Interobserver Variability in Target Definition for Stereotactic Arrhythmia Radioablation

Martijn H. van der Ree, MD¹, Phillip S. Cuculich, MD², Marcel van Herk, PhD³, Geoffrey D. Hugo, PhD⁴, Jippe C. Balt, MD, PhD⁵, Matthew Bates, MD⁶, Gordon Ho, MD⁷, Etienne Pruvot, MD⁸, Claudia Herrera-Siklody, MD⁸, Wiert F. Hoeksema, MD¹, Justin Lee, MD⁹, Michael S. Lloyd, MD¹⁰, Michiel Kemme, MD, PhD², Frederic Sacher, MD, PhD¹¹, Romain Tixier, MD¹¹, Brian V. Balgobind, MD, PhD¹², Clifford G. Robinson, MD⁴, Coen R.N. Rasch, MD, PhD¹³ and Pieter G. Postema, MD, PhD¹

- 1) Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Department of Cardiology, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, the Netherlands; Amsterdam Cardiovascular Sciences, Heart Failure and arrhythmias, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- 2) Department of Internal Medicine, Cardiovascular Division, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri, USA
- *3)* Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Centre, Manchester, UK
- 4) Department of Radiation Oncology, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri, USA
- 5) Department of Cardiology, St. Antonius Hospital, Nieuwegein, the Netherlands
- 6) Department of Cardiology, South Tees Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Middleborough, UK.
- 7) Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology Cardiac Electrophysiology, Cardiovascular Institute, University of California San Diego, San Diego, California, USA.
- 8) Heart and Vessel Department, Service of Cardiology, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- 9) Department of Immunity, Infection and Cardiovascular Disease, University of Sheffield Sheffield, UK.
- 10) Section of Cardiac Electrophysiology, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA
- 11) Cardiac arrhythmia department, IHU LIRYC, Bordeaux University Hospital, Bordeaux, France.
- 12) Department of Radiation Oncology, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- 13) Department of Radiation Oncology, LUMC, Leiden, the Netherlands

Words: 4725

References: 24

Figures and tables: 5

<u>Keywords:</u> cardiac radioablation, stereotactic arrhythmia radiotherapy, stereotactic arrhythmia radioablation, ventricular tachycardia, interobserver variability

Clinical Trial Registration Information: not applicable

1 ABSTRACT

2 Background:

- 3 Stereotactic arrhythmia radioablation (STAR) is emerging as a potential new therapy for patients
- 4 with refractory ventricular tachycardia (VT). The arrhythmogenic substrate (target) is synthesized
- 5 from clinical and electro-anatomical information. This study was designed to evaluate the baseline
- 6 interobserver variability in target delineation for STAR.

7 Methods:

- 8 Delineation software designed for research purposes was used. The study was split into three
- 9 phases. Firstly, electrophysiologists (observers) delineated a well-defined structure in three
- 10 patients (spinal canal). Secondly, observers delineated the arrhythmogenic cardiac VT target in
- 11 three patients previously treated with STAR based on case descriptions. To evaluate baseline
- 12 performance, a basic workflow approach was used, no advanced techniques were allowed (e.g.
- 13 image integration). Thirdly, observers delineated three predefined segments from the cardiac 17-
- 14 segment model. Interobserver variability was evaluated by assessing volumes, variation in distance
- 15 to the median volume as expressed by the root-mean-square of the observer standard deviation
- 16 (RMS SD) over the target volume, and the Dice coefficient.

17 Results

- 18 Ten electrophysiologists completed the study. For the first phase (spinal canal delineation),
- 19 interobserver variability was low as indicated by low variation in distance to the median volume
- 20 (RMS SD range: 0.02-0.02cm) and high Dice coefficients (mean: 0.97±0.01). In the second phase
- 21 (VT-target delineation), distance to the median volume was large (RMS SD range: 0.52-1.02cm) and
- the Dice coefficients low (mean: 0.40±0.15). In the third phase (segment delineation), similar
- 23 results were observed (RMS SD range: 0.51-1.55cm, Dice coefficient mean: 0.31±0.21)

24 Conclusions:

- 25 Interobserver variability is high for manual delineation of the VT-target and ventricular segments.
- 26 Difficulties in cardiac anatomical orientation on traditional radiation oncology CT scans appear to
- 27 be an important driver of variability. This evaluation of the baseline observer variation shows that
- 28 there is a need for methods and tools to improve variability and allows for future comparison of
- 29 interventions aiming to reduce observer variation.
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34

35 BACKGROUND

- Ventricular tachycardia (VT) is a life-threatening cardiac arrhythmia that is associated with
 increased risk of mortality and morbidity. Implantation of an implantable cardioverter defibrillator
 (ICD) reduces mortality, but ICD therapies are accompanied with their own adverse outcomes.^{1,2} In
- 39 a subset of patients, the current state of the art, namely medication and radiofrequency ablation,
- 40 fails. In these therapy-refractory patients, stereotactic arrhythmia radioablation (STAR, =cardiac
- 41 radioablation) has been suggested as a bail-out procedure.³ In STAR, the ventricular arrhythmogenic
- 42 substrate is treated by applying ionizing radiation. STAR is associated with a relatively durable
- 43 reduction in VT episodes and a mostly mild acute toxicity profile in patients in patients during the
- 44 first year.³⁻¹⁰ Longer term follow-up is currently accumulating.
- 45 With STAR, the arrhythmogenic substrate is first determined by aggregating clinical and electro-
- 46 anatomical information to delineate a target substrate, upon which a 4D-CT scan is acquired for
- 47 radiotherapy treatment planning purposes.¹¹ Variables include a 12-lead electrocardiograms during
- 48 VT if present, electroanatomical data from prior VT ablation(s), and cardiac imaging such as
- 49 echocardiography, cardiac computed tomography imaging (CT), cardiac magnetic resonance
- 50 imaging (CMR), and myocardial perfusion scintigraphy or F18-FDG positron emission tomography. In
- 51 contrast to traditional planning for malignant tumors, the pro-arrhythmic substrate is not directly
- 52 visualized on the radiotherapy planning 4D-CT scan, which complicates target definition and
- 53 delineation. Thus, delineation is based on subjective and collaborative synthesis of the aggregate of
- 54 many variables, which is naturally prone to large interobserver variability.^{12,13}
- The interobserver variability for target delineation in malignant tumors has been well quantified
 using established methods.¹⁴ Reducing observer variability allows for more standardized treatment,
 and, potentially, improved outcomes and reduced toxicity.¹⁵
- 58 To standardize and improve STAR treatment, the magnitude of interobserver variation in the
- 59 context of STAR should be explored. This study was designed as a baseline study to evaluate and
- 60 explore interobserver variation in target delineation for STAR. This baseline study will allow for
- 61 future benchmarking of interventions aimed at reducing interobserver variation.
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65
- 66

67 METHODS

68 Delineation and observers

69 Observers were required to have experience in the treatment of VT and of refractory VT using

70 STAR. The observer panel was composed from electrophysiologists from different hospitals in

- 71 Europe and the United States and observers were asked to perform contour delineation in three
- 72 study phases.

73 To evaluate and explore the baseline interobserver variation in STAR, this study was split into three 74 phases. Phase one consisted of delineation of a simple and well-defined anatomical structure: the 75 spinal canal. This phase was used to verify whether the observers were able to delineate a well-76 defined structure using the study delineation software. In phase two, observers were asked to 77 delineate the clinical target volume (CTV, VT-target without any additional uncertainty margins) 78 for cardiac radioablation in three previously treated patients (see below: "Patients and CT-scans") 79 based on case descriptions with clinical and electro-anatomical information (text and images) as is 80 common practice in STAR. Delineation instructions for the second phase included rules that are 81 outlined in Table 1. To serve as a baseline study, a basic workflow approach was used and no 82 advanced techniques such as resampling of the images in cardiology-preferred views and/or auto-83 segmentation of scans according to the AHA 17-segmented model or image integration were allowed.^{13,16,17} The third phase consisted of delineation of 3 predefined segments from the 17-84 segmented model (1 segment for each patient); basal-anterior (segment 1), mid inferoseptal 85 (segment 9) and apical lateral (segment 16).¹⁸ This phase allowed exploration of interobserver 86 variability in delineation of a predefined cardiac structure in conventional oriented scans (oriented 87 88 to the body axes as traditionally used in radiation oncology, instead of the cardiac axes as 89 traditionally used in cardiology). The delineation instructions and case descriptions are provided in 90 the supplementary material.

91 Patients and CT-scans

92 Phase 1 of the study included three patients who previously underwent an invasive catheter 93 ablation for VT in the Amsterdam UMC and had a CT scan of the (Patient A, B and C). To enhance 94 the visibility and delineation of the spinal canal, slices comprising of only one vertebra were 95 selected allowing the spinal canal to be completely surrounded by bony structure. For phase 2 and 96 3 of the study, three patients suffering from therapy-refractory VT from the Washington University 97 School of Medicine (St. Louis, Missouri, United States of America) previously treated with STAR 98 were selected by the treating cardiologist (Patient 1, 2 and 3). Prior to STAR treatment, these 99 patients underwent a 4D-CT scan for radiotherapy treatment planning purposes according to the 100 local protocol (free breathing, patient in supine position with arms raised above the head in a 101 forearm support, contrast enhancement when patient characteristics allowed and 1.5mm slice 102 thickness). To reduce delineation times, slices with odd instance numbers were removed for phase 103 2 and 3. Outcome in terms of VT burden and safety were not part of this study. The institutional 104 ethical review boards approved the study and patients gave written informed consent.

105 Delineation tools

Specific delineation software, previously described in detail and specifically designed for research purposes, was used.¹⁴ This software includes delineation tools that are included in most commercial radiotherapy planning systems, but also enables detailed analyses of the delineation process. In the software, axial slices, and coronal and sagittal reconstruction of the CT scans were available for delineation. Per study phase, the observers received personal passwords to delineate and edit

- 111 contours within the software. Only after completion of a phase, the observers received a new
- 112 password for the subsequent phase. Observers were only able to view their own delineations.

113 Contour analysis

- 114 Interobserver variability was evaluated by performing contour analysis. For every case in the three
- 115 phases of the study, the delineated volumes were calculated per observer. The median surface of
- 116 the delineated contours was computed in 3D, representing the 50% coverage of the contours
- 117 (meaning that every voxel inside this median surface is delineated by \geq 50% of the observers).¹⁹ The
- 118 variation in perpendicular distance from this median volume to each observer's individual contour
- 119 was calculated. Distances larger than 20mm were set to 20mm. Then for each median volume point
- 120 the standard deviation (SD) was calculated (and visualized) and the overall observer SD was
- 121 expressed by the root-mean-square of the values in all points. The generalized Dice coefficient was
- 122 calculated, which is a measure for overlap in volumes (Figure 1.).²⁰ The Dice coefficient is
- 123 expressed from 0-1 with 0 indicating no overlap in volumes, whilst a value of 1 indicates complete
- 124 overlap. The Dice coefficient was calculated for all combinations of observers and then averaged.
- 125 Data are presented as mean±standard deviation unless otherwise indicated.

126 **RESULTS**

- 127 Ten observers from seven tertiary care hospitals completed the study. Table 2 shows the results for128 the three phases of the study. From figure 2, delineations from representative cases for each study
- phase can be appreciated. In figure 3 the standard deviation is projected on the median surface of the delineations for representative cases in each phase of the study.
- 131 Phase 1: Spinal canal
- 132 Low interobserver variation was found for the first phase of the study, the delineation of the spinal
- 133 canal. This is indicated by low variation in the volumes (table 2), low variation in distance to the
- 134 median volume (RMS SD range 0.02-0.02cm), and very high Dice coefficients (mean: 0.97±0.01)
- 135 (table 2, figure 2A and 3A).
- 136 Phase 2: VT-target

137 Patient characteristics

- 138 Patient characteristics of the 3 test cases for phase 2 included patients of age 54-70 years, all non-
- 139 ischemic cardiomyopathy and left ventricular ejection fraction between 20-32%. Treatment
- 140 included anti-arrhythmic drugs consisting of both amiodarone and mexiletine and previous catheter
- 141 ablations (n≥4 per patient). For targeting, 12-lead VT ECGs, noninvasive electrocardiographic

- 142 imaging (VT-exit site), echocardiography, CMR and nuclear imaging were available in all patients. In
- 143 two (67%) patients, no recent electroanatomical maps from invasive catheter ablations were
- available and in one (33%) patient the diagnostic cardiac CT-scan was not available.

145 *Results*

- 146 Delineation of the VT-target based on case descriptions without advanced techniques resulted in
- 147 high interobserver variability (table 2, figure 2B and 3B). The mean target volume ranged from 23-
- 148 35 cm³ and widely differed per observer (range: 9.9-61.4 cm³, table 2), as did the variation in
- 149 distance to the median volume (RMS SD range: 0.5-1.02cm, table 2). The mean Dice coefficient for
- all three patients was 0.40±0.15 with a range of 0.32-0.47 indicating low volume overlap.

151 Phase 3: Segments

- 152 For phase 3, delineations of segments from the 17-segmented model showed equally high
- 153 interobserver variation (table 2, figure 2C & 3C) as indicated by differences in delineated volumes
- 154 between observers (table 2), large variation in distance to the median volume (RMS SD range: 0.51-
- 155 1.55cm) and Dice coefficients below 0.5 (mean: 0.31±0.21)

156 DISCUSSION

- 157 In this baseline study, the interobserver variation in target volume delineation for STAR was
- 158 explored. Firstly, we observed that cardiologist-electrophysiologists can delineate a well-defined
- 159 anatomical structure with low interobserver variability in software specifically designed for this
- 160 purpose. Secondly, for delineation of the VT-target using a basic workflow approach, interobserver
- 161 variability was high. Lastly, interobserver variability was also high in delineation of predefined
- 162 segments from the 17-segmented heart model.¹⁸
- 163 Our findings are congruent with previous studies evaluating interobserver variation in delineation of
- 164 the VT-target for STAR treatment.^{12,13} In these studies the VT-target delineations were compared to
- 165 consensus delineations¹² or based on a head-head comparison of two observers.¹³ This study adds to
- 166 the prior data in its demonstration of interobserver variation in the context of STAR treatment
- 167 among an experienced and intercontinental (Europe and America) group of observers basing our
- 168 results on median volumes and comparisons for each combination of observers. Noteworthy, when
- 169 comparing the different studies, it is important to acknowledge that this study was designed as a
- baseline study allowing to evaluate interventions to reduce observer variation in the future.
- 171 An important aspect of this analysis is our use of a control arm in phase 1, which shows the
- 172 generally good agreement among our observer cohort for identifying basic radiologic borders. It
- 173 supports the conclusion that variation in subsequent phases cannot be explained by difficulties in
- the delineation process itself, but are due to other sources of uncertainty, e.g. including
- 175 challenging cardiac anatomic orientation in conventional radiation oncology CT scans oriented to
- 176 the long-axis of the body (instead of following cardiac axes).
- 177 The high interobserver variation for VT-target delineation we observed in phase 2, does not
- 178 necessarily mean there is no consensus on the pro-arrhythmic regions In general, delineations did

179 show overlap (figure 2B). As can be appreciated from figure 3B, there appears to be consensus on 180 the core of the pro-arrhythmic substrate. Importantly, during conventional ablation 181 electrophysiologists interact with the substrate, and the effect of applying ablative energy can be 182 directly observed. This allows for a better understanding of the pathophysiology and the 183 localization of the VT-substrate underlying the ventricular arrhythmias and probably reduces 184 variability due to direct feedback. It is important to acknowledge that in this study, observers did 185 not have an interaction with the substrate and their delineations were merely based on text and 186 images presented in the case descriptions. Although this is a limitation, such a workflow is also part 187 of STAR treatment, because delineation is always separately performed and does not include direct 188 feedback. Moreover, when patients referred for STAR treatment recently underwent a (high-risk) 189 procedure in another hospital or are not able to undergo a (repeat) invasive catheter ablation due 190 to limiting patient characteristics (e.g. insufficient access), an off-line aggregation of the electro-191 anatomical data (preferably together with the principal operator of the last VT-ablation) will be 192 performed. The fact that Dice coefficients in phase 3 (predefined segments) was similar as in phase 193 2 (VT-target) could indicate that the interpretation of electroanatomical information is not the 194 main driver of the interobserver variation. Instead, difficulties in cardiac anatomical orientation on 195 traditional radiation oncology CT-scans appears to be an important driver of variability (i.e. no 196 contrast enhancement and orientations to the long-axis of the body). This is supported by the fact 197 that in patient 1, in which the CT-scan was not contrast enhanced due to the patient's renal 198 insufficiency, the variability was particularly high in both phase 2 and 3.

Indeed, in the third phase of the study, as mentioned above, we also found high interobserver variability.¹⁸ This is likely explained by the fact that these segments are defined based on a cardiac orientation and not on the conventional orientation with planes perpendicular to the long-axis of the body as used in radiotherapy planning systems. While the 17-segmented model as structured approach interpretation and delineation of the VT-target has previously been proposed,¹⁶ we here show that manual delineation in scans not angulated to the cardiac orientation leads to undesirable results.

206 Potential interventions to reduce interobserver variation

Now that the baseline interobserver variation in the context of STAR is determined, future research
 should focus on methods to reduce this variability. Several methods and techniques are already
 used in clinics worldwide. ^{13,16,17,21} Currently, the best strategy to reduce interobserver variation
 and improve efficacy and safety needs to be decipher.

211 *Reorientation and segmentation*

- 212 Firstly, cardiologist-electrophysiologists are used to the cardiac orientation in imaging. We
- 213 therefore believe that re-orienting and re-sampling the images could ease delineation and reduce
- 214 interobserver variation. As previously mentioned, the 17-segmented model could be used to
- 215 enhance orientation in cardiac anatomy.¹⁶ Based on our results and previous work, re-orientation

and segmentation should be performed in a (semi-)automated manner as this has been shown to be reproducible.¹⁷

218 Delineation teams

219 Currently, STAR treatment is only used in patients with refractory VT. As a result, eligible patients

- 220 are highly complex. Peer review of targets has demonstrated to increase contour agreement in
- 221 radiation oncology.²² Potentially, by discussing and delineating cases with cardiologist-
- electrophysiologists (or in multi-disciplinary teams) a reduction in interobserver variability could be achieved as well.
- 223 achieved as well.

224 Image integration

225 VT-target delineation is based on results of several electroanatomical modalities. Integrating all the

- 226 different modalities into radiotherapy planning systems could result in lower interobserver
- 227 variability. However, matching imaging data with electro-anatomical maps from previously
- 228 performed catheter ablation will introduce new uncertainties and matching errors. This
- 229 notwithstanding, efforts are being undertaken to develop robust methods for image
- 230 integration.^{21,23,24}

231 Clinical implications

- High interobserver variation in STAR treatment is undesirable as this leads to differences in
- 233 treatments between centers. It is unknown whether the variation observed results in differences in
- treatment plans or clinical outcomes, although this would be conceivable. The interobserver
- variation may seem clinically very high. However, when interpreting these results, it is important
- 236 to consider that also for the current state-of-the-art treatments, e.g. VT ablation, differences
- 237 between operators and hospitals exist (for example, due to experience of the operator, diagnostic
- 238 work-up and different ablation techniques and strategies).^{1,2} These differences, however, have not
- been quantified. In contrast, in radiation oncology there is a long history of great interest in
- 240 interobserver variability in target delineation that has led to international harmonization and
- 241 standardization. Therefore, we believe our results are not discouraging, but should rather be seen
- as a starting point to improve and standardize STAR treatment to improve efficacy and safety.
- 243 Given the large observer variation one may wonder why the clinical outcomes of STAR are so good
- 244 and it is possible that this is due the nature of the disease: contrary to a tumor it may be that STAR
- 245 is effective if part of the substrate is irradiated.

246 CONCLUSION

- 247 The interobserver variation in the context of STAR treatment was high for delineation of the VT-
- 248 target using a basic workflow approach. Difficulties in cardiac anatomical orientation on traditional
- radiation oncology CT scans appear to be an important driver of variability. To standardize STAR
- 250 treatment, future studies should focus on interventions aiming to reduce this variability. The
- 251 results of this baseline evaluation will allow for future comparisons of such interventions.

252 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

253 None.

254 SOURCES OF FUNDING

- 255 Dutch Heart Foundation grant 03-003-2021-T061 to Dr. Postema. This project has been supported
- 256 by the Foundation "De Drie Lichten" in The Netherlands.

257 DISCLOSURES

- 258 Washington University receives research support from Varian Medical Systems, Siemens
- 259 Healthineers, Mevion, and ViewRay. GDH: Consulting for Varian Medical Systems. GH: Equity in
- 260 Vektor Medical Inc and consulting for Abbott and Kestra. JL: Consulting for Varian Medical Systems.
- 261 CGR: Consulting for Varian Medical Systems.
- 262
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- 268
- 269
- 270
- 271
- 272

273

- ___
- 274
- 275
- 276

277

279 **REFERENCES**

- Al-Khatib SM, Stevenson WG, Ackerman MJ, Bryant WJ, Callans DJ, Curtis AB, Deal BJ,
 Dickfeld T, Field ME, Fonarow GC, et al. 2017 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for Management of
 Patients With Ventricular Arrhythmias and the Prevention of Sudden Cardiac Death: A
 Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on
 Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *Circulation*. 2018;138:e272 e391. doi: 10.1161/cir.00000000000549
- Zeppenfeld K, Tfelt-Hansen J, de Riva M, Winkel BG, Behr ER, Blom NA, Charron P, Corrado
 D, Dagres N, de Chillou C, et al. 2022 ESC Guidelines for the management of patients with
 ventricular arrhythmias and the prevention of sudden cardiac death. *Eur Heart J.* 2022. doi:
 10.1093/eurheartj/ehac262
- van der Ree MH, Blanck O, Limpens J, Lee CH, Balgobind BV, Dieleman EMT, Wilde AAM, Zei
 PC, de Groot JR, Slotman BJ, et al. Cardiac radioablation—A systematic review. *Heart Rhythm.* 2020;17:1381-1392. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2020.03.013
- Carbucicchio C, Andreini D, Piperno G, Catto V, Conte E, Cattani F, Bonomi A, Rondi E,
 Piccolo C, Vigorito S, et al. Stereotactic radioablation for the treatment of ventricular
 tachycardia: preliminary data and insights from the STRA-MI-VT phase Ib/II study. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. 2021;62:427-439. doi: 10.1007/s10840-021-01060-5
- Gianni C, Rivera D, Burkhardt JD, Pollard B, Gardner E, Maguire P, Zei PC, Natale A, Al Ahmad A. Stereotactic arrhythmia radioablation for refractory scar-related ventricular
 tachycardia. *Heart Rhythm.* 2020;17:1241-1248. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2020.02.036
- Ho G, Atwood TF, Bruggeman AR, Moore KL, McVeigh E, Villongco CT, Han FT, Hsu JC,
 Hoffmayer KS, Raissi F, et al. Computational ECG mapping and respiratory gating to
 optimize stereotactic ablative radiotherapy workflow for refractory ventricular
 tachycardia. *Heart Rhythm O2*. 2021;2:511-520. doi: 10.1016/j.hroo.2021.09.001
- Lee J, Bates M, Shepherd E, Riley S, Henshaw M, Metherall P, Daniel J, Blower A, Scoones
 D, Wilkinson M, et al. Cardiac stereotactic ablative radiotherapy for control of refractory
 ventricular tachycardia: initial UK multicentre experience. *Open Heart*. 2021;8. doi:
 10.1136/openhrt-2021-001770
- Lloyd MS, Wight J, Schneider F, Hoskins M, Attia T, Escott C, Lerakis S, Higgins KA. Clinical
 experience of stereotactic body radiation for refractory ventricular tachycardia in advanced
 heart failure patients. *Heart Rhythm.* 2020;17:415-422. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2019.09.028
- Neuwirth R, Cvek J, Knybel L, Jiravsky O, Molenda L, Kodaj M, Fiala M, Peichl P, Feltl D,
 Januška J, et al. Stereotactic radiosurgery for ablation of ventricular tachycardia. *Europace*

| 313 | | : European pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac electrophysiology : journal of the working |
|-----|-----|--|
| 314 | | groups on cardiac pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac cellular electrophysiology of the |
| 315 | | European Society of Cardiology. 2019;21:1088-1095. doi: 10.1093/europace/euz133 |
| 316 | 10. | van der Ree MH, Dieleman EMT, Visser J, Adam JA, de Bruin-Bon RHA, de Jong RMAJ, |
| 317 | | Hoeksema WF, Mosterd A, Balt JC, Planken RN, et al. Direct Clinical Effects of Cardiac |
| 318 | | Radioablation in the Treatment of a Patient With Therapy-Refractory Ventricular |
| 319 | | Tachycardia Storm. Advances in Radiation Oncology. 2022;7. doi: |
| 320 | | 10.1016/j.adro.2022.100992 |
| 321 | 11. | Cuculich PS, Schill MR, Kashani R, Mutic S, Lang A, Cooper D, Faddis M, Gleva M, Noheria A, |
| 322 | | Smith TW, et al. Noninvasive Cardiac Radiation for Ablation of Ventricular Tachycardia. The |
| 323 | | New England Journal of Medicine. 2017;377:2325-2336. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1613773 |
| 324 | 12. | Boda-Heggemann J, Blanck O, Mehrhof F, Ernst F, Buergy D, Fleckenstein J, Tülümen E, |
| 325 | | Krug D, Siebert F-A, Zaman A, et al. Interdisciplinary Clinical Target Volume Generation for |
| 326 | | Cardiac Radioablation: Multicenter Benchmarking for the RAdiosurgery for VENtricular |
| 327 | | TAchycardia (RAVENTA) Trial. International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biology*Physics. |
| 328 | | 2021;110:745-756. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2021.01.028 |
| 329 | 13. | Abdel-Kafi S, Sramko M, Omara S, de Riva M, Cvek J, Peichl P, Kautzner J, Zeppenfeld K. |
| 330 | | Accuracy of electroanatomical mapping-guided cardiac radiotherapy for ventricular |
| 331 | | tachycardia: pitfalls and solutions. Europace. 2021;23:1989-1997. doi: |
| 332 | | 10.1093/europace/euab195 |
| 333 | 14. | Steenbakkers RJ, Duppen JC, Fitton I, Deurloo KE, Zijp L, Uitterhoeve AL, Rodrigus PT, |
| 334 | | Kramer GW, Bussink J, De Jaeger K, et al. Observer variation in target volume delineation |
| 335 | | of lung cancer related to radiation oncologist-computer interaction: a 'Big Brother' |
| 336 | | evaluation. Radiother Oncol. 2005;77:182-190. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2005.09.017 |
| 337 | 15. | Vinod SK, Min M, Jameson MG, Holloway LC. A review of interventions to reduce inter- |
| 338 | | observer variability in volume delineation in radiation oncology. J Med Imaging Radiat |
| 339 | | Oncol. 2016;60:393-406. doi: 10.1111/1754-9485.12462 |
| 340 | 16. | Brownstein J, Afzal M, Okabe T, Harfi TT, Tong MS, Thomas E, Hugo G, Cuculich P, Robinson |
| 341 | | C, Williams TM. Method and Atlas to Enable Targeting for Cardiac Radioablation Employing |
| 342 | | the American Heart Association Segmented Model. International Journal of Radiation |
| 343 | | Oncology Biology Physics. 2021;111:178-185. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2021.03.051 |
| 344 | 17. | van der Ree MH, Visser J, Planken RN, Dieleman EMT, Boekholdt SM, Balgobind BV, Postema |
| 345 | | PG. Standardizing the Cardiac Radioablation Targeting Workflow: Enabling Semi-Automated |

| 346 347 | | Angulation and Segmentation of the Heart According to the American Heart Association Segmented Model. <i>Adv Radiat Oncol.</i> 2022;7:100928. doi: 10.1016/j.adro.2022.100928 |
|------------|-----|---|
| 348 | 18. | Cerqueira MD, Weissman NJ, Dilsizian V, Jacobs AK, Kaul S, Laskey WK, Pennell DJ, |
| 349 | | Rumberger JA, Ryan T, Verani MS. Standardized Myocardial Segmentation and |
| 350 | | Nomenclature for Tomographic Imaging of the Heart. Circulation. 2002;105:539-542. doi: |
| 351 | | 10.1161/hc0402.102975 |
| 352 | 19. | Deurloo KE, Steenbakkers RJ, Zijp LJ, de Bois JA, Nowak PJ, Rasch CR, van Herk M. |
| 353 | | Quantification of shape variation of prostate and seminal vesicles during external beam |
| 354 | | radiotherapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2005;61:228-238. doi: |
| 355 | | 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2004.09.023 |
| 356 | 20. | Dice LR. Measures of the Amount of Ecologic Association Between Species. Ecology. |
| 357 | | 1945;26:297-302. doi: 10.2307/1932409 |
| 358 | 21. | Hohmann S, Henkenberens C, Zormpas C, Christiansen H, Bauersachs J, Duncker D, |
| 359 | | Veltmann C. A novel open-source software-based high-precision workflow for target |
| 360 | | definition in cardiac radioablation. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 2020;31:2689-2695. doi: |
| 361 | | 10.1111/jce.14660 |
| 362 | 22. | Mercieca S, Pan S, Belderbos J, Salem A, Tenant S, Aznar MC, Woolf D, Radhakrishna G, van |
| 363 | | Herk M. Impact of Peer Review in Reducing Uncertainty in the Definition of the Lung Target |
| 364 | | Volume Among Trainee Oncologists. Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol). 2020;32:363-372. doi: |
| 365 | | 10.1016/j.clon.2020.01.026 |
| 366 | 23. | Brett CL, Cook JA, Aboud AA, Karim R, Shinohara ET, Stevenson WG. Novel Workflow for |
| 367 | | Conversion of Catheter-Based Electroanatomic Mapping to DICOM Imaging for Noninvasive |
| 368 | | Radioablation of Ventricular Tachycardia. Pract Radiat Oncol. 2021;11:84-88. doi: |
| 369 | | 10.1016/j.prro.2020.04.006 |
| 370 | 24. | Qian PC, Quadros K, Aguilar M, Wei C, Boeck M, Bredfeldt J, Cochet H, Blankstein R, Mak R, |
| 371 | | Sauer WH, et al. Substrate Modification Using Stereotactic Radioablation to Treat |
| 372 | | Refractory Ventricular Tachycardia in Patients With Ischemic Cardiomyopathy. JACC Clin |
| 373 | | Electrophysiol. 2022;8:49-58. doi: 10.1016/j.jacep.2021.06.016 |
| 374 | | |
| 375 | | |
| 376 | | |
| 377 | | |
| 570 | | |

379 TABLES

Table 1. Rules for delineation of the clinical target volume in study phase 2.

| Rule | | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Choose scar or border zone, not healthy tissue | | | | |
| 2 | Choose only scar or border zone near VT exit sites, not necessarily the entire scar | | | | |
| 3 | Choose a single larger area, not multiple small areas | | | | |
| 4 | Goldilocks principle: | | | | |
| | Delineate too small, and you might miss the VT circuit | | | | |
| | • Delineate too large, and there is (likely) higher risk for normal tissue injury | | | | |

380

Table 2 - Results of the three study phases

| Phase 1: Spinal canal | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Median structure | Mean volume | Range in | RMS SD | Dice coefficent | | | | |
| | volume* (cm ³) | (cm ³) | volume (cm ³) | (cm) | | | | | |
| Patient A | 1.78 | 1.56±0.03 | 1.52 - 1.62; 0.1 | 0.02 | 0.97±0.01 | | | | |
| Patient B | 2.97 | 2.58±0.06 | 2.47 - 2.67; 0.2 | 0.02 | 0.98±0.01 | | | | |
| Patient C | 2.08 | 1.79±0.04 | 1.7 - 1.82; 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.97±0.01 | | | | |
| Phase 2: VT-target | | | | | | | | | |
| | Median structure | Mean Volume | Range in | RMS SD | Dice coefficent | | | | |
| | Volume* (cm ³) | (cm ³) | volume (cm ³) | (cm) | | | | | |
| Patient 1 | 25.8 | 34.6±17.4 | 9.9 - 61.4 | 1.02 | 0.32±0.17 | | | | |
| Patient 2 | 23.2 | 28.2±11.9 | 11.1 - 56.0 | 0.53 | 0.47±0.11 | | | | |
| Patient 3 | 16.9 | 22.7±7.8 | 10.8 - 36.7 | 0.52 | 0.41±0.11 | | | | |
| Phase 3: Segments | | | | | | | | | |
| | Median structure | Mean Volume | Range in | RMS SD | Dice | | | | |
| | Volume *(cm ³) | (cm ³) | volume (cm ³) | (cm) | coefficient | | | | |
| Patient 1 | 6.3 | 13.5±9.5 | 6.4 - 35.2 | 1.55 | 0.21±0.19 | | | | |
| Patient 2 | 11.1 | 12.8±4.1 | 5.4 - 17.3 | 0.51 | 0.46±0.14 | | | | |
| Patient 3 | 5.4 | 9.4±4.7 | 3.2 - 19.9 | 0.55 | 0.25±0.20 | | | | |
| *The median structure volume represents the 50% coverage of the delineations, meaning that each | | | | | | | | | |
| voxel inside the median structure is delineated by at least 50% of the observers. | | | | | | | | | |
| RMS SD: root-mean-square of the standard deviation | | | | | | | | | |

381

383 FIGURES



384

385 Figure 1. Illustration of the calculation of the Dice coefficient for two volumes A and C, B

386 indicating the overlap. The Dice coefficient is calculated by dividing two times the volume of

387 overlap (B) by the individual volumes (A+C) (formula: *Dice coefficient* = $\frac{(2B)}{(A+C)}$).

388



391 Figure 2: delineations in representative cases by the different observers (A) Phase 1: Spinal canal,

- 392 patient A (B) Phase 2: VT-target, patient2 (C) Phase 3: Segments, patient 3 (segment 16: apical-
- 393 lateral). Each color indicates a different observer.



394

Figure 3: The local standard deviation projected on the median structure of the delineations, from dark blue: SD<0.1 cm to red SD>1.5 cm. (A) Results for phase 1, delineation of the spinal canal, projected on the axial plane for patient A. Note that the standard deviation is below <0.1cm for the entire spinal canal. (B) Results for phase 2 of patient 2, delineation of the VT-target, projected on the frontal and sagittal planes. (C) Results for phase 3 of patient 3, delineation of the apicallateral segment, projected on the frontal and sagittal plane. LA: left atrium, LAO: left anterior oblique view, LV: left ventricle, RV: right ventricle and SAX: cardiac short-axis view.