

ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction

Subcommittee on Radiation Exposure: David W. Jordan, PhD^a; Murray Becker, MD, PhD^b; Samuel Brady, PhD, MS^c; Janet Ching-Mei Feng PhD^d; Mary E. Jafari, MS^e; Loretta M. Johnson, PhD^f; Mary A. Keenan, DMP^g; Douglas R. Kitchin, MD^h; Ryan K. Lee, MD, MBAⁱ; William Sensakovic, PhD^j; Nimarta Singh, MD, MPH^k; Jiali Wang, PhD.^l

Many of the diagnostic imaging examinations described in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® (AC) guidelines involve exposure of patients to ionizing radiation from radioactive materials or x-rays. It is important to be aware of potential health risks associated with radiation exposure when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, relative radiation levels (RRLs) have been included for most imaging examinations (see [Table 1](#)) [1,2]. The RRLs are effective dose rankings. This quantity takes into account the sensitivity to radiation of different body organs and tissues [3]. Effective dose is expressed in units of millisievert (mSv). It is important to note that, because effective dose does not delineate differences in risk based on age and sex, it cannot accurately specify risk for an individual patient. However, effective dose provides a way to estimate risk among different imaging examinations. All RRL assignments are based on reviews of current literature, U.S. diagnostic reference level publications, and the experience of medical physicists and radiologists. A partial list of literature consulted is provided [4-20]. In some examinations, dose estimates from published studies and/or practice experience vary significantly; in these cases, the reviewing committee conservatively assigned the RRL for the examination to the higher level. These assignments will be periodically reviewed and updated, as practice evolves, equipment becomes more capable of dose savings, and further information becomes available.

The primary risk associated with exposure to ionizing radiation in medical imaging is potential induction of cancer. The National Academies' Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation report, BEIR VII [21], states:

On average, assuming a sex and age distribution similar to that of the entire U.S. population, the BEIR VII lifetime risk model predicts that approximately one individual in 100 persons would be expected to develop cancer (solid cancer or leukemia) from a dose of 100 mSv while approximately 42 of the 100 individuals would be expected to develop solid cancer or leukemia from other causes. Lower doses would produce proportionally lower risks.

BEIR VII also emphasizes that:

At doses of 100 mSv or less, statistical limitations make it difficult to evaluate cancer risk in humans.

Adverse health outcomes for radiation doses below 100 mSv are not shown by evidence and the American Association of Physicists in Medicine (AAPM) cautions that [22]:

Given the lack of scientific consensus about potential risks from low doses of radiation, predictions of hypothetical cancer incidence and mortality from the use of diagnostic imaging are highly speculative. The AAPM and other radiation protection organizations, specifically discourages these predictions of hypothetical harm. Such predictions can lead to sensationalistic stories in the public media. This may lead some patients to fear or refuse safe and appropriate medical imaging, to the detriment of the patient.

Keep in mind that cancer, regardless of the etiologic process, has a minimum latent period of years to decades [23,24]. Further, it is important to remember that in addition to radiation exposure from imaging procedures, individuals are exposed to ubiquitous radiation from natural sources, including radon, cosmic rays, soil, building materials, and food. The average annual amount of natural background radiation for someone living in the United States is approximately 3 mSv [7].

^aChair, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio. ^bRobert Wood Johnson Medical School, New Brunswick, New Jersey. ^cCincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio. ^dUniversity of Texas Health Science Center at Houston and McGovern Medical School, Houston, Texas. ^eGundersen Health System, La Crosse, Wisconsin. ^fUniversity of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama. ^gVanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee. ^hMadison Radiologists, Madison, Wisconsin. ⁱEinstein Healthcare Network, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. ^jMayo Clinic, Scottsdale, Arizona. ^kMidwest Imaging Professionals, Chicago, Illinois. ^lKaiser Permanente, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Pasadena, California.

The RRL designations in these documents are general population-based ranges to allow relative comparisons between different procedures and are not meant to precisely predict radiation dose for individual patient exam scenarios. Radiation levels vary substantially as a function of differences in equipment, protocols, and patient factors [25]. For procedures where a more general description is provided (eg, CT appendicular skeleton), dose will vary depending on the area being imaged. A qualified medical physicist must be consulted for more accurate dose estimates in specific clinical situations.

In the current version of the AC, RRLs are designated as “varies” for most image-guided interventional procedures, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors. These include patient factors, such as body habitus and age; and technical factors, such as type of imaging modality used for guidance, specific nature of the intervention, treatment modality used, and skill and experience of the operator. For example, biopsy of a lung nodule may be done with fluoroscopic or CT guidance. The CT may involve static imaging or CT fluoroscopy. The lesion may be peripheral, large, and readily accessible, or central, small and technically very challenging to reach. Similarly, if a patient is undergoing visceral angiography for the treatment of a gastrointestinal bleed, the procedure may be brief if a precise bleeding site is readily identified and treated with embolization, or it may require a long period of fluoroscopy and many recorded angiographic runs due to unclear or confusing findings, or inability to easily cannulate a small suspect artery. For these reasons, the actual dose to a given patient for a given intervention may vary from none to high.

Certain patient groups require special attention with regard to radiation exposure. In general, radiation-induced cancer mortality risk in children is 3 to 5 times higher than for adults [3], both because of increased organ sensitivity and longer life expectancy (relevant to the long latency that appears to accompany radiation exposure). For these reasons, the RRL dose estimate ranges for pediatric examinations are lower as compared to those specified for adults. Even though radiation levels required for imaging examinations of children are generally lower than those for adults due to their smaller size, it is particularly important to consider radiation exposure levels when selecting appropriate imaging examinations for children due to their greater sensitivity to radiation exposure [26,27]. However, in practice, radiation doses may not be lower for small patients and children. If the radiation exposure from a protocol designed for an adult is used for smaller body sizes, the dose is larger. Unless specific pediatric-reduced techniques have been implemented by the facility, the radiation levels for small patients and children may exceed typical adult radiation levels [28]. It is also important to note that, as people age, their risk of radiation-induced cancer decreases. As a result, when compared to a 40-year-old, an 80-year-old is 3 to 4 times less likely to develop cancer from radiation exposure [21].

The developing fetus is sensitive to radiation exposure. Depending on the magnitude of the radiation dose and the gestational age of the fetus, these effects may include childhood cancer [29]. Though the fetal dose from diagnostic x-ray procedures is generally well below the threshold for increased risk of developmental or physical damage, unintended fetal exposure should be avoided by establishing the pregnancy status of female patients of reproductive age prior to conducting any imaging procedure which involves direct exposure of the abdomen [30]. Radiological examinations outside the abdominal and pelvic regions in general result in only minimal fetal exposure and most often can be performed safely. Before any imaging procedures involving ionizing radiation are performed on pregnant patients, however, the clinical necessity, possible alternatives that do not involve ionizing radiation and all other risk factors should be carefully evaluated.

Although the overall risk of cancer induction from a diagnostic imaging procedure involving ionizing radiation is small, it has not been proven to be zero. Therefore, it is prudent to ensure that a patient’s radiation exposure is only that necessary to accomplish the diagnostic task. There are several strategies to help accomplish the goal of limiting exposure to ionizing radiation. First, use appropriateness criteria recommendations to select the most suitable procedure for the patient’s condition; avoid ordering procedures that are not likely to provide useful information. Second, prior to ordering an imaging procedure, review the patient’s history, results, and clinical indications to determine whether the procedure can provide additional information to assist in patient management. Third, consider using imaging procedures that do not use ionizing radiation, but only if they have similar diagnostic accuracy to procedures that use ionizing radiation [31].

Frequently, patients will ask a physician questions about the radiation exposure associated with imaging examinations and the risk of ionizing radiation in general. An easily accessible resource that can be used for these discussions is the RadiologyInfo website (www.radiologyinfo.org/). This website provides information to the public on radiologic procedures, including specific content on radiation exposure and safety. The material is provided by

experts in the field of radiology from the ACR and the Radiological Society of North America. Additional information on radiation in imaging is available for imaging professionals, referring practitioners and patients and their families at the Image Wisely® (www.imagewisely.org/) and the Image Gently® (www.imagegently.org/) websites.

Table 1. Relative radiation level designations along with common example examinations for each classification

Relative Radiation Level*	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range	Example Examinations
○	0 mSv	0 mSv	Ultrasound; MRI
☼	<0.1 mSv	<0.03 mSv	Chest radiographs; Hand radiographs
☼☼	0.1-1 mSv	0.03-0.3 mSv	Pelvis radiographs; Mammography
☼☼☼	1-10 mSv	0.3-3 mSv	Abdomen CT with IV contrast, Nuclear medicine bone scan
☼☼☼☼	10-30 mSv	3-10 mSv	Abdomen CT without and with contrast; Whole body PET/CT
☼☼☼☼☼	30-100 mSv	10-30 mSv	CTA chest abdomen and pelvis with contrast; Transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt placement

*The RRL assignments for some of the examinations cannot be made, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors (eg, the region of the body exposed to ionizing radiation, the imaging guidance that is used, etc.). The RRLs for these examinations are designated as “Varies.”

References

- Royal College of Radiologists. Making the best use of a department of clinical radiology: guidelines for doctors. 5th ed. London: The Royal College of Radiologists; 2003.
- Martin CJ. Effective dose: how should it be applied to medical exposures? Br J Radiol 2007;80:639-47.
- The 2007 Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection. ICRP publication 103. Annals of the ICRP 2007;37:1-332.
- American College of Radiology. Dose Index Registry. Available at: <http://www.acr.org/Quality-Safety/National-Radiology-Data-Registry/Dose-Index-Registry>. Accessed January 28, 2020.
- Radiation dose to patients from radiopharmaceuticals (addendum 2 to ICRP publication 53). Annals of the ICRP 1998;28:1-126.
- United States Pharmacopeia Drug Information: Drug Information for the Health Care Professional. 27th ed. Greenwood Village, CO: Thomson Micromedex; 2007.
- Ionizing Radiation Exposure of the Population of the United States. Bethesda, MD: National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement. NCRP report 160; 2009.
- Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc. Nationwide Evaluation of X-Ray Trends (NEXT) - Tabulation and Graphical Summary of 2005-2006 Survey of Computed Tomography. Available at: http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.crcpd.org/resource/collection/81C6DB13-25B1-4118-8600-9615624818AA/NEXT_CT2005-2006Tabulations&GraphicalSummary.pdf. Accessed January 28, 2020.
- Bor D, Sancak T, Olgar T, et al. Comparison of effective doses obtained from dose-area product and air kerma measurements in interventional radiology. Br J Radiol 2004;77:315-22.
- Lassmann M, Treves ST. Paediatric radiopharmaceutical administration: harmonization of the 2007 EANM paediatric dosage card (version 1.5.2008) and the 2010 North American consensus guidelines. European journal of nuclear medicine and molecular imaging 2014;41:1036-41.
- Mettler FA, Jr., Bhargavan M, Faulkner K, et al. Radiologic and nuclear medicine studies in the United States and worldwide: frequency, radiation dose, and comparison with other radiation sources--1950-2007. Radiology 2009;253:520-31.
- Mettler FA, Jr., Huda W, Yoshizumi TT, Mahesh M. Effective doses in radiology and diagnostic nuclear medicine: a catalog. Radiology 2008;248:254-63.

13. Wall BF, Hart D. Revised radiation doses for typical X-ray examinations. Report on a recent review of doses to patients from medical X-ray examinations in the UK by NRPB. National Radiological Protection Board. Br J Radiol 1997;70:437-9.
14. Kanal KM, Butler PF, Sengupta D, Bhargavan-Chatfield M, Coombs LP, Morin RL. U.S. Diagnostic Reference Levels and Achievable Doses for 10 Adult CT Examinations. Radiology 2017;284:120-33.
15. Becker MD, Butler PF, Bhargavan-Chatfield M, et al. Adult Gamma Camera Myocardial Perfusion Imaging: Diagnostic Reference Levels and Achievable Administered Activities Derived From ACR Accreditation Data. J Am Coll Radiol 2016;13:688-95.
16. Becker MD, Butler PF, Siam M, et al. U.S. PET/CT and Gamma Camera Diagnostic Reference Levels and Achievable Administered Activities for Noncardiac Nuclear Medicine Studies. Radiology 2019;293:203-11.
17. Report No. 172 - Reference levels and achievable doses in medical and dental imaging : recommendations for the United States. *NCRP report*. Bethesda, Md.: National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements; 2012:x, 133 p.
18. Alessio AM, Farrell MB, Fahey FH. Role of Reference Levels in Nuclear Medicine: A Report of the SNMMI Dose Optimization Task Force. Journal of nuclear medicine : official publication, Society of Nuclear Medicine 2015;56:1960-4.
19. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. Report No. 184 – Medical Radiation Exposure of Patients in the United States (2019). Available at: <https://ncrponline.org/shop/reports/report-no-184-medical-radiation-exposure-of-patients-in-the-united-states-2019/>. Accessed January 28, 2020.
20. Mattsson S, Johansson L, Leide Svegborn S, et al. Radiation Dose to Patients from Radiopharmaceuticals: a Compendium of Current Information Related to Frequently Used Substances. Annals of the ICRP 2015;44:7-321.
21. National Research Council (U.S.). Committee to Assess Health Risks from Exposure to Low Level of Ionizing Radiation. *Health risks from exposure to low levels of ionizing radiation : BEIR VII Phase 2*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press; 2006.
22. American Association of Physicists in Medicine. PP 25-C. AAPM Position Statement on Radiation Risks from Medical Imaging Procedures. Available at: <https://www.aapm.org/org/policies/details.asp?id=439&type=PP>. Accessed January 28, 2020.
23. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. SOURCES, EFFECTS AND RISKS OF IONIZING RADIATION, UNSCEAR 2017 Report to the General Assembly. Available at: https://www.unscear.org/docs/publications/2017/UNSCEAR_2017_Report.pdf. Accessed January 28, 2020.
24. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. *Implications of recent epidemiologic studies for the linear nonthreshold model and radiation protection*. Bethesda, Maryland: National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements; 2018.
25. Amis ES, Jr., Butler PF, Applegate KE, et al. American College of Radiology white paper on radiation dose in medicine. J Am Coll Radiol 2007;4:272-84.
26. National Cancer Institute. *Radiation Risks and Pediatric Computed Tomography (CT): A Guide for Health Care Providers*. Available at: <http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/causes/radiation-risks-pediatric-CT>. Accessed January 28, 2020.
27. Image Gently. The Alliance for Radiation Safety in Pediatric Imaging. Available at: <http://www.imagegently.org/>. Accessed January 28, 2020.
28. Strauss KJ, Somasundaram E, Sengupta D, Marin JR, Brady SL. Radiation Dose for Pediatric CT: Comparison of Pediatric versus Adult Imaging Facilities. Radiology 2019;291:158-67.
29. McCollough CH, Schueler BA, Atwell TD, et al. Radiation exposure and pregnancy: when should we be concerned? Radiographics : a review publication of the Radiological Society of North America, Inc 2007;27:909-17; discussion 17-8.
30. American College of Radiology. ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for Imaging Pregnant or Potentially Pregnant Adolescents and Women with Ionizing Radiation. Available at: http://www.acr.org/~media/ACR/Documents/PGTS/guidelines/Pregnant_Patients.pdf. Accessed January 28, 2020.
31. Image Wisely. Radiation Safety in Adult Medical Imaging. Available at: <http://www.imagewisely.org/>. Accessed January 28, 2020.