

Kotre, John (2022) Radiation protection: from martyrs to ‘zero dose’: changes to protection and zero dose techniques such as robotics, optical image guidance. In: British Institute of Radiology (BIR) Annual Congress 2022, 22-23 September 2022, Royal College of Physicians, London, UK. (Unpublished)

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/6746/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria’s institutional repository ‘Insight’ must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria’s institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
 - a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator’s reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.



From martyrs to 'zero dose': Changes to protection, and zero dose techniques such as robotics and optical image guidance

John Kotre

Visiting Research Fellow

University of Cumbria




Declarations of Interest

I have no financial connection to any products featured in this presentation

I'd take the money but nobody offered

You'll see why



Thomas Dodd
Joined Forth Banks
Infirmary in 1899

Radiographer for 20
years

Suffered severe
radiation injuries and
lost 3 fingers


Died from cancer in
1929

Name inscribed on
Radiation Martyrs
Memorial





*Image courtesy
of Mersea
Museum*



Ernest Harnack joined London Hospital, Whitechapel in 1896 as first radiographer

By 1910 listed as 'Pensioner London Hospital X-ray Operator'


Lost both hands due to radiation injuries

Died 1942 after traffic accident

Commemorated on the Radiation Martyrs Memorial

Image courtesy of Mersea Museum


Entrance surface air kerma AP pelvic radiograph



Kemerink
et al 2019



Radiologist annual effective dose



*Data from Linet et al
2010 plus PHE and
Kotre*



So is this As Low As Reasonably Practicable?

ALARP legally defined by costs not being 'disproportionate' to benefits (Edwards v. NCB, 1949)

Cost of human life lost to cancer estimated at 3.5M (HSE)

Assume fractional probability of a death has fractional cost

Suggested disproportion factor 2 for low public risks, 3 for workers, 10 for high risks (HSE submission to Sizewell B enquiry)

Risk factor for fatal cancer 5% per Sievert (ICRP 103)



ICRP 103

(87) It is therefore the recommendation of the Commission that the approximated overall fatal risk coefficient of 5% per Sv on which current international radiation safety standards are based continues to be appropriate for the purposes of radiological protection.

(219) Optimisation of protection is not minimisation of dose. Optimised protection is the result of an evaluation which carefully balances the detriment and the resources available for the protection of individuals. Thus the best option is not necessarily the one with the lowest dose.



A Test for ALARP

$$A \approx 175 R N T D$$

A is the limit at which the proposed expenditure is no longer ALARP (£)

R is the proposed annual dose reduction to the individual (mSv/yr)

N is the number of individuals to which the dose reduction will apply

T is the time over which the proposed intervention will apply (yr)

D is the disproportion factor 2, 3, 10 depending on risk



Example

The Health Protection Agency 2010 review of radiation exposure to the UK population gives an average figure of 0.11 mSv/yr occupational exposure for radiologists and 0.12 mSv/yr for cardiologists. Taking the higher figure of 0.12 mSv/yr and supposing that 10 individual radiologists/cardiologists would be using the purchased equipment over a period of 5 years, then the upper limit to ALARP expenditure using a disproportion factor of 3 in the expression above is £3150 over the 5 year period, or £630 per year. This would not purchase much in the way of protective equipment. Shows doses are already well controlled.




Image courtesy of Biotronik Inc.



Image courtesy of Egg Medical Inc.



Image courtesy of Corindus Inc.



FORS - Fibre Optic Real-Shape

Image courtesy of Philips N.V



Conclusions

Radiation protection for radiology staff has come a long way in 120 years and doses are well controlled by standard procedures

Significant investment aimed solely at further reducing staff doses could be argued not to be within the ALARP principle

The most valuable technical developments would seem be those aimed at reductions in patient radiation doses which in turn offer the possibility of reduced staff doses



References

Kotre C J, 2022. ALARP: when does reasonably practicable become rather pricey? *Brit. J. Radiol* 2022 10.1259/bjr.20220612. (Open Access)

Kotre C J and Little B G, 2006. Patient and staff radiation doses from early radiological examinations (1899-1902). *Brit. J. Radiol.*, 79, 837-842.

Kemerink G et al 2019. The skin dose of pelvis radiographs since 1896. *Insights into Imaging* <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13244-019-0710-1>

Linet M S et al. 2010. Historical review of occupational exposures and cancer risks in medical radiation workers. *Rad. Res.* 174;6 793-808.