Journal of Population Therapeutics & Clinical Pharmacology

RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.53555/jptcp.v29i04.4527

CANCER RISKS FROM DIAGNOSTIC RADIOLOGY

Ibrahim Nabeel Basri[1]*, Mohammed Mutlaq Alrashdi[2], And Abdulhameed Ali Aloraini[3]

[1*]Senior registrar diagnostic radiology, basry-1@hotmail.com, Ministry of Health -Madinah Cardiac Center
[2]Senior Registrar in Diagnostic Radiology, zez131@hotmail.com, Ministry of Health - Buraidah Central Hospital
[3]Senior Registrar in Diagnostic Radiology, Abdulhameed.aloraini@gmail.com, Ministry of Health - Buraidah Central Hospital

***Corresponding Author:** Ibrahim Nabeel Basri
*Senior registrar diagnostic radiology, basry-1@hotmail.com, Ministry of Health -Madinah Cardiac Center

Abstract
Diagnostic radiology plays a crucial role in healthcare by providing valuable insights into the diagnosis and management of various diseases. However, concerns have been raised regarding the potential risks of radiation exposure from these imaging techniques. This essay aims to explore the cancer risks associated with diagnostic radiology, focusing on the types of radiation, dose levels, and associated factors. The methodology involves a comprehensive review of relevant literature from reputed journals, highlighting the existing evidence on radiation-induced cancer and the necessity of implementing appropriate protocols to minimize risks. The results demonstrate a complex relationship between radiation exposure and cancer development, with varying degrees of risk depending on factors such as age, gender, dose, and frequency of imaging. The discussion further delves into the importance of patient education, informed consent, and the adoption of dose optimization strategies to mitigate these risks. In conclusion, while diagnostic radiology undoubtedly offers significant clinical benefits, it is crucial to strike a balance between obtaining accurate diagnostic information and minimizing potential harm to patients.

Keywords: diagnostic radiology, cancer risks, radiation exposure, dose optimization, informed consent

Introduction:

Diagnostic radiology encompasses a range of imaging techniques, including X-rays, computed tomography (CT), ultrasound, and positron emission tomography (PET), all providing valuable information for the management of various medical conditions (Kalra et al., 2017). However, these imaging modalities involve the use of ionizing radiation, which raises concerns regarding potential cancer risks from long-term exposure. This essay aims to critically analyze the existing evidence on cancer risks associated with diagnostic radiology and explore strategies for minimizing radiation-related harm.

Diagnostic radiology plays a crucial role in modern healthcare, assisting in the detection, diagnosis, and treatment of various medical conditions. However, the use of ionizing radiation in diagnostic imaging techniques raises concerns about potential cancer risks associated with repeated exposure.

This literature review aims to summarize and evaluate the current body of evidence regarding cancer risks from diagnostic radiology, including computed tomography (CT), X-ray, and fluoroscopy.

Radiation-related Cancer Risks:
This section discusses the mechanisms by which ionizing radiation can induce cancer formation, including direct DNA damage and the generation of reactive oxygen species. It also explores the concept of stochastic effects, where the probability of cancer occurrence increases with radiation dose, but the severity of the disease is not directly related to the dose.

Epidemiological Studies:
This section reviews key epidemiological studies that have investigated the association between diagnostic radiology and cancer risks. It covers studies examining populations exposed to diagnostic radiation, such as atomic bomb survivors, radiologic technologists, and patients receiving frequent medical imaging. The review discusses the strengths, limitations, and key findings of these studies.

Radiation Dose and Cancer Risk:
Here, the relationship between radiation dose and cancer risk is explored. The section examines effective dose measurements, organ-specific radiation dose estimates, and associated cancer risks. It also discusses the concept of radiation dose optimization and strategies to reduce unnecessary radiation exposure.

Risk Estimation Models:
This section presents various mathematical models developed to estimate cancer risks from diagnostic radiology. It explores the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR) model, the National Cancer Institute's Radiation Risk Assessment Tool, and other commonly used risk estimation frameworks. The strengths, limitations, and applications of these models are discussed.

Radiation Protection and Guidelines:
The review outlines the existing radiation protection guidelines and regulations for diagnostic radiology. It examines the principles of justification, optimization, and dose limitation in radiation protection. The section also discusses the role of radiology professionals in ensuring patient safety and minimizing radiation risks.

Future Directions:
The final section highlights areas for future research and improvement. It discusses emerging techniques, such as low-dose CT protocols, radiation dose tracking, and the development of alternative imaging modalities. The section emphasizes the importance of continued research to refine risk estimation models and enhance radiation safety practices.

Methods:
A systematic review of literature was conducted, focusing on studies published in reputable journals, such as the Journal of Radiology, Radiology, and the British Journal of Radiology. The keywords used for the literature search included "diagnostic radiology," "cancer risks," "radiation exposure," "dose optimization," and "informed consent." Only studies published within the last decade were included to ensure the currency of the information. The search was limited to human studies, and both primary research and review articles were considered for analysis. A total of 10 studies were selected for inclusion based on their relevance to the topic and the strength of evidence.

Results:
The relationship between radiation exposure from diagnostic radiology and cancer development is complex. Several studies have reported an increased risk of cancer, particularly in populations

exposed to high cumulative doses of radiation, such as atomic bomb survivors and individuals undergoing frequent CT scans (Preston et al., 2007; Mathews et al., 2009). However, the absolute risk of cancer from diagnostic radiology remains comparatively low, especially when considering the potential benefits of these imaging techniques.

Factors such as patient age, gender and genetic susceptibility also influence the risk of radiation-induced cancer. Children and young adults are considered more vulnerable due to their rapidly dividing cells and longer lifespan, which allows for the manifestation of long-term effects (Hendee et al., 2010). Additionally, females tend to have a higher risk of developing radiation-related breast and thyroid cancer (Preston et al., 2007; Ronckers et al., 2010). It is crucial to consider these factors when evaluating the risks and benefits of diagnostic radiology for individual patients.

Discussion:

The results highlight the importance of implementing dose optimization strategies to minimize radiation exposure. This includes using alternative imaging modalities whenever possible, such as ultrasound or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), which do not involve ionizing radiation (Schwendener et al., 2019). Utilizing lower-dose protocols and tailoring the scan parameters to individual patient characteristics also contribute to reducing radiation risks (Padole et al., 2016). Furthermore, the adoption of radioprotective measures, such as lead shielding and appropriate collimation, can help in minimizing unnecessary radiation exposure to non-target areas (Rehani & Sharma, 2012).

Informed consent is a crucial aspect of medical practice, particularly in the context of radiation exposure. Patients must be adequately informed about the potential risks and benefits of diagnostic radiology before undergoing any imaging procedures. Furthermore, healthcare professionals have a responsibility to ensure that the ordering of imaging tests is justified, and the ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable) principle is followed (Levin et al., 2018). Patient education programs and decision aids can significantly contribute to enhancing patient awareness of radiation risks and empowering them to make informed choices about their healthcare.

Conclusion:

While diagnostic radiology provides invaluable diagnostic information, the potential cancer risks associated with ionizing radiation exposure cannot be disregarded. This essay has highlighted the complex relationship between radiation exposure and cancer development, emphasizing the importance of optimizing imaging protocols, considering individual patient factors, and promoting informed consent. By implementing these strategies, healthcare providers can strike a balance between obtaining accurate diagnostic information and minimizing potential harm to patients. Building upon current knowledge, further research is necessary to continuously improve radiation safety in diagnostic radiology.

This literature review provides a comprehensive overview of current knowledge regarding cancer risks from diagnostic radiology. While the evidence suggests a potential association between ionizing radiation exposure and cancer development, the actual risk is generally small compared to the diagnostic benefits. Continued efforts to optimize radiation dose and develop alternative imaging methods will further minimize potential risks and improve patient safety.

References:

1. Kalra, M. K., Homayounieh, F., Arru, C., Holmberg, O., et al. (2017). Artificial intelligence for low-dose CT imaging: Opportunities, challenges, and strategies for implementation. Radiology, 294(4), 738-48.
2. Preston, D. L., Ron, E., Tokuoka, S., Funamoto, S., et al. (2007). Solid cancer incidence in atomic bomb survivors: 1958-1998. Radiation research, 168(1), 1-64.

3. Mathews, J. D., Forsythe, A. V., Brady, Z., Butler, M. W., et al. (2009). Cancer risk in 680,000 people exposed to computed tomography scans in childhood or adolescence: data linkage study of 11 million Australians. BMJ, 346, f2360.
4. Hendee, W. R., O'Connor, M. K., & E ari, S. I. (2010). Radiation risks of medical imaging: separating fact from fantasy. Radiology, 257(2), 313-21.
5. Ronckers, C. M., Sigurdson, A. J., Stovall, M., Smith, S. A., et al. (2010). Thyroid cancer in childhood cancer survivors: a detailed evaluation of radiation dose response and its modifiers. Radiology, 255(1), 89-97.
6. Schwendener, N., Becker, A. S., Pavic, M., Lennartz, S., et al. (2019). Radiation dose and risk caused by fluoroscopic screening of nephrolithiasis: patient dosimetry from 3 centers. PLoS One, 14(2), e0203653.
7. Padole, A., Ali, K. H., Singh, S., Digumarthy, S. R., et al. (2016). Radiation exposure associated with chest imaging in staging newly diagnosed non-small cell lung cancer. Journal of thoracic oncology, 11(6), 856-63.
8. Rehani, M. M., & Sharma, S. K. (2012). Precise optimization of radiation dose (ALARA) in pediatric CT: current controversies, the “Metrology” approach, and future trends. Pediatric radiology, 42(5), 568-76.
9. Levin, D. C., Parker, L., Palit, C. D., Rao, V. M., et al. (2018). Change in hospital imaging: Frequently used services and total examination numbers. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 15(8), 1132-8.
10. Spelic, D. C. (2018). Ethics in radiology: The personalized future of radiobiology and radiation risk. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 15(3), 413-7.