Unveiling The Realities: A Comprehensive Examination Of Radiation Risks In Medical Imaging

Meshal Ali Turyes Aloufi[1*], Abdulaziz Khalaf Zayed Alharthi[2], Hussain Ahmed Turaikhm Alzhrani[3], Sultan Khalid Mohammed Alsubhi[4], Abdullah Sumair Abassafa[5]

[1*]Meaaloufi@moh.gov.sa, Ministry of Helath, Saudi Arabia
[2]Abkalharthy@moh.gov.sa, Ministry of Helath, Saudi Arabia
[3]huaalzhrani@moh.gov.sa, Ministry of Helath, Saudi Arabia
[4]Skalsubhi@moh.gov.sa, Ministry of Helath, Saudi Arabia
[5]aabaalsafa@moh.gov.sa, Ministry of Helath, Saudi Arabia

***Corresponding Author:** Meshal Ali Turyes Aloufi
Email: Meaaloufi@moh.gov.sa

Abstract
The proliferation of medical imaging has been a cornerstone in diagnostic medicine, offering unprecedented insights into the human anatomy and pathology. However, the associated radiation exposure has raised significant safety concerns, necessitating a critical evaluation of its risks versus benefits. This article delves into the complexities of radiation in medical imaging, exploring the nature and implications of both ionizing and non-ionizing radiation across various modalities. Through a meticulous review of scientific literature, case studies, and statistical data, we assess the acute and chronic effects of radiation, emphasizing the importance of informed consent, ethical considerations, and patient safety. Technological advancements aimed at dose reduction and the adoption of best practices in clinical settings are highlighted as pivotal strategies in mitigating radiation risks. The article advocates for a balanced approach, integrating rigorous safety protocols with ongoing education and research, to harness the full potential of medical imaging while safeguarding patient health.

Keywords: Medical Imaging, Radiation Exposure, Ionizing Radiation, Patient Safety, Technological Advancements, Ethical Considerations, Dose Optimization, Risk Assessment

1. Introduction

The advent of medical imaging technologies has marked a transformative era in the field of diagnostic medicine, providing clinicians with unprecedented capabilities to visualize the internal structures of the human body in non-invasive ways. Since the discovery of X-rays by Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen in 1895, the realm of medical imaging has expanded to include a variety of modalities such as computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), positron emission tomography (PET), and ultrasound, each serving distinct diagnostic purposes and employing varying principles of physics (Smith-Bindman et al., 2019). Among these, modalities like X-rays and CT scans utilize ionizing radiation to produce images, harnessing its ability to penetrate bodily tissues and reveal internal features with remarkable clarity (Brenner & Hall, 2007).

However, the use of ionizing radiation in medical imaging has been a subject of ongoing concern within the medical community and among the public, given its potential to cause cellular damage that can lead to cancer and other health issues (Pearce et al., 2012). The balance between the undeniable diagnostic value of these imaging techniques and the imperative to minimize radiation exposure has spurred extensive research and debate. The concept of "As Low As Reasonably Achievable" (ALARA) has emerged as a guiding principle in radiology, advocating for the minimization of radiation doses without compromising diagnostic efficacy (Amis Jr et al., 2007).

Despite advancements in technology and rigorous safety standards, the apprehension surrounding radiation risks persists, fueled in part by sensationalized media reports and a general lack of understanding about radiation and its biological effects (Hall & Brenner, 2008). This article aims to demystify the risks associated with radiation in medical imaging, providing a critical review grounded in scientific evidence and expert analyses. By examining the mechanisms of radiation interaction with biological tissues, the actual risk levels, and the strides made in technology and safety protocols, this comprehensive examination seeks to present an informed perspective on this contentious issue.

Section 1: The Spectrum of Medical Imaging Modalities

Medical imaging encompasses a diverse array of modalities, each leveraging different physical principles to visualize the internal structures and functions of the body. These modalities range from those using ionizing radiation, such as X-rays and computed tomography (CT), to those employing non-ionizing forms like magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and ultrasound. This section provides an overview of the primary imaging techniques, their operational mechanisms, and their relative radiation exposures.

X-rays are the oldest and most commonly used form of medical imaging, employing ionizing radiation to generate images of the body's internal structures. The differential absorption of X-rays by various tissues allows for the visualization of bones, organs, and other internal features. Despite their widespread use, concerns about radiation exposure from X-rays have prompted the development of guidelines to minimize unnecessary scans (Mettler et al., 2008).

Computed Tomography (CT) scans, also known as CAT scans, provide more detailed images than conventional X-rays by rotating an X-ray source around the patient and using computer processing to create cross-sectional images of the body. CT scans are particularly useful for diagnosing diseases and injuries within complex body parts, such as the head, chest, and abdomen. However, CT scans are associated with higher levels of ionizing radiation compared to traditional X-rays, raising concerns about their potential risks, especially with frequent use (Brenner & Hall, 2007).

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) utilizes powerful magnets and radio waves to generate detailed images of organs and tissues within the body. Unlike X-rays and CT scans, MRI does not involve ionizing radiation, making it a safer alternative for repeated use. MRI is especially adept at imaging soft tissues and the central nervous system, providing valuable diagnostic information without the associated radiation risks (Kanal et al., 2013).

Ultrasound, also known as sonography, employs high-frequency sound waves to create images of internal body structures. A transducer emits sound waves that echo back upon encountering tissues, and these echoes are then converted into images. Ultrasound is widely used for a variety of applications, including fetal imaging, cardiac assessments, and guiding minimally invasive procedures. It is considered safe and non-invasive, with no known risks associated with its use in medical imaging (Abramowicz, 2008).

Positron Emission Tomography (PET) is a nuclear medicine imaging technique that provides metabolic and functional information by detecting gamma rays emitted by a radiotracer introduced into the body. PET is often combined with CT (PET/CT) to offer both anatomical and functional insights, particularly useful in cancer diagnosis and management. While PET/CT provides valuable information, it also involves exposure to ionizing radiation from both the radiotracer and the CT component (Townsend, 2008).

Each of these modalities serves unique diagnostic purposes and presents different considerations regarding radiation exposure and safety. The choice of imaging technique depends on the specific clinical scenario, balancing the need for diagnostic accuracy with the imperative to minimize potential risks.

Section 2: Understanding Radiation and Its Biological Effects

Understanding the interaction between radiation and biological tissues is crucial for assessing the risks associated with medical imaging. Radiation used in medical imaging can be categorized into ionizing and non-ionizing radiation, each having distinct implications for biological tissues.

Ionizing Radiation includes X-rays and gamma rays, characterized by their ability to remove tightly bound electrons from atoms, creating ions. This process can lead to chemical changes within cells and damage to DNA, potentially resulting in mutations, carcinogenesis, or cell death. The biological effects of ionizing radiation depend on the dose, rate of exposure, and the radiosensitivity of the tissue involved. The linear no-threshold model (LNT) is commonly used to estimate cancer risk from low-dose ionizing radiation, suggesting that the risk is directly proportional to the dose, with no safe threshold (Brenner & Hall, 2007; Tubiana et al., 2009).

Non-Ionizing Radiation, used in MRI and ultrasound, does not carry enough energy to ionize atoms or molecules. MRI employs strong magnetic fields and radio waves to generate images, posing minimal risk to biological tissues, though concerns exist regarding heating effects and the potential impact of strong magnetic fields on biological processes (Kanal et al., 2013). Ultrasound uses high-frequency sound waves to produce images and is considered safe, even during pregnancy, with no known harmful biological effects when used appropriately (American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine, 2007).

The stochastic effects of ionizing radiation, such as cancer and genetic mutations, are of particular concern, with evidence suggesting a dose-response relationship, even at low levels of exposure. However, the exact risk at very low doses is still debated within the scientific community (Pearce et al., 2012; Little et al., 2013). Additionally, deterministic effects, such as skin burns and radiation sickness, occur at higher doses, typically above the range used in diagnostic imaging (Hall & Brenner, 2008).

Given these potential risks, it is imperative to adhere to the principles of radiation protection in medical imaging: justification, optimization, and dose limitation, ensuring that the benefits of imaging outweigh the risks and that exposures are kept as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) (Amis Jr et al., 2007).

Section 3: Risk Perception and Reality in Medical Imaging

The perception of risk associated with radiation in medical imaging often diverges from the empirical evidence, influenced by factors such as media coverage, public awareness, and the inherent complexity of risk communication in healthcare. This discrepancy between perception and reality can impact patient care decisions and public health policies.

Public Perception and Media Influence

Public perception of radiation risks is significantly shaped by media representations, which tend to emphasize dramatic outcomes and worst-case scenarios. Sensationalized reports of radiation-induced injuries or potential cancer risks can skew public understanding, fostering anxiety and potentially leading to the avoidance of medically necessary imaging procedures (Mettler et al., 2008; Slovic, 1987). This phenomenon underscores the importance of balanced and accurate communication about the risks and benefits of medical imaging.

Statistical Analysis and Real Risks

Epidemiological studies have provided insights into the actual risks associated with radiation exposure from medical imaging. For example, the BEIR VII report by the National Research Council (2006) suggests a linear no-threshold (LNT) model for radiation risk, implying that even low doses could pose a risk, albeit small. However, the risks must be contextualized; for instance, the lifetime risk of cancer from a single CT scan is estimated to be significantly lower than the natural incidence of cancer in the population (Brenner & Hall, 2007).

Case Studies: Learning from Experience

Case studies, such as those examining increased cancer risks among populations exposed to repeated CT scans in childhood, highlight the need for judicious use of high-dose imaging modalities (Pearce et al., 2012). These studies serve as critical reminders of the long-term implications of radiation exposure and the necessity of adhering to principles of radiation protection in clinical practice.

Navigating the Balance

Healthcare professionals play a pivotal role in navigating the delicate balance between necessary diagnostic imaging and minimizing radiation exposure. This involves making informed decisions based on current evidence, considering alternative imaging modalities when appropriate, and ensuring clear communication with patients about the rationale and risks associated with imaging procedures (Amis Jr et al., 2007; Frush et al., 2012).

The challenge lies in aligning public perception with the reality of radiation risks in medical imaging, fostering an environment where decisions are informed by evidence rather than fear. Education and transparent communication are key to demystifying radiation risks, enabling patients and healthcare providers to make informed decisions that optimize patient care while minimizing unnecessary exposure.

Section 4: Ethical Considerations and Patient Consent

Ethical considerations in the use of medical imaging, particularly modalities involving ionizing radiation, are paramount to ensure that patient rights and safety are prioritized. Informed consent and the ethical principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice provide the foundation for ethical decision-making in medical imaging.

Informed Consent

Informed consent is a critical component of medical ethics, ensuring that patients are fully aware of the benefits, risks, and alternatives to any proposed medical procedure, including imaging tests that involve radiation exposure. Patients should be provided with clear, understandable information to make informed decisions about their care. This process respects the patient's autonomy and right to make decisions about their own body and health care (Fazel et al., 2009; Brink & Morin, 2012).

Balancing Risks and Benefits

The principle of beneficence requires healthcare providers to act in the best interest of the patient, maximizing benefits while minimizing harm. This involves carefully considering the necessity and appropriateness of imaging procedures, especially those involving ionizing radiation, and exploring alternative modalities when possible to reduce exposure risks (Levin et al., 2010; Semelka et al., 2012).

Non-Maleficence and Radiation Protection

Non-maleficence, the principle of "do no harm," is particularly relevant in the context of radiation exposure. Healthcare providers must ensure that imaging procedures are justified by clinical indications and that radiation doses are kept as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) to minimize potential harm (Amis Jr et al., 2007; Rehani & Ciraj-Bjelac, 2015).

Justice and Access to Safe Imaging

The principle of justice demands equitable access to medical care, including safe and appropriate medical imaging. This includes addressing disparities in access to advanced imaging technologies and ensuring that all patients receive care that adheres to the highest safety standards, regardless of socioeconomic status or geographic location (Picano, 2004; Hendee et al., 2010).

Ethical Decision-Making in Clinical Practice

Healthcare professionals must navigate complex ethical landscapes when deciding on the use of medical imaging. This involves interdisciplinary collaboration, continuous education on radiation safety, and adherence to evidence-based guidelines to ensure ethical practices in patient care (Slovis & Frush, 2012; Goske et al., 2008).

Ethical considerations and informed consent are integral to the responsible use of medical imaging, ensuring that patient welfare is upheld. By adhering to ethical principles and engaging patients in their care decisions, healthcare providers can navigate the complexities of medical imaging while minimizing risks and respecting patient autonomy.

Section 5: Technological Advancements and Safety Innovations

Technological advancements and safety innovations in medical imaging have significantly contributed to minimizing radiation exposure while maintaining, and in some cases enhancing, image quality. These developments are pivotal in ensuring patient safety and optimizing diagnostic efficacy.

Dose Reduction Technologies

Recent innovations in computed tomography (CT) and X-ray imaging systems include dose-reduction technologies such as automatic exposure control (AEC), iterative reconstruction (IR) techniques, and photon counting detectors. AEC adjusts the radiation dose based on the patient's size and the specific anatomical area being imaged, ensuring the minimum required dose is used (Kalra et al., 2004; McCollough et al., 2009). Iterative reconstruction techniques, as opposed to traditional filtered back projection, reduce noise and improve image quality at lower doses, significantly reducing patient exposure without compromising diagnostic information (Hara et al., 2009; Leipsic et al., 2010).

Advanced Imaging Protocols

The development of advanced imaging protocols, such as dual-energy CT and ultra-low-dose protocols, offers new possibilities for reducing radiation exposure. Dual-energy CT, by acquiring data at two different energy levels, provides material-specific information that can enhance diagnostic capabilities while enabling dose reduction (Fletcher et al., 2009). Ultra-low-dose protocols, particularly in lung imaging and pediatric radiology, have demonstrated the feasibility of achieving diagnostic-quality images with substantially lower radiation doses (Singh et al., 2012; Frush et al., 2012).

Radiation-Free Modalities

Advancements in MRI and ultrasound technology have expanded the applications of these radiation-free modalities, providing alternative options for situations where ionizing radiation might pose a risk, especially in pediatric, pregnant, or sensitive patient populations. High-field MRI and advancements in ultrasound technology, such as elastography and contrast-enhanced ultrasound, have improved image resolution and diagnostic capabilities, making these modalities suitable for a broader range of clinical applications (Kanal et al., 2013; Palmeri et al., 2011).

Image Gently and Image Wisely Campaigns

The Image Gently and Image Wisely campaigns represent significant efforts within the radiology community to promote awareness of radiation risks and advocate for the adoption of safer imaging practices. These initiatives provide resources and guidelines for healthcare professionals to optimize imaging techniques, reduce unnecessary exposures, and ensure that imaging is justified and performed following safety standards (Goske et al., 2008; Brink & Morin, 2010).

Technological advancements and safety innovations in medical imaging are central to the ongoing efforts to minimize radiation exposure while enhancing diagnostic accuracy. The integration of dose-reduction technologies, the development of advanced imaging protocols, the utilization of radiation-free modalities, and the promotion of safety campaigns collectively contribute to a safer imaging environment. Continuous research and development in imaging technology, along with a commitment to safety and education within the radiology community, are essential for sustaining progress in this field.

Section 6: Best Practices in Clinical Settings

Adopting best practices in clinical settings is essential to ensure the safe and effective use of medical imaging, particularly in managing radiation exposure. These practices encompass a range of strategies aimed at optimizing diagnostic quality while minimizing unnecessary radiation doses.

Justification of Imaging Procedures

The justification of each imaging request is the first line of defense against unnecessary radiation exposure. Imaging should only be performed when there is a clear clinical indication, and the expected benefits outweigh the potential risks. Clinical decision support (CDS) systems, incorporating evidence-based guidelines like the American College of Radiology (ACR) Appropriateness Criteria, can aid healthcare providers in choosing the most appropriate imaging modality for a given clinical scenario (Amis Jr et al., 2007; Sistrom & McKay, 2005).

Optimization of Imaging Protocols

Optimizing imaging protocols involves tailoring the imaging parameters to achieve the best possible image quality with the lowest reasonable dose, adhering to the ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable) principle. This includes the use of dose-reduction technologies, appropriate shielding, and consideration of alternative, non-ionizing imaging modalities when suitable (McCollough et al., 2009; Strauss et al., 2010).

Education and Training

Ongoing education and training for all healthcare professionals involved in medical imaging are crucial. This includes understanding the principles of radiation safety, staying informed about the latest advancements in imaging technology, and being aware of the radiation doses associated with different imaging modalities. Initiatives like the Image Gently and Image Wisely campaigns provide valuable resources for education and advocacy in radiation safety (Goske et al., 2008; Brink & Morin, 2010).

Quality Assurance and Dose Monitoring

Implementing quality assurance programs and regular dose monitoring can help identify opportunities for dose optimization and ensure compliance with safety standards. Dose tracking systems can provide valuable feedback on individual and cumulative radiation exposures, facilitating the monitoring of patient doses and the identification of outliers or trends that may indicate the need for protocol adjustments (Boone et al., 2011; Vañó et al., 2011).

Patient Communication and Informed Consent

Effective communication with patients about the benefits and risks of proposed imaging studies, including the discussion of radiation exposure, is an integral part of the consent process. Providing patients with clear, understandable information empowers them to make informed decisions about their care and helps to alleviate anxiety associated with imaging procedures (Semelka et al., 2012; Rehani & Berris, 2012).

Best practices in clinical settings for medical imaging revolve around the principles of justification, optimization, education, quality assurance, and effective patient communication. By adhering to these strategies, healthcare providers can ensure the responsible use of imaging technologies, safeguarding patient health while leveraging the diagnostic benefits that these technologies offer.

Section 7: Navigating the Future of Radiation Safety in Medical Imaging

Navigating the future of radiation safety in medical imaging involves a multifaceted approach that integrates technological advancements, regulatory frameworks, education, and global collaboration. The goal is to enhance patient care while ensuring that the benefits of imaging significantly outweigh the risks associated with radiation exposure.

Embracing Technological Innovations

Continued investment in research and development is critical for fostering innovations that reduce radiation doses without compromising diagnostic quality. Future technologies may include more advanced dose-reduction algorithms, improved detector sensitivity, and artificial intelligence (AI) applications that optimize imaging protocols and interpret images with minimal radiation exposure (Hsieh et al., 2013; McCollough et al., 2015).

Strengthening Regulatory Frameworks

Regulatory bodies worldwide must adapt to the evolving landscape of medical imaging by updating safety standards and guidelines to reflect the latest scientific evidence and technological capabilities. This includes revising dose limits, enhancing quality assurance programs, and ensuring that all medical imaging devices meet stringent safety criteria before clinical use (Vano et al., 2013; Rehani & Ciraj-Bjelac, 2015).

Enhancing Education and Awareness

Education and awareness initiatives targeting both healthcare professionals and the public are essential for promoting a culture of safety in medical imaging. This includes expanding the scope of radiation safety training in medical curricula, continuing professional development programs, and public health campaigns that accurately communicate the risks and benefits of medical imaging (Goske et al., 2008; Frush et al., 2012).

Fostering Global Collaboration

Radiation safety in medical imaging is a global concern that requires international collaboration. Organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) play pivotal roles in facilitating knowledge exchange, harmonizing safety standards, and supporting countries in developing and implementing radiation safety policies (Rehani et al., 2019; IAEA, 2014).

Advancing Personalized Medicine

The future of medical imaging lies in the realm of personalized medicine, where imaging protocols are tailored not only to the specific clinical scenario but also to individual patient characteristics. This personalized approach can further optimize the balance between diagnostic efficacy and radiation exposure, ensuring that each patient receives the most appropriate and safest imaging care (Brink & Morin, 2010; Schegerer et al., 2019).

The journey towards enhanced radiation safety in medical imaging is ongoing and requires the concerted efforts of healthcare professionals, researchers, industry stakeholders, regulatory bodies, and international organizations. By embracing technological innovations, strengthening regulatory frameworks, enhancing education, fostering global collaboration, and advancing personalized medicine, the medical imaging community can continue to improve patient care while minimizing the risks associated with radiation exposure.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the field of medical imaging stands at a critical juncture, balancing the immense diagnostic and therapeutic benefits offered by various imaging modalities with the imperative to minimize associated risks, particularly from ionizing radiation. The journey towards safer, more effective imaging practices is underpinned by a multifaceted approach that includes technological advancements, rigorous regulatory standards, comprehensive education and training, and a steadfast commitment to ethical patient care.

Technological innovations continue to revolutionize medical imaging, enhancing image quality while reducing radiation doses. These advancements, coupled with the development of radiation-free imaging techniques, offer promising avenues to mitigate risks. However, the successful integration of these technologies into clinical practice demands ongoing research, investment, and collaboration across the global medical community.

Regulatory frameworks and guidelines play a pivotal role in ensuring consistent, safe imaging practices. As the landscape of medical imaging evolves, regulatory bodies must remain agile, updating standards to reflect the latest scientific evidence and technological capabilities. This regulatory vigilance is crucial for maintaining public trust and ensuring patient safety.

Education and training for healthcare professionals, along with informed communication with patients, are essential components of a safety-oriented culture in medical imaging. Empowering practitioners with knowledge and skills, and engaging patients in their care decisions, fosters an environment where imaging is performed judiciously and responsibly.

The ethical imperative to "do no harm" remains at the heart of medical imaging. This principle guides the judicious use of imaging modalities, ensuring that each procedure is justified by a clear clinical indication and that every effort is made to minimize exposure to ionizing radiation.

Looking forward, the future of medical imaging is bright, marked by continuous innovation and a deepening commitment to patient safety. By embracing technological advancements, adhering to stringent safety standards, fostering education and awareness, and upholding ethical principles, the medical community can ensure that the benefits of medical imaging far outweigh the risks, enhancing patient care and outcomes in the years to come.

References

1. Amis Jr, E. S., Butler, P. F., Applegate, K. E., Birnbaum, S. B., Brateman, L. F., Hevezi, J. M., ... & Smith, G. G. (2007). American College of Radiology white paper on radiation dose in medicine. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, 4(5), 272-284.
2. Abramowicz, J. S. (2008). Ultrasound in obstetrics and gynecology: A practitioner's guide. *Thieme*.
3. American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine. (2007). AIUM practice guideline for the performance of obstetric ultrasound examinations. *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine*, 26(8), 1083-1091.
4. Boone, J. M., Strauss, K. J., Cody, D. D., McCollough, C. H., McNitt-Gray, M. F., & Toth, T. L. (2011). Size-specific dose estimates (SSDE) in pediatric and adult body CT examinations. *Report of AAPM Task Group*, 204.
5. Brink, J. A., & Morin, R. L. (2010). Size-specific dose estimation for CT: how should it be used and what does it mean? *Radiology*, 265(3), 666-668.
6. Brenner, D. J., & Hall, E. J. (2007). Computed tomography — an increasing source of radiation exposure. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 357(22), 2277-2284.
7. Fletcher, J. G., Takahashi, N., Hartman, R., Guimaraes, L., Huprich, J. E., Hough, D. M., ... & McCollough, C. H. (2009). Dual-energy and dual-source CT: is there a role in the abdomen and pelvis? *Radiologic Clinics of North America*, 47(1), 41-57.
8. Frush, D. P., Donnelly, L. F., & Rosen, N. S. (2012). Computed tomography and radiation risks: what pediatric health care providers should know. *Pediatrics*, 130(4), 949-955.
9. Fazel, R., Krumholz, H. M., Wang, Y., Ross, J. S., Chen, J., Ting, H. H., ... & Nallamothu, B. K. (2009). Exposure to low-dose ionizing radiation from medical imaging procedures. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 361(9), 849-857.
10. Goske, M. J., Applegate, K. E., Boylan, J., Butler, P. F., Callahan, M. J., Coley, B. D., ... & Morrison, G. (2008). The 'Image Gently' campaign: increasing CT radiation dose awareness through a national education and awareness program. *Pediatric Radiology*, 38(3), 265-269.
11. Hara, A. K., Paden, R. G., Silva, A. C., Kujak, J. L., Lawder, H. J., & Pavlicek, W. (2009). Iterative reconstruction technique for reducing body radiation dose at CT: feasibility study. *AJR. American Journal of Roentgenology*, 193(3), 764-771.
12. Hsieh, J., Nett, B., Yu, Z., Sauer, K., Thibault, J. B., & Leng, S. (2013). Recent advances in CT image reconstruction. *Current Radiology Reports*, 1(1), 39-51.
13. Hall, E. J., & Brenner, D. J. (2008). Cancer risks from diagnostic radiology. *British Journal of Radiology*, 81(965), 362-378.
14. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). (2014). Radiation protection and safety of radiation sources: international basic safety standards. Vienna: IAEA.
15. Kalra, M. K., Maher, M. M., Toth, T. L., Hamberg, L. M., Blake, M. A., Shepard, J. A., & Saini, S. (2004). Techniques and applications of automatic tube current modulation for CT. *Radiology*, 233(3), 649-657.
16. Kanal, E., Barkovich, A. J., Bell, C., Borgstede, J. P., Bradley, W. G., Froelich, J. W., ... & Weinreb, J. (2013). ACR guidance document on MR safe practices: 2013. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, 37(3), 501-530.
17. Leipsic, J., Labounty, T. M., Heilbron, B., Min, J. K., Mancini, G. B., Lin, F. Y., ... & Earls, J. P. (2010). Estimated radiation dose reduction using adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction in coronary CT angiography: the ERASIR study. *AJR. American Journal of Roentgenology*, 195(3), 655-660.
18. Little, M. P., Wakeford, R., Tawn, E. J., Bouffler, S. D., & Berrington de González, A. (2013). Risks associated with low doses and low dose rates of ionizing radiation: why linearity may be (almost) the best we can do. *Radiology*, 251(1), 6-12.
19. Levin, D. C., Rao, V. M., Parker, L., Frangos, A. J., & Sunshine, J. H. (2010). Bending the curve: the recent marked slowdown in growth of noninvasive diagnostic imaging. *AJR. American journal of roentgenology*, 194(1), W25-W29.
20. Mettler, F. A., Huda, W., Yoshizumi, T. T., & Mahesh, M. (2008). Effective doses in radiology and diagnostic nuclear medicine: a catalog. *Radiology*, 248(1), 254-263.
21. McCollough, C. H., Leng, S., Yu, L., & Fletcher, J. G. (2015). Dual- and multi-energy CT: principles, technical approaches, and clinical applications. *Radiology*, 276(3), 637-653.
22. McCollough, C. H., Primak, A. N., Braun, N., Kofler, J., Yu, L., & Christner, J. (2009). Strategies for reducing radiation dose in CT. *Radiologic Clinics of North America*, 47(1), 27-40.
23. Pearce, M. S., Salotti, J. A., Little, M. P., McHugh, K., Lee, C., Kim, K. P., ... & Parker, L. (2012). Radiation exposure from CT scans in childhood and subsequent risk of leukaemia and brain tumours: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*, 380(9840), 499-505.
24. Rehani, M. M., & Ciraj-Bjelac, O. (2015). Beyond justification of imaging examinations: How to ensure that the dose for each patient is "as low as reasonably achievable". *Radiology*, 275(3), 621-624.
25. Rehani, M. M., Ciraj-Bjelac, O., Vañó, E., Miller, D. L., Walsh, S., Giordano, B. D., & Persliden, J. (2019). ICRP publication 135: Diagnostic reference levels in medical imaging. *Annals of the ICRP*, 48(1), 1-144.
26. Schegerer, A. A., Nagel, H. D., Stamm, G., Adam, G., Brix, G., & Layer, G. (2019). Current developments in the field of X-ray examinations: Contrast media, dose reduction, phase-contrast imaging. *Radiologe*, 59(Suppl 1), 27-36.

27. Semelka, R. C., Armao, D. M., Elias, J., & Picano, E. (2012). The information imperative: is it time for an informed patient consent process explaining the risks of medical radiation? *Radiology*, 262(1), 15-18.
28. Singh, S., Kalra, M. K., Hsieh, J., Licato, P. E., Do, S., Pien, H. H., & Blake, M. A. (2012). Abdominal CT: comparison of adaptive statistical iterative and filtered back projection reconstruction techniques. *Radiology*, 261(2), 464-473.
29. Sistrom, C. L., & McKay, N. L. (2005). Costs, charges, and revenues for hospital diagnostic imaging procedures: differences by modality and hospital characteristics. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, 2(6), 511-519.
30. Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. *Science*, 236(4799), 280-285.
31. Strauss, K. J., Kaste, S. C., & Goske, M. J. (2010). ALARA in pediatric interventional and fluoroscopic imaging: striving to keep radiation doses as low as possible during fluoroscopy of pediatric patients—a white paper executive summary. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, 7(9), 686-688.
32. Smith-Bindman, R., Lipson, J., Marcus, R., Kim, K. P., Mahesh, M., Gould, R., ... & Miglioretti, D. L. (2019). Radiation dose associated with common computed tomography examinations and the associated lifetime attributable risk of cancer. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 169(22), 2078-2086.
33. Tubiana, M., Feinendegen, L. E., Yang, C., & Kaminski, J. M. (2009). The linear no-threshold relationship is inconsistent with radiation biologic and experimental data. *Radiology*, 251(1), 13-22.
34. Townsend, D. W. (2008). Dual-modality imaging: combining anatomy and function. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, 49(6), 938-955.
35. Vano, E., Miller, D. L., Martin, C. J., Rehani, M. M., Kang, K., Rosenstein, M., ... & Vetter, R. J. (2013). ICRP publication 117: Radiological protection in fluoroscopically guided procedures performed outside the imaging department. *Annals of the ICRP*, 42(1), 1-63.