

3. Fernandez-Ulloa M, Lukes SJ, Williams CC, et al. Radiokinetics of I-131 and In-111 labeled monoclonal antibodies and their F(ab')₂ fragments administered interstitially in rabbits [Abstract]. *Radiology* 1986; 39: p 161.
4. Goldberg BB, Pollack HM. Ultrasonic aspiration transducer. *Radiology* 1972; 102:187-189.

Eric W. Neils
Mariano Fernandez-Ulloa
University of Cincinnati Medical
Center
E.L. Saenger Radioisotope
Laboratory
Cincinnati, Ohio

True Measurement of the Angle in a Slant Hole Collimator

TO THE EDITOR: I read with interest the article by Kaplan et al. (1) on the three-dimensional localization of internal mammary lymph nodes by radionuclide scintigraphy in which the depth of the lymph nodes was calculated from a reference point using a slant hole collimator technique described by Siddon et al. (2). However, the authors did not mention if they verified the angle of their slant hole collimator. When we set up a similar protocol at our institution, we found that the angle of our "30°" slant hole collimator was in fact 26.4°. This was found fairly easily by fixing two point sources at a known depth "A" from each other and then taking two images with the slant hole collimator rotated 180° between images. These images are acquired on computer and then added together. The distance between the two images of each source are measured on computer and translated to true distances using a known conversion factor of mm/pixel. These values are given as D₂ and D₁ for the two point sources. Tan θ can then be calculated from the formula:

$$\tan \theta = \frac{D_2 - D_1}{A \times 2}$$

Tan θ can be verified by making similar measurements at varying heights of the collimator above the point sources. In our case, if we had not made this correction, a 14% error would have resulted. Translating this into distances, a calculated depth of 3 cm from the reference point based on the erroneous use of 30° is in fact 3.49 cm—almost a half-cm error.

A second question, concerns the number of nodes visualized using the slant hole collimator technique versus the anterior image. Rose et al. (3) found an average of eight lymph nodes per patient visualized on the anterior projection versus an average of 4.3 lymph nodes per patient visualized on both the anterior and lateral projections thus making it impossible to calculate the depth for all lymph nodes using orthogonal projections. In our limited experience, we found a similar problem with the slant hole collimator. The authors did not comment on this in their article although the data appears to be available.

References

1. Kaplan WD, Anderson JW, Siddon RL, et al. The three-dimensional localization of internal mammary lymph

nodes by radionuclide lymphoscintigraphy. *J Nucl Med* 1988; 29:473-478.

2. Siddon RL, Chin LM, Zimmerman RE, et al. Utilization of parasternal lymphoscintigraphy in radiation therapy of breast carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1982; 8:1059-1063.
3. Rose CM, Kaplan WD, Marck A, et al. Parasternal lymphoscintigraphy: implications for the treatment planning of internal mammary lymph nodes in breast cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1979; 5:1849-1853.

H. Daniel Fawcett
University of Texas Medical Branch
Galveston, Texas

REPLY: Dr. Fawcett has drawn attention to one potential source of error in the determination of lymph node location when using slant hole collimators (1). In fact, there are several sources of error which could effect the final determination. These include errors from the collimator, gamma camera position gains, display system gains, and the digitizing tablet when using Poloroid film as input for data points.

In our 1982 paper (2), we evaluated the errors in the total determination process and found that we could localize a node utilizing this lymphoscintigraphic technique to within 3 mm, disregarding the effect of patient motion. At the time, this degree of precision and accuracy was sufficient for clinical use and we felt that knowing the exact error due solely to the collimator was not necessary; we were interested in the overall performance of the process.

Prompted by Dr. Fawcett's letter, we repeated our previous localization experiments and found that the error in depth measurement was again 1.2 ± 1.8 mm. Determination of the collimator angle using an analysis similar to that proposed by Dr. Fawcett yielded $29^\circ \pm 1^\circ$. As demonstrated in our 1982 paper (2), the error in the collimator angle is less than the error introduced by other uncertainties in the analysis.

With respect to the question of nodal visualization using slant hole vs. parallel hole collimation, in the paper by Rose et al. (3) we used a parallel hole collimator. Indeed, the increased collimator-to-target distance and the soft-tissue attenuation encountered on the lateral view, resulted in suboptimal visualization of the subxyphoid and supraclavicular nodes. This is not the case with the slant hole collimator however.

The mean of 4.6 nodes per patient included for analysis in our current study (1) was based upon prospectively localizing only those nodes which were to be included in the opposing tangential radiation beams. Nodes above and below these levels were routinely visualized (on occasion requiring two additional views) but were intentionally excluded from three-dimensional analysis.

References

1. Kaplan WD, Anderson JW, Siddon RL, et al. The three-dimensional localization of internal mammary lymph nodes by radionuclide lymphoscintigraphy. *J Nucl Med* 1988; 29:473-478.
2. Siddon RL, Chin LM, Zimmerman RE, et al. Utilization of parasternal lymphoscintigraphy in radiation therapy of breast carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1982; 8:1059-1063.
3. Rose CM, Kaplan WD, Marck A, et al. Parasternal lym-