International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2990-2997
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Radiation Exposure Prevention Strategies in Diagnostic Imaging: A Review of Nursing and Radiology Roles

Nasser Nazal Fraih Alanazi[1]*, Khaled Awad Alenzi[2], Altalal Fahad Muqrin Faraj[3], Abdullah Abdulhadi Alaanizi[4], Amal Ayad Lavi Alanazi[5], Abtesam Mohamed Q Alrawaily[6], Alruwaili Shamsah Abdullah R[7], Maha Asal Khalaf Alenezi[8], Alruwaili Rabiah Ghadhban H[9], Mona Farhan B Alenezi[10], Nawal Muwafiq Glab Alruwaili[11]

[1]Radiology Specialist – Diagnostic Radiology – King Salman Specialist Hospital, Hail Health Cluster – Hail – Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** Nalanazi103@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5047-7850

[2]Radiological Technician – Al-Hamidiyah Health Center, Al-Jouf Health Cluster – Al-Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Khalenzi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-9950

[3]Radiology Specialist – King Fahad Specialist Hospital, Qassim Health Cluster – Buraidah – Al-Qassim Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Fahadiologist@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5246-7850

[4]Radiology Technician – Ministry of Health Branch, Northern Borders Region – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: aalaanizi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7650

[5]Nursing Technician – Prince Abdullah bin Musaad Specialized Dental Center, Northern Borders Health Cluster – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: amaalanizi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-9850

[6]Nursing Specialist – Turaif General Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster – Turaif – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: ibaalruwaili@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-5850

[7]Nursing – Maternity and Children Hospital, Al-Jouf Health Cluster – Sakaka – Al-Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: salrweley@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7450

[8]Nursing Technician – Prince Abdullah bin Abdulaziz bin Musaad Specialized Dental Center, Northern Borders Health Cluster – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: maasalenezi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-3850

[9]Nursing Technician – Prince Mutaib bin Abdulaziz Hospital, Al-Jouf Health Cluster – Sakaka – Al-Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: ralraoely@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7250

[10]Nursing Technician – Maternity and Children Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: mofralanazi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-1850

[11]Nursing Technician – North Medical Tower Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: nruwaili@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-1150

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4428
Received : 02 July 2024
Accepted : 30 July 2024

Keywords

Radiation exposure,
diagnostic imaging,
prevention strategies,
nursing roles,
radiology roles,
ALARA principle

Abstract:

Radiation exposure in diagnostic imaging poses significant risks to both patients and healthcare providers, making it imperative to implement effective prevention strategies. Nurses and radiology professionals play crucial roles in this preventive framework, collaborating to ensure that radiation is utilized safely and judiciously. Key strategies include adhering to the ALARA principle (As Low As Reasonably Achievable), which encourages minimizing radiation doses while still obtaining quality diagnostic images. Education and training programs are essential for both nursing staff and radiologists, enhancing their understanding of radiation safety protocols and promoting effective communication with patients about the importance of informed consent and the risks associated with imaging procedures. These proactive measures serve to safeguard patient health and foster a culture of safety within healthcare settings. In addition to direct patient care, nurses and radiology professionals are essential in developing institutional policies that prioritize radiation safety. Regular audits and assessments of imaging practices help identify areas for improvement and ensure compliance with national and international safety standards. Furthermore, technological advancements, such as dose-monitoring software and advanced imaging techniques, are important tools that can be integrated into practice to enhance safety. Interdisciplinary collaboration is key in promoting a unified approach to radiation exposure prevention, allowing for shared knowledge and resources. By focusing on both educational initiatives and policy development, the nursing and radiology workforce can significantly reduce the risks associated with radiation exposure in diagnostic imaging, ultimately improving patient outcomes and enhancing the overall quality of care.

1. Introduction

The utilization of diagnostic imaging modalities has become an indispensable cornerstone of modern healthcare, enabling the detection, diagnosis, and management of a vast array of medical conditions. Techniques such as X-ray radiography, computed tomography (CT), fluoroscopy, and nuclear medicine provide clinicians with critical visual insights into the human body, guiding therapeutic decisions and improving patient outcomes [1]. However, the fundamental principle underlying many of these technologies is the use of ionizing radiation, a form of energy with sufficient force to remove electrons from atoms, thereby creating ions. While the diagnostic benefits are immense, exposure to ionizing radiation carries an inherent risk, as it can damage living tissue at the cellular and molecular level. This damage has been scientifically linked to an increased probability of stochastic effects, such as cancer induction, and at high doses, deterministic effects like skin burns or cataracts [2]. The linear no-threshold model, widely adopted in radiation protection, suggests that there is no completely safe dose of ionizing radiation, and that cancer risk increases linearly with dose, emphasizing the necessity of minimizing exposure wherever possible [3].

In this context, the imperative for robust radiation exposure prevention strategies becomes unequivocal. The goal is to maximize the diagnostic yield of imaging procedures while minimizing the radiation dose delivered to patients, healthcare workers, and the public. This endeavor is not the sole responsibility of a single profession but represents a multidisciplinary challenge requiring coordinated action. Radiologists and radiology technologists are traditionally at the forefront of radiation safety, operating the equipment and optimizing technical parameters. Yet, the role of nursing professionals in this ecosystem is equally vital and often underappreciated. Nurses are frequently involved in patient care before, during, and after imaging procedures, positioning them as key advocates and implementers of safety protocols [4]. Their interactions with patients provide crucial opportunities for education, assessment, and the application of protective measures.

This comprehensive review aims to elucidate the various strategies employed to prevent unnecessary radiation exposure in diagnostic imaging, with a specific focus on delineating and integrating the roles of both nursing and radiology professionals. It will explore the scientific principles of radiation safety, detail practical prevention methodologies, examine the distinct and collaborative responsibilities of these healthcare groups, and discuss the challenges and future directions in this critical field. By synthesizing current knowledge and practices, this article seeks to reinforce the concept that effective radiation protection is a shared duty, fundamental to the ethical provision of high-quality patient care.

2. Radiation in Diagnostic Imaging

To fully appreciate the strategies for prevention, one must first understand the nature and sources of

radiation in the clinical setting. Diagnostic imaging primarily employs ionizing radiation, which includes X-rays and gamma rays. X-rays are generated artificially by machines such as radiographic and CT scanners, while gamma rays are emitted from radioactive isotopes used in nuclear medicine procedures like positron emission tomography (PET) scans [5]. The absorbed dose, measured in grays (Gy), quantifies the energy deposited per unit mass. However, for radiation protection purposes, the equivalent dose (measured in sieverts, Sv) and the effective dose (also in Sv) are more commonly used, as they account for the type of radiation and the sensitivity of different tissues, providing a better estimate of biological risk [6].

The biological effects of ionizing radiation are a consequence of its ability to cause ionization in cells, leading to direct damage to DNA or indirect damage through the production of free radicals. The human body has remarkable repair mechanisms, but misrepair or overwhelming damage can lead to cellular death or mutation. Deterministic effects, such as skin erythema or hair loss, occur when a threshold dose is exceeded and the severity increases with dose. These are typically associated with prolonged interventional fluoroscopic procedures [7]. Of greater concern for routine diagnostic imaging are stochastic effects, primarily cancer and heritable genetic effects, which have no threshold and whose probability—but not severity—is assumed to increase with dose [8]. While the individual risk from a single CT scan is small, the collective population risk is significant given the exponential growth in medical imaging utilization over recent decades [9]. This underscores the importance of justification and optimization for every procedure.

3. Principles of Radiation Safety

The foundation of all radiation protection efforts in healthcare is built upon three core principles: justification, optimization, and dose limitation. These principles, formally established by the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP), provide a systematic framework for safety [10]. Justification requires that no practice involving exposure to radiation should be adopted unless it produces a net benefit to the individual or to society. This means that every imaging request must be clinically warranted, with the potential benefits outweighing the radiation risks. The referring physician plays a critical role in this first step, but radiologists and nurses can also contribute by questioning orders that may not be appropriate based on established referral guidelines [11].

Optimization, often encapsulated in the acronym ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable), dictates that all exposures should be kept as low as reasonably achievable, taking into account economic and societal factors. This is the operational heart of exposure prevention and involves a continuous process of adjusting equipment, techniques, and procedures to use the minimum dose necessary to achieve the required diagnostic information [12]. The third principle, dose limitation, applies primarily to occupational exposure and members of the public, setting legal dose limits that should not be exceeded. For patients, dose limits are not applicable, as exposure is governed by the clinical need, but the ALARA principle is paramount [13]. Practical application of these principles relies on the fundamental concepts of time, distance, and shielding. Reducing the time of exposure, increasing the distance from the radiation source, and using appropriate shielding materials are the most effective ways to minimize dose for both patients and staff [14].

4. Strategies for Radiation Exposure Prevention

A multi-faceted approach is required to effectively prevent unnecessary radiation exposure. These strategies span technological, procedural, and human factors. One of the most significant technological strategies is the development and use of dose-reduction technologies. In CT imaging, this includes automatic exposure control (AEC), which modulates the tube current based on patient size and attenuation, iterative reconstruction algorithms that allow for high-quality images from lower dose data, and dual-energy CT which can provide material differentiation without additional scans [15]. For fluoroscopy, pulsed fluoroscopy modes, last-image-hold features, and copper filtration are standard dose-saving tools [16].

Procedural strategies are equally critical. The implementation of diagnostic reference levels (DRLs) is a key optimization tool. DRLs are investigation-level doses for typical examinations for standard-sized patients, and they serve as a benchmark to identify practices where doses are unusually high, prompting review and correction [17]. Protocol standardization and customization are vital. Standardizing scanning protocols for common examinations ensures consistency, while customizing protocols for pediatric patients, who are more radiosensitive, and for different clinical indications (e.g., a CT for renal stones versus a CT for tumor staging) avoids a one-size-fits-all approach [18]. Patient-specific strategies include

accurate positioning and collimation to limit the radiation field strictly to the area of interest, thereby sparing adjacent tissues. The use of shielding, particularly for radiosensitive organs such as the thyroid, breasts, and gonads, remains a topic of discussion in CT but is firmly established in projection radiography and dental imaging [19].

Furthermore, a crucial preventive strategy is the avoidance of duplicate or unnecessary examinations. This requires robust health information exchange systems so that previous images are accessible, and a culture of collaboration where radiologists consult with referring clinicians to determine if prior studies are sufficient [20]. For nuclear medicine, the use of the smallest permissible amount of radiopharmaceutical to obtain a diagnostic result, coupled with efficient imaging protocols, is the cornerstone of optimization [21].

5. Role of Radiology Professionals in Radiation Safety

Radiology professionals, encompassing radiologists, radiologic technologists (radiographers), and medical physicists, bear primary operational responsibility for radiation safety in imaging departments. The radiologist, as the physician expert in medical imaging, has a multifaceted role. They act as a consultant in the justification process, often through the mechanism of appropriateness criteria like those developed by the American College of Radiology (ACR). By vetting referral requests, they can prevent unnecessary exposures [22]. During procedure planning and interpretation, the radiologist must ensure that the examination protocol is optimized for the clinical question. They are also responsible for monitoring patient doses, comparing them to DRLs, and leading quality improvement initiatives when doses deviate from benchmarks [23].

The radiologic technologist is the frontline operator of imaging equipment and is thus instrumental in the practical application of ALARA. Their competencies include selecting appropriate technical parameters (kVp, mAs, scan length), utilizing all available dose-reduction features on the equipment, and expertly positioning the patient to obtain a diagnostic image on the first attempt, thereby avoiding repeat exposures due to technical error [24]. Technologists are also responsible for applying patient shielding when indicated, monitoring the dose display during fluoroscopic procedures, and communicating effectively with patients to ensure cooperation and immobility. Their training in radiation biology and protection is essential for understanding the consequences of their technical choices [25].

Medical physicists provide the scientific backbone for a radiation safety program. They are involved in the acceptance testing and routine performance evaluation of imaging equipment to ensure it operates within specified parameters and delivers the expected dose. They calibrate dosimeters, develop and optimize imaging protocols in collaboration with radiologists and technologists, and conduct detailed dose assessments for complex procedures [26]. Furthermore, medical physicists often lead the staff radiation safety training program and are key members of the radiation safety committee, ensuring compliance with regulatory standards [27].

6. Role of Nursing Professionals in Radiation Safety

The nursing role in radiation safety is pervasive and pivotal, though sometimes less formally recognized. Nurses interact with patients throughout the care continuum, offering unique opportunities for intervention. In the pre-procedural phase, nurses are often responsible for patient preparation. This includes a thorough patient assessment, which is crucial for safety. Assessing pregnancy status for females of childbearing age is a mandatory step to prevent fetal exposure, guided by the “10-day rule” or, more commonly, the “28-day rule” depending on institutional policy [28]. Nurses also assess renal function before procedures requiring iodinated contrast, which, while not directly a radiation issue, is part of the holistic safety assessment for CT and angiography.

Patient education is a primary nursing function that directly impacts radiation safety. Nurses can explain the procedure in simple terms, allay anxieties, and instruct patients on the importance of remaining still during the examination. For pediatric patients, this may involve coaching parents on how to comfort and immobilize their child, potentially avoiding the need for sedation or repeat scans [29]. Nurses can also advocate for the patient by verifying that the correct procedure has been ordered and that the patient’s history has been fully considered, serving as an additional checkpoint in the justification process [30].

During certain imaging procedures, especially interventional radiology or fluoroscopically-guided studies performed outside the radiology department (e.g., in cardiac catheterization labs or operating rooms), nurses are actively involved in the procedure room. In these settings, they must adhere strictly to occupational radiation protection principles. They should utilize movable lead shields

(table skirts, ceiling-suspended screens), wear appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) such as lead aprons, thyroid shields, and leaded glasses, and maintain maximum feasible distance from the radiation source when their direct involvement is not required [31]. Nurses also monitor the patient's physiological status during prolonged procedures, which can help the operator manage the procedure efficiently and potentially reduce fluoroscopy time.

Post-procedurally, nurses are involved in patient monitoring and follow-up. They can document the procedure details, including any radiation safety measures taken, in the patient's record. For patients undergoing therapeutic nuclear medicine procedures, nurses provide instructions on radiation precautions to protect family members and the public [32]. By embodying a culture of safety, nurses reinforce the importance of radiation protection in everyday practice.

7. Interprofessional Collaboration for Enhanced Safety

The synergy between nursing and radiology professionals is a powerful driver for enhanced radiation safety. Effective communication and mutual respect between these groups break down silos and create a unified safety front. Interprofessional education (IPE) initiatives are foundational to this collaboration. When nursing students and radiography students train together on radiation safety scenarios, they develop a shared understanding and language, fostering teamwork before they enter clinical practice [33]. In the clinical environment, joint in-service training sessions on new equipment or protocols ensure that all team members are aligned.

Collaboration is particularly evident in high-risk areas such as pediatric imaging and emergency departments. In pediatric CT, a collaborative team including a pediatric radiologist, a specialized technologist, and a pediatric nurse can work together to tailor the procedure. The nurse may use distraction techniques or swaddling to calm the child, the technologist adjusts the protocol to pediatric settings, and the radiologist confirms the minimal necessary scan range, collectively achieving a diagnostic study with the lowest possible dose [34]. In the emergency department, nurses can facilitate communication between the referring emergency physician and the radiology department, ensuring that the most appropriate imaging test is ordered promptly, potentially avoiding multiple preliminary studies [35].

Interprofessional rounds and safety huddles provide formal platforms for collaboration. Discussing complex cases prospectively allows the team to plan the imaging approach, assign roles for patient preparation and monitoring, and address potential safety concerns. Furthermore, the development and updating of institutional policies and procedures for radiation safety should involve representatives from both nursing and radiology to ensure they are practical, comprehensive, and adhered to by all [36].

8. Technological Advances in Radiation Reduction

The landscape of diagnostic imaging is continually evolving with technological innovations designed to reduce radiation dose without compromising image quality. In CT, the shift from filtered back projection to iterative reconstruction has been revolutionary. Algorithms like adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction (ASIR) and model-based iterative reconstruction (MBIR) allow for significant dose reductions—often 30-60%—by using sophisticated mathematical models to suppress noise in low-dose data [37]. Deep learning-based reconstruction, an advancement of artificial intelligence, is now emerging, promising even greater dose efficiency and image quality [38].

Digital radiography has largely replaced film-screen systems, offering a wider dynamic range and the ability to separate image acquisition from display. However, careful technique is still required to avoid dose creep. Direct dose monitoring software is now integrated into many radiography and fluoroscopy systems, providing real-time feedback to the operator and generating dose reports for the patient's record and institutional tracking [39]. In fluoroscopy, advanced features like spectral shaping using unique filters (e.g., tin filters) selectively remove low-energy X-rays that contribute to patient dose but not to image contrast, leading to substantial dose savings [40].

Nuclear medicine is also benefiting from technological progress. New solid-state detector materials in SPECT and PET cameras offer improved sensitivity and resolution, allowing for shorter scan times or lower administered activities. The development of PET/MRI hybrid systems is particularly promising, as it combines the functional information of PET with the exquisite soft-tissue detail of MRI, entirely avoiding the ionizing radiation associated with CT in traditional PET/CT scanners [41]. These technologies, however, require substantial investment and specialized training for staff to harness their full dose-reduction potential.

9. Regulatory and Ethical Considerations

Radiation protection in medicine operates within a framework of national and international regulations and ethical guidelines. Regulatory bodies, such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in the United States or corresponding agencies in other countries, set and enforce standards for the safe use of radiation. These regulations cover equipment performance, occupational dose limits, radioactive material handling, and quality assurance programs [17]. Accreditation programs from organizations like the American College of Radiology (ACR) or the Joint Commission go beyond regulation, promoting best practices through voluntary peer review that includes rigorous evaluation of dose management and safety protocols [22].

The ethical dimension of radiation exposure is profound. The principle of beneficence obligates healthcare providers to act in the best interest of the patient, which includes minimizing harm from radiation. Non-maleficence, or "do no harm," directly applies to the need to avoid unnecessary exposure. Justice requires the equitable application of safety measures for all patients, regardless of age, size, or clinical setting [10]. There is also an ethical duty to inform patients about the risks and benefits of imaging procedures, contributing to the informed consent process. While detailed disclosure of small stochastic risks from a single X-ray may not be practical, for higher-dose procedures like CT, many advocate for a discussion of radiation risk as part of shared decision-making, especially for elective studies [3]. This ethical responsibility is shared by referring physicians, radiologists, and nurses who interact with patients.

10. Challenges in Implementing Prevention Strategies

Despite well-established principles and strategies, numerous challenges hinder the universal and consistent implementation of optimal radiation safety practices. A significant barrier is the variation in knowledge and awareness among healthcare providers. Referring physicians may lack up-to-date knowledge on the relative radiation doses of different imaging modalities or appropriate referral guidelines, leading to unjustified requests [11]. Similarly, not all radiologic technologists or nurses may receive ongoing, advanced training in the latest dose-optimization techniques for newer equipment [25].

Economic and resource constraints pose another challenge. State-of-the-art dose-reduction technology, such as iterative reconstruction software or new digital detectors, requires significant capital investment, which may not be feasible for all healthcare facilities, particularly in low-resource settings [15]. Time pressure in busy clinical environments, such as emergency departments, can lead to shortcuts, like forgoing patient shielding or using default adult protocols for children, in the interest of speed [18]. Furthermore, patient-related factors, including obesity, which requires higher technical factors to penetrate tissue, or inability to cooperate due to age or clinical condition, can make dose minimization technically difficult [19].

The "technological imperative"—the tendency to use advanced technology simply because it is available—can drive overutilization. Defensive medicine, where physicians order imaging to mitigate malpractice risk rather than due to clinical necessity, remains a pervasive contributor to unnecessary exposure [20]. Finally, measuring and tracking radiation dose in a standardized way across different vendors and modalities is complex, though initiatives like the Radiation Dose Index Registry (RDIR) are making strides in this area [23]. Overcoming these challenges requires sustained commitment, education, and systemic change.

11. Future Directions in Radiation Safety

The future of radiation safety in diagnostic imaging will be shaped by continued technological innovation, enhanced education, and data-driven quality improvement. Artificial intelligence (AI) is poised to play a transformative role. AI algorithms can be used for several safety applications: they can assist in the justification process by analyzing electronic health records to suggest the most appropriate imaging test based on guidelines; they can automatically optimize scan parameters in real-time based on patient anatomy; and they can reconstruct diagnostic-quality images from extremely low-dose raw data [38]. The integration of AI into clinical workflows has the potential to standardize and optimize practice, reducing human variability.

Education and training will evolve to be more immersive and interprofessional. Simulation-based training using virtual reality can allow technologists and nurses to practice complex procedures, like managing a moving pediatric patient during a CT scan, in a risk-free environment, honing their skills in dose minimization [33]. Mandatory dose metrics reporting to referring physicians, often called "dose feedback," is a promising strategy to raise awareness. By including the effective dose or a comparable metric in the imaging report, the referring clinician becomes more cognizant of the radiation burden, potentially influencing future ordering behavior [22].

Personalized radiation safety represents another frontier. Just as medicine moves towards personalized therapy, radiation protection could move towards personalized dose limits based on individual factors like age, genetic predisposition to radiation sensitivity, and cumulative exposure history. While this is currently speculative, it highlights the direction of more nuanced risk assessment [3]. Furthermore, global efforts to harmonize safety standards and share best practices, particularly to support low- and middle-income countries in building capacity for safe imaging, will be crucial for worldwide public health [36].

12. Conclusion

The prevention of unnecessary radiation exposure in diagnostic imaging is a complex, multidisciplinary endeavor that is fundamental to the ethical practice of modern medicine. It requires a steadfast commitment to the principles of justification, optimization, and limitation. As this review has detailed, effective prevention encompasses a broad spectrum of strategies, from technological innovations like iterative reconstruction and AI, to rigorous procedural protocols like the use of diagnostic reference levels and patient shielding. Crucially, the human element remains central. Radiologists, radiologic technologists, and medical physicists bring specialized expertise in equipment operation, protocol design, and dose monitoring. Nursing professionals contribute indispensable skills in patient assessment, education, advocacy, and hands-on care during procedures, serving as a constant safety checkpoint and a bridge between the patient and the imaging team.

The highest level of safety is achieved not through isolated efforts, but through deliberate and respectful interprofessional collaboration. When nurses and radiology staff communicate effectively, participate in joint training, and develop shared protocols, they create a robust culture of safety that permeates every imaging encounter. While challenges such as knowledge gaps, economic constraints, and clinical pressures persist, the future is promising. Advances in technology, coupled with enhanced education and data analytics, offer powerful tools to further the ALARA goal. Ultimately, protecting patients and healthcare workers from avoidable radiation risk is a shared responsibility—one that demands ongoing vigilance, education, and cooperation from all members of the healthcare team to ensure that the immense diagnostic power of medical imaging is delivered in the safest manner possible.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Koukorava C, Farah J, Struelens L, et al. Efficiency of radiation protection equipment in interventional radiology: a systematic Monte Carlo study of eye lens and whole body doses. J Radiol Prot. 2014;34:509–528.
2. Efstathopoulos EP, Pantos I, Andreou M, et al. Occupational radiation doses to the extremities and the eyes in interventional radiology and cardiology procedures. Br J Radiol. 2011;84:70–77.
3. Perisinakis K, Solomou G, Stratakis J, Damilakis J. Data and methods to assess occupational exposure to personnel involved in cardiac catheterization procedures. Phys Med. 2016;32:386–392.
4. Worgul BV, Kundiev Y, Likhtarev I, Sergienko N, Wegener A, Medvedovsky CP. Use of subjective and nonsubjective methodologies to evaluate lens radiation damage in exposed populations - an overview. Radiat Environ Biophys. 1996;35:137–144.
5. Boal TJ, Pinak M. Dose limits to the lens of the eye: International Basic Safety Standards and related guidance. Ann ICRP. 2015;44:112–117.
6. Baumann F, Katzen BT, Carelsen B, Diehm N, Benenati JF, Peña CS. The effect of realtime monitoring on dose exposure to staff within an interventional radiology setting. Cardiovasc Interv Radiol. 2015;38:1105–1111.
7. Haga Y, Chida K, Kaga Y, Sota M, Meguro T, Zuguchi M. Occupational eye dose in interventional cardiology procedures. Scient Rep (Nature Publisher Group). 2017;7:1.
8. Jacob S, Boveda S, Bar O, et al. Interventional cardiologists and risk of radiation-induced cataract: results of a French multicenter observational study. Int J Cardiol. 2013;167:1843–1847.

9. Ciraj-Bjelac O, Rehani M, Minamoto A, Sim KH, Liew HB, Vano E. Radiation-induced eye lens changes and risk for cataract in interventional cardiology. Cardiology. 2012;123:168–171.
10. Sandblom V, Mai T, Almén A, et al. Evaluation of the impact of a system for real-time visualisation of occupational radiation dose rate during fluoroscopically guided procedures. J Radiol Prot. 2013;33:693–702.
11. Hall EJ, Giaccia AJ. Radiobiology for the Radiologist, 7th ed Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2012.
12. Wilson-Stewart K. A survey of radiation protection utilization and accessibility within Australian cardiac angiography laboratories. J Radiol Nurs. 2017;36:112–116.
13. Butcher RL, Gaggini R, Thoirs K. Does wearing a real-time visual dosimeter reduce the personal radiation dose for interventional radiology nurses? An observational comparative study. J Radiol Nurs. 2015;34:137–142.
14. Vano E. Basis for standards: ICRP activities. Radiat Prot Dosimetry. 2015;165:30–33.
15. Vano E, Kleiman NJ, Duran A, Rehani MM, Echeverri D, Cabrera M. Radiation cataract risk in interventional cardiology personnel. Radiat Res. 2010;174:490–495.
16. Domienik J, Brodecki M, Rusicka D. A study of the dose distribution in the region of the eye lens and extremities for staff working in interventional cardiology. Radiat Meas. 2012;47:130–138.
17. Sailer AM, Schurink GWH, Bol ME, et al. Occupational radiation exposure during endovascular aortic repair. Cardiovasc Interv Radiol. 2015;38:827–832.
18. Dave JK. Why is the X-Ray tube usually located underneath the patient instead of above the patient for interventional fluoroscopic procedures? AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2016;207:W24.
19. Racadio J, Nachabe R, Carelsen B, et al. Effect of real-time radiation dose feedback on pediatric interventional radiology staff radiation exposure. J Vasc Interv Radiol. 2014;25:119–126.
20. Omar A, Kadesjo N, Palmgren C, Marteinsdottir M, Segerdahl T, Fransson A. Assessment of the occupational eye lens dose for clinical staff in interventional radiology, cardiology and neuroradiology. J Radiol Prot. 2017;37:145–159.
21. Mahesh M. Radiation Dose Management for Fluoroscopically Guided Interventional Medical Procedures, Vol 39. Alexandria, VA: American Association of Physicists in Medicine; 2012:5789–5790.
22. Rühm W, Woloschak GE, Shore RE, et al. Dose and dose-rate effects of ionizing radiation: a discussion in the light of radiological protection. Radiat Environ Biophys. 2015;54:379–401.
23. Haqqani OP, Agarwal PK, Halin NM, Iafrati MD. Defining the radiation “scatter cloud” in the interventional suite. J Vasc Surg. 2013;58:1339–1345.
24. Omar A, Marteinsdottir M, Kadesjo N, Fransson A. On the feasibility of utilizing active personal dosimeters worn on the chest to estimate occupational eye lens dose in x-ray angiography. J Radiol Prot. 2015;35:271–284.
25. Chohan MO, Sandoval D, Buchan A, Murray-Krezan C, Taylor CL. Cranial radiation exposure during cerebral catheter angiography. J Neurointerv Surg. 2014;6:633–636.
26. McLean D, Hadaya D, Tse J. Eye dose to staff involved in interventional and procedural fluoroscopy. J Phys Conf Ser. 2016;694:012054.
27. Rühm W, Azizova TV, Bouffler SD, et al. Dose-rate effects in radiation biology and radiation protection. Ann ICRP. 2016;45:262–279.
28. Gilligan P, Lynch J, Eder H, et al. Assessment of clinical occupational dose reduction effect of a new interventional cardiology shield for radial access combined with a scatter reducing drape: shield/drape combination reduces staff doses. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2015;86:935–940.
29. Topol EJ, Teirstein PS. Textbook of Interventional Cardiology E-Book, 7th ed Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2015.
30. Antic V, Ciraj-Bjelac O, Rehani M, Aleksandric S, Arandjic D, Ostojic M. Eye lens dosimetry in interventional cardiology: results of staff dose measurements and link to patient dose levels. Radiat Protect Dosimetry. 2013;154:276–284.
31. Korir GK, Ochieng BO, Wambani JS, Korir IK, Jowi CY. Radiation exposure in interventional procedures. Radiat Prot Dosimetry. 2012;152:339–344.
32. James RF, Wainwright KJ, Kanaan HA, et al. Analysis of occupational radiation exposure during cerebral angiography utilizing a new real time radiation dose monitoring system. J Neurointerv Surg. 2015;7:503–508.
33. Pradhan A, Lee J, Kim J. On the scenario of passive dosimeters in personnel monitoring: relevance to diagnostic radiology and fluoroscopy-based interventional cardiology. J Med Phys. 2016;41:81–84.
34. Dumonceau JM, Garcia-Fernandez F, Verdun F, et al. Radiation protection in digestive endoscopy: European society of digestive endoscopy (ESGE) guideline. Endoscopy. 2012;44:408–424.
35. Implications for Occupational Radiation Protection of the New Dose Limit for the Lens of the Eye. In: Agency IAE, ed. IAEA_TECDOC. Vol 1731. Vienna; 2014.
36. Almasri HY, Kakinohana Y, Yogi T. Occupational radiation monitoring at a large medical center in Japan. Radiol Phys Technol. 2014;7:271–276.