y Radioembolization for metastatic neuroendocrine liver tumors: preliminary results from a multi-institutional experience. *Ann Surg*. 2008;247(6):1029-1035.
36. Kalinowski M, Dressler M, Konig A, et al. Selective internal radiotherapy with Yttrium-90 microspheres for hepatic metastatic neuroendocrine tumors: a prospective single center study. *Digestion*. 2009;79(3):137-142.
37. Cao CQ, Yan TD, Bester L, Liauw W, Morris DL. Radioembolization with yttrium microspheres for neuroendocrine tumour liver metastases. *Br J Surg*. 2010;97(4):537-543.
38. Saxena A, Chua TC, Zhao J, Morris DL. Liver-directed therapy for neuroendocrine neoplasm hepatic metastasis prolongs survival following progression after initial surgery. *J Surg Oncol*. 2012;105(4):342-350.
39. Memon K, Lewandowski RJ, Mulcahy MF, et al. Radioembolization for neuroendocrine liver metastases: safety, imaging, and long-term outcomes. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2012;83(3):887-894.
40. Rajekar H, Bogammana K, Stubbs RS. Selective internal radiation therapy for gastrointestinal neuroendocrine tumour liver metastases: a new and effective modality for treatment. *Int J Hepatol*. 2011;2011:404916.
41. Paprottka PM, Hoffmann RT, Haug A, et al. Radioembolization of symptomatic, unresectable neuroendocrine hepatic metastases using yttrium-90 microspheres. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2012;35(2):334-342.

## APPENDIX A

### Literature Review

#### A. Hepatocellular Carcinoma

Treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is a balance between tumor progression and the treatment's detrimental effect on liver reserve. Although single lesions can be treated effectively with ablative techniques such as radiofrequency ablation, with an increase in the number and growth of lesions and the failure of other liver directed therapies, eg, transarterial chemoembolization, RMBD can be utilized effectively [14]. Patients with early stage HCC and well-compensated cirrhosis (Child-Pugh A) respond well to RMBD with an overall survival of 14 to 23 months as seen in both prospective and retrospective studies [15-17]. As expected, the more extensive the HCC and the more advanced the cirrhosis, the more survival is impaired. Nevertheless, use of RMBD in Child-Pugh B and C patients results in survival rates of 6 to 13 months and 4 to 8 months, respectively [18]. Since this is primarily an outpatient therapy, it is better tolerated than other embolotherapy options for treatment of HCC [18]. The invasion of the portal vein by HCC is a contraindication to the use of embolotherapy, except in RMBD in which the survival of these patients is approximately 10 months rather than 4 months with standard therapy [19]. RMBD can also be utilized effectively to down stage unresectable HCC, enabling ablative techniques, surgical resection, or transplantation [20].

## B. Colorectal Cancer

Colorectal cancer is the third most common cancer diagnosed among both men and women in the United States. The American Cancer Society [21] estimates that approximately 148,810 new cases of colorectal cancer and 49,960 deaths were expected in 2008.

Approximately 72% of new diagnoses are colon cancer and 28% are rectal cancer. The liver is the most frequent site of metastases. An estimated 60% of patients who are diagnosed with colorectal cancer eventually will experience liver disease as a predominant site [22]. Surgical resection is associated with long-term survival in patients with colorectal liver metastases [23]. A median overall survival of 44 months and a 5-year survival rate of 35% [24] are associated with surgical resection of liver confined disease for patients with no evidence of disseminated disease with a resection strategy encompassing all liver disease with adequate remnant liver for recovery and medical fitness for laparotomy. However, patients who have liver metastases amenable to resection account for less than 20% of the population with metastatic liver disease [25]. For the majority of patients without resectable disease, the median overall survival is 22 months and rarely is associated with the survival beyond 5 years [26]. Targeted nonsurgical approaches for liver-confined CRC metastases may offer survival advantages beyond that of systemic therapy alone.

### 1. Radioablation for chemorefractory liver metastases:

RMBD was evaluated in a cohort of 72 patients with unresectable hepatic colorectal metastases who were treated at a targeted absorbed dose of 120 Gy with a median delivered dose of 118 Gy [27]. The safety and toxicity was assessed using version 3 of the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria. Response was assessed radiographically and survival was estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method from the diagnosis of hepatic metastases and first treatment. Treatment-related toxicities included fatigue (61%), nausea (21%), and abdominal pain (25%), with grade 3 and 4 bilirubin toxicities observed in 9 of 72 patients (12.6%). The tumor response rate was 40.3%. The median time to hepatic progression was 15.4 months, and the median response duration was 15 months. Overall survival from the first radioablation treatment was 14.5 months. Based on substratification analyses, tumor replacement ( $\leq 25\%$  versus  $>25\%$ ) was associated with significantly greater median survival (18.7 months versus 5.2 months). The presence of extrahepatic disease was associated negatively with overall survival (7.9 months versus 21 months). Overall survival from the date of initial hepatic metastases was 34.6 months. A subset analysis of patients who had an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of 0 demonstrated a median survival of 42.8 months and 23.5 months from the time of hepatic metastases and RMBD treatment, respectively. The data from this study also suggests that patients who have been exposed to fewer than 3 cytotoxic agents may have a better outcome than patients who have received all chemotherapy options prior to RMBD. Based on the subset analyses of this study, it appears patients with good performance status, no extrahepatic metastases, liver disease limited to  $\leq 25\%$  of liver volume, who have not received all available lines of chemotherapy may benefit most from treatment of RMBD.

Resin microspheres have also been evaluated in the treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer. Radioablation [28] was associated with mild to moderate toxicity, except for one grade 4 treatment-associated cholecystitis and 2 grade gastric ulcers, using resin microspheres administered as a single session, whole liver treatment in 41 patients with metastatic colorectal cancer refractory to chemotherapy.

### 2. RMBD with chemotherapy in liver metastases:

In a phase III trial [29], 46 patients with unresectable, chemotherapy-refractory liver-limited metastatic CRC were randomly assigned to fluorouracil protracted intravenous infusion 300 mg/m<sup>2</sup> days 1 through 14 every 3 weeks (Arm A) or to radioembolization plus intravenous FU 225 mg/m<sup>2</sup> days 1 through 14 and then 300 mg/m<sup>2</sup> days 1 through 14 every 3 weeks (Arm B) until hepatic progression. Crossover to radioembolization was permitted after progression in the chemotherapy alone arm. Median follow-up was 24.8 months. Median TTLP was 2.1 and 5.5 months in arms A and B, respectively ( $P= 0.003$ ). Grade 3 or 4 toxicities were recorded in 6 patients after FU monotherapy and in one patient after radioembolization plus FU treatment ( $P= 0.10$ ). Twenty-five of 44 patients received further treatment after progression, including 10 patients in arm A who received radioembolization. Median overall survival was 7.3 and 10.0 months in arms A and B,

respectively ( $P= 0.80$ ). The conclusion is that radioembolization with 90Y- resin microspheres plus FU is well tolerated and significantly improves TTLP and TTP compared with FU alone for chemotherapy-refractory liver-limited metastatic CRC.

In dose escalation studies reporting use of the resin microspheres in combination with oxaliplatin- [30] based chemotherapy, the maximum-tolerated dose of oxaliplatin was 60 mg/m<sup>2</sup> during the first 3 cycles of chemotherapy. In combination with irinotecan-based chemotherapy [31], the authors concluded that the maximum-tolerated dose of irinotecan was not reached. In both trials, radioembolization treatment was administered within a cycle of chemotherapy with the majority of patients experiencing mild to moderate transient toxicities.

### 3. Response evaluation:

PET appears to be an accurate indicator of treatment response [4]. Studies demonstrated a significant difference between the metabolic and the anatomic response after yttrium-90 glass microsphere treatment for unresectable liver metastases in colorectal cancer. FDG-PET imaging is more sensitive than CT in the assessment of early response to resin microspheres, allowing clinicians to proceed with further therapeutic options [3].

## C. Neuroendocrine Tumors

Neuroendocrine tumors (NETs), thought to be uncommon, represent the second highest in incidence of gastrointestinal malignancies. There is mounting evidence that NETs have been increasing in incidence and prevalence over last 3 decades. Gastroentero-pancreatic NETs that arise from cells throughout the gut and pancreas are subclassified based upon the production of hormone-related symptoms (functional versus nonfunctional). The 5-year survival of patients with metastatic disease is less than 40%. The prognosis at presentation for NET is ambiguous, but recent evidence suggests that, along with staging, immunohistochemical and pathological grading are important. Yttrium-90 radioembolotherapy has been demonstrated to retard disease progression in patients with NET liver metastases. Based on sound principles, yttrium-90 microsphere radioembolotherapy offers advantages of low acute and subacute toxicity, and standardized dosing allows interoperator comparison of outcomes. The table below summarizes the peer-reviewed outcomes in NET patients [32-41].

Author	Year	Total Patients	Embolotherapy	Study Design	Median Activity/ Treatment	CR + PR	Symptom Response%	Tumor Marker Response%	Median Survival (months)	5-year Survival (months)
Granberg	2007	3	Resin 90Y	Observation	1	100	nr	67	15	nr
King	2008	34	IV 5FU+90Y Resin	Phase 4	1.99	50	55	nr	nr	nr
Kennedy	2008	148	Resin 90Y	Observation	1.14	63.2	nr	nr	@36	nr
Rhee	2008	22	Glass 90Y	Observation	nr	54	nr	nr	70	nr
Rhee	2008	20	Resin 90Y	Observation	nr	50	nr	nr	22	nr
Kalinowski	2009	9	Resin 90Y	Phase 4	2.1	66	nr	nr	28	nr

Cao	2009	58	Resin 90Y +/- IV 5FU	Observation	1.8	37	nr	nr	@36	nr
Saxena	2010	48	IV 5FU+90Y Resin	Phase 2	1.94	54	nr	nr	36	nr
Memon	2011	40	Glass 90Y	Observation	1.98	64	84	nr	35	nr
Rajekar	2011	14	Resin 90Y +/- IA 5FU	Observation	nr	nr	100	71	34.4	nr
Paprottka	2012	42	Resin 90Y	Observation	1.63	22.5	95	54.8	25	42%

**APPENDIX B**

**Radiation Safety Discharge Instructions for Patients with Radioactive Yttrium-90 Spheres for Liver Brachytherapy**

Yttrium-90 microspheres are radioactive sources that, over time, become inactive. This means that for the next few days there will be a small amount of radioactivity near your liver. This does not represent a significant risk to others. However, to be on the safe side, these precautions and instructions should be followed:

1. Try not to be within 3 feet of others for the next 3 days, especially children (eg, anyone under 18 years old) or pregnant women.
2. If you have to go to a doctor or emergency room or need surgery within 3 days of this treatment, notify the medical staff that you have a small amount of radiation in your liver. Your physicians should give you any immediate and necessary medical or surgical treatments without concern for the radiation in the liver. They can call Radiation Medicine or Radiation Safety with any questions regarding the details of the treatment.
1. There is NO need to make special arrangements for body fluids (urine, stool, blood, or vomit).

If you have any questions concerning radiation safety, please call the following contacts:

During normal working hours: \_\_\_\_\_

Radiation Oncologist/Interventional Radiologist: \_\_\_\_\_

Radiation Safety Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

After hours: \_\_\_\_\_

I have read and understand the above radiation safety instructions and agree to abide by them.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Patient Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Radiation Safety Officer Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

\*Practice parameters and technical standards are published annually with an effective date of October 1 in the year in which amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council. For practice parameters and technical standards published

before 1999, the effective date was January 1 following the year in which the practice parameter or technical standard was amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council.

Development Chronology for this Practice Parameter

2008 (Resolution 2)

Amended 2009 (Resolution 11)

Revised 2014 (Resolution 17)