

The role of analytics in improving the efficiency of cancer treatment facilities

Louis-Martin Rousseau




Healthcare systems

One person is diagnosed with cancer every 3 minutes in Canada, 20 seconds in USA.

One person dies from cancer every 7 minutes in Canada, 1 minute in USA.

First cause of mortality in Canada (30%):
45% of Canadian will develop cancer
5 year survivability 66%

Ever increasing of new cancer cases:
12% within 4 years
Aging of population;
Demographic growth.




How to treat all these patients while keeping excellent care ?

What are your treatment options ?

Local

Locally advanced


Metastatic




About 50% of cancer patients will receive radiotherapy

Tools

Internal




External




Teams

	Chemotherapy	Radiotherapy
Prescribes	Oncologist	Radiation Oncologist
Prepares	Pharmacist	Physicist
Delivers	Nurse	Therapist

Care Trajectory



Care Trajectory in details



Important steps


Simulation:

- Uses: CT, MRI, PET-CT
- Used for treatment planning purposes
- 3D model of the human body




Treatment Planning

- Calculates radiation deposition in the human body
- Multi-criteria optimization solver
- Server farm, GPU calculations, etc.



Plan approval



Linear accelerator

- mm accuracy
- 100x more powerful than a radiology X-ray



(Q1) when to book a patient ?

Patient arrives




how much time ?



Patient is treated



Considering existing calendar...



Mac Tardieu - 21/08/2008

... and patient priorities

Palliative	Curative 1	Curative 2
< 3 days	< 14 days	< 28 days

Different possible approaches


Stochastic Optimization

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & g(x) = c^T x + E[Q(x, \xi)] \\ \text{subject to} & Ax = b \\ & x \geq 0 \end{array}$$



$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} & q(\xi)^T y \\ \text{subject to} & T(\xi)x + W(\xi)y = h(\xi) \\ & y \geq 0 \end{array}$$

Markov Decision Process



Online Optimization



Online Stochastic Combinatorial Opt.




For each new request:


- Build a set of scenarios;
- Compute a solution for each scenario
- Heuristically, choose a response for the request based on all solutions.

OSCO in context RT cancer patient booking

- Online stochastic combinatorial optimization:
 1. For each solution, we compute :
 1. A utilization cost (by day and by linac) for a time slot;
 2. We choose the appointment of minimum cost:
 1. Waiting time cost (depending of the priority) ;
 2. Expected utilization cost.
 - Booking model -> Dantzig-Wolfe decomposition;
 - Uncertainties -> Benders decomposition.



Structure of the model



Treatment planning fix to 7 days ... for now

Stochastic Programming Model

$$\min \sum_{i \in S_j} c_{ij} x_{ij} + \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega_j} [\sum_{l \in \mathcal{P}^\omega} \sum_{i \in S_l} c_{il} y_{il}^\omega + \sum_{k \in H} \sum_{m \in M} c^o z_{mk}^\omega]$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{i \in S_j} x_{ij} = 1$$

$$\sum_{i \in S_l} y_{il}^\omega = 1, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_j, \forall l \in \mathcal{P}^\omega$$

Approximated utilization cost of
a given initial treatment time slot
= dual variable of this constraint

$$\sum_{i \in S_j} a_{ijk}^m x_{ij} + \sum_{l \in \mathcal{P}^\omega} \sum_{i \in S_l} a_{ilk}^m y_{il}^\omega \leq F_k^m + z_{mk}^\omega, \quad \forall m \in M, \forall k \in H, \forall \omega \in \Omega_j$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{P}_p}(j) \sum_{i \in S_j} a_{ijk}^m x_{ij} + \sum_{l \in \mathcal{P}_p^\omega} \sum_{i \in S_l} a_{ilk}^m y_{il}^\omega \geq z_{mk}^\omega, \quad \forall m \in M, \forall k \in H, \forall \omega \in \Omega_j$$

$$\sum_{k=b}^{b+4} z_{mk}^\omega \leq O_{week}, \quad \forall m \in M, \forall b \in \mathcal{B}, \forall \omega \in \Omega_j$$

$$z_{mk}^\omega \in [0, O_{day}], \quad \forall m \in M, \forall k \in H, \forall \omega \in \Omega_j$$

$$x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i \in S_j$$

$$y_{il}^\omega \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall l \in \mathcal{P}^\omega, \forall i \in S_l, \forall \omega \in \Omega_j$$

Choose greedily the pattern
With best reduced cost

Pattern 1

Pattern 0

Initial Results


	Due date violations			Average waiting time			Utilization	Overtime
	>3	>14	>28	Palliative	Curative 1	Curative 2		
CICL	14	16	0	2,07	14,38	12,98	88,3%	44
OSCO - 1	9	6	0	1,05	10,57	15,98	88,0%	6

CICL real data:

- 170 patients ;
- 120 days;
- 2 linacs with 23 slots.

Legrain A, MA Fortin, Lahrichi N, Rousseau L-M (2015) "Online Stochastic Optimization of Radiotherapy Patient Scheduling", *Healthcare Management Science*, 18, 110-123.

(Q2) How much for treatment preparation ?




Appointment booking

Unknown dosimetry duration

Preparation completed


Preparation Tasks



Best feasible appointment


Online stochastic optimization:

1. For each solution, we compute :
 1. A utilization cost (by day and by linac) for a slot;
 2. A minimum day to start the treatment.
 1. with fast Genetic Algorithm
 2. with exact Constraint Programming Model



2. We choose the appointment of minimum cost:
 1. Waiting time cost (depending of the priority) ;
 2. Expected utilization cost.

Global Approach



New Results

	Cancellations	Due date (in days)			Average waiting time			Overtime
		>3	>14	>28	>3	>14	>28	
CICL	230	373	104	0	3,45	12,58	12,63	111
OSCO 1	107	335	67	0	1,05	10,57	15,98	19
OSCO 2	1	326	119	0	3,23	14,04	18,43	8

CICL real data:

- 1529 patients ;
- 248 days;
- 4 linacs with 29 slots.




A. Legrain, N. Lahrichi, LM. Rousseau and M. Widmer, Combining Benders and Dantzig-Wolfe decompositions for online stochastic combinatorial optimization, *submitted to IJoC*.

(Q3) Booking a LINAC for how long ?

- At the moment all patients are booked for 20 minutes on the LINACS (so schedules look nice).
- How long do each treatment really lasts ?
- Data driven approach (thanks to RFID)


	A	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1	Dossier	Site prescrit	Activité	Lieu RV	Statut RV	Date RV	Heure RV	Heure d'arrivée du patient	Heure de vérification de la mise en place du patient en salle	Heure prise d'image CT	Heure traitée 1er champ	Heure de complétion RV	Lieu traité	Lieu traité diffère du lieu RV ?
2 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 DC		18/03/2013	12:50:00	12:09:04	12:41:41	12:45:46	12:47:01	12:49:36		RO Salle 5	
3 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		19/03/2013	12:50:00	12:20:44	12:55:49	12:59:16	13:00:34	13:03:16		RO Salle 5	
4 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		20/03/2013	12:50:00	11:59:18	12:09:15	12:12:26	12:15:00	12:16:04		RO Salle 5	
5 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		21/03/2013	12:50:00	11:47:14	12:24:38	00:00:00	12:34:26	12:35:04		RO Salle 5	
6 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		22/03/2013	12:50:00	12:00:48	12:43:52	12:53:39	12:56:23	12:59:10		RO Salle 5	
7 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		25/03/2013	12:50:00	12:02:30	12:44:32	12:48:25	12:51:07	12:51:43		RO Salle 5	
8 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		26/03/2013	12:50:00	12:11:21	12:41:25	12:48:57	12:51:35	12:52:06		RO Salle 5	
9 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		27/03/2013	12:50:00	12:11:31	12:42:03	12:44:47	12:47:21	12:48:02		RO Salle 5	
10 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		28/03/2013	12:50:00	12:14:28	12:26:36	12:30:12	12:32:50	12:33:46		RO Salle 5	
11 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		02/04/2013	12:50:00	11:51:22	12:11:20	12:15:44	12:18:21	12:18:49		RO Salle 5	
12 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		03/04/2013	12:50:00	12:03:39	12:32:08	12:35:51	12:38:30	12:39:10		RO Salle 5	
13 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		04/04/2013	12:50:00	11:55:03	12:39:21	12:43:22	12:45:58	12:46:37		RO Salle 5	
14 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		05/04/2013	12:50:00	11:46:52	12:34:13	12:38:26	12:41:00	12:41:28		RO Salle 5	
15 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		08/04/2013	12:50:00	11:56:38	12:23:03	12:30:19	12:32:57	12:33:31		RO Salle 5	
16 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		09/04/2013	12:50:00	11:50:47	12:55:46	12:59:07	13:01:47	13:02:26		RO Salle 5	
17 1	P1SEIN D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		10/04/2013	12:50:00	11:51:47	12:57:33	13:01:45	13:04:20	13:05:09		RO Salle 5	
18 1	P2SEIN D (SURDO)	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C, PS		11/04/2013	12:50:00	11:56:17	13:26:35	00:00:00	13:28:09	13:28:34		RO Salle 5	
19 1	P2SEIN D (SURDO)	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 C		12/04/2013	12:50:00	11:50:54	13:14:27	00:00:00	13:20:41	13:20:50		RO Salle 5	
20 1	P2SEIN D (SURDO)	TROEXTC	RO Salle 6 C		15/04/2013	16:30:00	16:11:49	16:27:44	00:00:00	16:35:35	16:35:43		RO Salle 6	
21 1	P2SEIN D (SURDO)	TROEXTC	RO Salle 5 FC		16/04/2013	12:50:00	11:47:14	12:45:48	00:00:00	12:51:16	12:51:25		RO Salle 5	
22 2	P1SUS-CLAV D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 2 DC		27/08/2013	11:50:00	11:35:24	12:04:21	12:10:14	12:11:43	12:21:43		RO Salle 2	
23 2	P1SUS-CLAV D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 2 C		28/08/2013	11:50:00	11:37:32	11:55:13	11:59:46	12:01:24	12:09:39		RO Salle 2	
24 2	P1SUS-CLAV D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 2 C		29/08/2013	11:50:00	11:02:11	12:12:19	12:17:50	12:18:50	12:25:47		RO Salle 2	
25 2	P1SUS-CLAV D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 2 C		30/08/2013	11:50:00	11:37:44	11:52:23	11:56:12	11:57:39	12:05:07		RO Salle 2	
26 2	P1SUS-CLAV D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 2 C		03/09/2013	11:50:00	11:38:06	12:07:06	12:11:21	12:12:24	12:20:12		RO Salle 2	
27 2	P1SUS-CLAV D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 2 C		04/09/2013	11:50:00	11:38:38	12:24:41	12:28:32	12:29:50	12:37:20		RO Salle 2	
28 2	P1SUS-CLAV D	TROEXTC	RO Salle 2 C		05/09/2013	11:50:00	11:36:04	12:13:07	12:17:05	12:18:10	12:26:06		RO Salle 2	

Duration profile



Looking at cancer type


Going beyond the average...



Looking at cancer type

Going beyond the average...

Durée prise en charge en min



More precise treatment slots

- Can we build a calendar with different time slots for different cancer type ?
- Does cancer type really explains duration ?
- How to manage variance and uncertainty ?
- Can this be done without increasing the patient wait time (actual is 7 minutes) ?
- Data seems to indicate huge potential gain
- Solutions will to be tested through simulation

Still an ongoing project...

(Q4) Can treatment be delivered faster ?


- More details on [VMAT](#)



- The VMAT treatment planning problem consists in:
 - Selecting a delivery sequence of collimator shapes
 - Determining the optimal dose rate and rotation speed.
- Our Objective
 - Maximize plan quality
 - Minimize treatment time
 - Fast computation time on “cheap” hardware


Column Generation Approach

- Highly combinatorial problem:
 - In a small case with a (5×10) beam and 100 sectors, there are 7.1×10^{251} apertures shapes.
- Column generation (CG) is a leading optimization technique successful solving large-scale problems
 - Exploits decomposable structures
 - Handles large number of variables



Column Generation Approach

- 360° around the patient is covered by arcs,
- Each arc consists of fixed sectors determining:
 - the aperture shape for including sectors
 - gantry speed
 - dose rate



Master Model: arc and intensity selection

Objective function

- quadratic voxel-based penalty function + delivery time

Constraints

1. calculating the dose deviation from described thresholds
2. Each sector should be covered at most by one arc
3. Restricting the change of dose rate between adjacent sectors
4. Restricting the dose rate to the max R
5. The gantry speed at each sector should be enough for leaf motions of the assigned arc
6. Restricting the change of sector time between adjacent sectors
7. Restricting the sector time to lower and upper bounds
8. Restricting the maximum total treatment time.

Master Model: arc and intensity selection

$$\mathbf{GP} : \min \quad \boxed{\mathbf{F}(z) + w T_{max}} \quad \text{Weighted quality and time objective}$$

$$z_j = \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{h \in H_k} D_{jh}(\mathcal{A}_h^k) \mathcal{y}^k \rho_h t_h \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{V}$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} \mathcal{a}_h^k \mathcal{y}^k \leq 1 \quad \forall h \in H$$

$$| \rho_{h+1} - \rho_h | \leq \Delta_\rho \quad \forall h = 1, 2, \dots, |H| - 1$$

$$0 \leq \rho_h \leq R \quad \forall h \in H$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} \tau_{h,h+1}^k \mathcal{y}^k \leq t_h \quad \forall h \in H$$

$$| t_{h+1} - t_h | \leq \Delta_t \quad \forall h = 1, 2, \dots, |H| - 1$$

$$\underline{T} \leq t_h \leq \bar{T} \quad \forall h \in H$$


$$\sum_{h \in H} t_h \leq T_{max}$$

$$\mathcal{y}^k \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall k \in K$$

Subproblem: building new arcs

The situation of each row in each sector is indicated as a node (h, l, r) ;

- e.g. node $(90, 0, 4)_5$ is the position of leaves of row 5 in sector 90:



Constraints include:



1. Maximum leaf motion constraint is considered.
 2. Conflicting trailing and leading leaves are avoided, i.e. $t + 1 \leq r$
 3. Cost of nodes and arcs based on the Master Model (dual values)
-
- Polynomial shortest path algorithm easily obtain the best solution.

Reducing problem size


Random down-sampling is a usual approach (Kufer et al. 2003)

We rather propose a method:


- Inspired by K-Means algorithm, the well-known data mining technique
- The goal: Similar neighbor voxels would be considered in a cluster.
- Value of voxel given by full open radiation of all beamlets.
- Each voxel represented by a vector in space R^n ($n = \text{number of beamlets}$).



Step 1



Step 2



Step 3

Reducing problem size

- Normal voxels are reduced to 5% and tumor voxels to 10%.
- The progress of solution quality from random sampling to the first iteration was about 78%.
- The progress from the first iteration to the fifth iteration has been only 9%


Voxel aggregation computational results.

Iter	# Transfer	Iter	Time (Sec.)	Avg.Dist
0				54.27054
1	19265		0.952947	11.57258
2	2160		0.74742	10.51782
3	301		0.733188	10.44499
4	40		0.729702	10.44053
5	13		0.738105	10.43969


Experimental evaluation

Case Characteristics		Algorithm Parameters	
Total # beamlets	25,404	Max dose rate	600 MU/min
Beamlet size (mm)	1×1	Max leaf speed	3 cm/sec
Voxel resolution (mm)	3, 3, 3	Max fluence change	2 MU/s
# Target voxels	9491	Max time change	2 s
# Body voxels	690,373	Gantry speed	[1 6] $^{\circ}$ /sec


- CORT dataset (Craft et al, 2014)
- 180 equispaced sectors
- Algorithm is implemented in C++/CPLEX



Effect of aggregation



Effect of delivery time



Conclusion

- Efficiency is key in fighting cancer given the continuously increasing
 - number of patients
 - cost of new technology
- Predictive (ML and stat) and Prescriptive (OR) Analytics can help to fully utilise those infrastructure

FOLLOW US @ HANALOG.CA

Warm Thanks to

Radio-oncologists and Physicists

MA Fortin - M Hinsse - B Carroza - D Roberge - S Bedaoui - D Craft – T Long

Students

M Taobane - A Legrain - M Mahnam - P Descroix - V Cohen - F Camiat

Colleagues

N Lahichi - P Baptiste - M Gendreau

Past and Present Partners

