Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة

ISSN: 2707-7675

Journal of University Studies for Inclusive Research

Vol.11, Issue 11 (2022), 8434- 8462

USRIJ Pvt. Ltd.,

Health and psychological effects of Tomography Scan use: A survey study

Khalid Abdulrahman Alsharif
Motaeb Sager Alenazi
Musab abdulgader hamad alfares

Riyadh

Bachelor's degree in CT radiology

Abstract

Computed tomography (CT), which was first used in the 1970s, has completely changed how doctors make diagnoses. The elevated radiation exposure that patients would experience as a result of the widespread adoption of CT is one of the main issues. The only way the doctors could see inside their patient's body was to cut them open. This dramatically changed, though, with the development of numerous valuable medical imaging techniques that allowed doctors to obtain internal organ and bone pictures without the patient feeling any discomfort. Numerous cross-sectional imaging scans have been established over the years as a result of significant breakthroughs. Computed tomography (CT) scan usage has grown globally. Ionizing radiation from CT scans, however, may raise the risk of cancer. The purpose of this research is to offer a review of the negative psychological and physical repercussions of tomography scan usage. The paper briefly discusses the most recent advancements in this field about the application of these strategies while also highlighting the technique's advantages and disadvantages. A few simple dose optimization techniques exist, such as removing extraneous pictures from the ends of acquired series, reducing the number of phases acquired, and using automatic exposure control rather than fixed tube current methods. New radiation dose-reduction picture reconstruction methods have also been developed in recent years with promising outcomes.

Keywords: Health effects psychological effect, Computed tomography, **Scans,** Radiation exposure.

Introduction .1

Computed tomography (CT) has transformed diagnostic decision-making since its invention in the 1970s (Mettler, 2008). Improvements in surgery, cancer detection and treatment, post-injury and serious trauma care, stroke care, and heart problems care have all been made as a result. The fact that CT can be conducted quickly and is generally accessible compared to other imaging modality gives doctors the ability to quickly confirm or rule out a diagnosis with more conviction. It has had a significant impact on the medical profession, reducing the requirement for emergency surgery from 13% to 5% and all but eliminating numerous exploratory surgical operations. There is less evidence of patients needing inpatient hospitalization as a result of the broad adoption of CT in clinical practice (Hricak, 2011). With improved spatial resolution and faster scanning periods, CT has become an increasingly popular imaging modality with a substantially increased variety of clinical applications, such as CT colonography, CT angiography, and CT urography, among many others. Given these benefits, it is not surprising that CT has had a massive increase in usage since it was first introduced. The increased radiation exposure that patients would experience as a result of the broad adoption of CT is one of the main issues (Power, 2016).

The effectiveness and precision of medical diagnosis have increased thanks to developments in medical imaging during the past few decades. The selection of various imaging techniques for various applications aids in streamlining and making changes to increase the scope of one technique without necessarily replacing it. Computed Tomography (CT) Scan is a common tool in use today. This method uses measurements from several X-ray angles to produce a cross-section image (Ginat & Gupta, 2014). The purpose of this essay is to explain the history, health implications, and psychological impacts of using tomography scans (Al-sharify, 2020). This research will also go over developments in the application of this methodology.

Computed Tomography Scan .2

CT scan or computed tomography is a medical imaging method based on x-rays (X-rays) used to create a three-dimensional image of the internal organs of the body. It is formed by several two-dimensional images taken around a fixed axis of rotation (Al-sharify, 2020).

Researchers were able to create computed tomographic pictures using computers in the 1960s because to improvements in technology and computers. The first CT scanner was created in the late 1960s, as shown in Figure 1a, and the first CT scan of a patient was carried out in the early 1970s. The introduction of the Computed Tomography (CT), also known as CAT scanning, technique by two eminent scientists and physicians in the 1970s brought about significant advances in the medical world (Esses, 2004). Clinical CT scanners evolved and were put to use over the following few years. While just the head could be scanned at first, later advancements allowed for full body scans (Karatas & Toy, 2014).
Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, the CT was recently employed in China to diagnose patients who had been found to have the corona virus. It was claimed that this technique is highly sensitive and should be thoroughly examined with additional research (Ai, 2020). While there are several imaging modalities available, many medical teams and

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

doctors choose to employ the quick and simple CT scanning procedure. Additionally, it enables the pertinent authorities to reach firm conclusions on the nature of disorders. Surgery rates have significantly decreased as a result of CT scans. This is due to the fact that it is known that once a patient gets a CT scan, the test rate of surgeries is lowered from 13% to 5% because an alternative treatment is advised. Contrarily, patients are visiting clinics and hospitals less frequently as a result of the usage of CT scans (Fazel, 2009). These days, technology is developing and progressing steadily in imaging modalities, and effective outcomes are starting to show up as a result of the shorter scanning periods needed and the higher resolution images generated. Because of this, the scope of CT scans has increased. For instance, CT scans are currently used to cover and test procedures including colonography, angiography, and urography (Power & Moloney, 2016).

Today, CT scans are a well-known and popular imaging-based diagnostic that may accurately identify a patient's health. It is clear that computed tomography technology has advanced recently (Karatas & Toy, 2014). Cone-beam, extreme multi-detector, dual-energy, iterative reconstruction methods, portable, and phase-contrast techniques were all introduced in CT technology [5]. It is inevitable that a patient's body parts would move during a CT scan exam because blurry, or "artefact-filled," images are produced. The main causes of such blurry pictures are involuntary movements of the respiratory, cardiac, and gastrointestinal systems (Moorrees & Bezak, 2012). The largest organ movement, when comparing these three types of motion, is still conceivable and is caused by respiratory motion. This problem is typically resolved by developing a number of innovative and effective techniques that can entirely or partially remove artifacts from CT scans. Such advancements not only have a substantial impact on CT scans but also frequently have a positive influence on radiation because they enable the elimination of the unfavorable effects of organ motion in radiotherapy, which leads to better outcomes. Cancer hazards from CT scanning due to radiation exposure are a growing issue in modern society. Given the fast rise in the number of CT scans performed, the negative consequences on the community cannot be disregarded (Freudenberg & Beyer, 2011).

The ionizing radiation doses administered to a patient during a CT scan need to be properly monitored. This is due to the possibility that useful organs in patients who have had CT scans over the long term could develop cancers and leukemia problems. As a result of receiving high doses of ionizing radiation during CT scans, patients are more likely to develop cancer at some point in their lifetime. It is still unclear whether or not the low dose ionization used in common diagnostic tests can eventually lead to cancer (Power & Moloney, 2016).

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

3. The Health Risks of Ionizing Radiation from Computed Tomography

Ionizing radiation from computed tomography (CT) scans has raised concerns about its potential health consequences. The biological consequences of radiation are covered in this paper along with study findings about the usage of CT scans, radiation dose reduction techniques, and the importance of ordering pediatric CT scans with caution. The diagnostic capabilities of computed tomography (CT) have had a significant impact on medical practice since the last decade of the 20th century. In a number of clinical situations, most notably the evaluation of chest illness and serious trauma, CT's advantages are unequaled. The stance that CT use is related with a minor but statistically significant increase in a patient's risk of cancer has lately been supported, however, by longitudinal follow-up of sizable populations of individuals who have undergone CT exams (Armao & Smith, 2014).

The typical ionizing radiation dose from a CT scan is between 5 and 50 millisieverts (mSv) for each organ that is scanned. The biological effects of x-rays are categorized as stochastic (causing genetic or cancerous damage) or deterministic (creating an immediate and predictable alteration to tissue) (Mathews, 2013). Deterministic consequences, which include alopecia, a burning sensation, ulcerative lesions, cataract development, and cardiovascular illness, happen when an x-ray dose

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

reaches a particular threshold. Although there have been well-publicized instances of patients undergoing CT angiography/perfusion studies of the brain who received high doses of radiation that resulted in hair loss, deterministic effects are uncommon at the levels of radiation received by patients undergoing noninvasive imaging procedures (Bogdanich, 2014). The biggest issue with medical imaging examinations is stochastic effects, which are typically brought on by radiation-induced mutations and depend on the radiation dose. The interaction of x-rays with DNA causes structural damage as well as stochastic consequences (Einstein, 2012).

The word stochastic refers to probabilistic phenomena; stochastic effects are thought to occur with a probability that rises with dose. They do not necessarily occur at a certain dose. In the context of exposure to low doses of x-rays, stochastic effects are generally believed to predominate; in this context, leukemia typically takes at least 2 years to grow and solid cancers typically require at least 5 years developing. Compared to fewer than 3 million in 1980, estimated 80 million CT exams were carried out in the US in 2010 (Brenner & Hricak, 2010). The National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements has conducted two thorough reviews of radiation exposure from all sources over the past 30 years, including naturally occurring background radiation and medical radiation from diagnostic x-rays and nuclear medicine procedures (Einstein, 2012). This organization was chartered

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

by Congress with the goal of ensuring the radiation safety of the US public.

In a retrospective cross-sectional investigation, Smith-Bindman and coworkers estimated the lifetime risk related to 11 popular types of diagnostic CT scans and described the effective radiation doses from those scans. Compared to traditional radiography, CT scans offer substantially higher radiation exposures. In contrast to a chest radiograph, a single CT scan of the chest offers an effective dose that is 100–1,000 times higher (Semelka, 2007). The usual practice of ordering several CT exams on the same patient increases radiation exposure from CT scans, which is already higher than that delivered during other medical imaging studies (Ai, 2020).

According to a retrospective review of 31,462 patients, 33% of them had received five or more CT scans throughout the course of the 22-year research period. The patient's baseline cancer risk increases gradually as a result of the cumulative CT radiation exposure that comes from such procedures (Sodickson, 2009). Furthermore, there are frequently noticeable fluctuations in radiation dosages. With a mean 13-fold range between the highest and lowest doses for identical CT procedures, a recent multi-institutional investigation of typical CT scans in the San Francisco Bay Area demonstrated significant variance in radiation doses within and between institutions. Therefore, the effective dose for a certain patient could significantly surpass the median depending on where and when they had their CT scan. There are no federal regulations

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

governing the uniformity of radiation dosages supplied by medical imaging, even though the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 2010 published a road map for decreasing and standardizing the radiation doses associated with CT scans. Instead, medical organisations and professional associations are now in charge of standardization (Armao & Smith, 2014).

According to the American College of Radiology (ACR), doses should be "as low as reasonably attainable" (ALARA), which refers to using the least amount of radiation necessary to produce an image with adequate diagnostic quality. The finest-quality images, which subject patients to the highest levels of radiation, are not always necessary to make a diagnosis; therefore healthcare professionals need to be aware of this. Lower-resolution scans are frequently diagnostic. The ACR has launched Image Wisely and is a founding member of the Image Gently campaign for pediatric imaging dose reduction (Al-sharify, 2020).

4. Radiation exposure and cancer risk with computed tomography

Given that some experimental and epidemiologic evidence has linked exposure to low-dose radiation to the development of solid organ cancers and leukaemia (Royal, 2008); the rapid increase in the use of CT has generated significant public concern regarding the doses of ionizing radiation delivered during scanning. It is well known that high doses of

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

ionizing radiation increase a person's lifetime risk of developing cancer, but it is uncertain if low-dose radiation (of the kind used in routine diagnostic tests) and oncogenesis are related (Freudenberg & Beyer, 2011).

The relationship between radiation exposure and the later emergence of neoplasia has mostly been inferred from studies of atomic bomb survivors in Japan in 1945[20] and from analyses of the elevated relative risk of neoplasia among workers exposed to radiation in the nuclear industry. Brenner et al. estimated that 1%–2% of all cancers in the United States would develop secondary to the effects of ionizing radiation delivered by medical imaging (Brenner & Hall, 2007), and a related study by Berrington de González et al. in 2009 predicted that 29000 additional cancer cases and 14500 additional deaths could be anticipated each year using this extrapolation method where small hypothetical risks are multiplied by enormous patient numbers (Berrington, 2009).

There is widespread disagreement regarding the amount of cumulative radiation dose delivered by medical imaging which increases the risk of cancer, despite the fact that there is little debate that large exposures to ionizing radiation, such as those seen in nuclear disasters, exponentially increase a person's risk of developing cancer (analysis of the fallout from the Chernobyl disaster has also highlighted an increased risk in thyroid cancer in those children exposed in utero downwind of Chernobyl) (Berrington Gonzále & Darby, 2004). Others contend that a practical threshold exists below which the risks of cancer are no greater than an individual's background spontaneous risk. While many authors contend that a linear no-threshold (LNT) model applies to the association between radiation and oncogenesis others disagree (Tubiana, 2005).

According to a recent study, a phenomenon known as hormesis, low-dose radiation exposure may potentially boost a person's immune system and so protect them from cancer. The claim that radiation causes cancer is a pretty general one. While certain organ systems have more effective defenses against the effects of ionizing radiation, others are more radiosensitive in general. For instance, while organs like the rectum, pancreas, and prostate are much less sensitive, the oesophagus, breast, and bladder are particularly susceptible (Al-sharify, 2020).

In more recent years, the validity of the linear no-threshold model has come under even more scrutiny. A comparison of the incidence of cancer in these two cities with other Japanese cities that weren't impacted by the nuclear explosions was made using data from the Radiation Effects Research Foundation (REFR), which has been tracking the victims of the Hiroshima and Nagaskai blasts. Colon cancer incidence was carefully examined because it is frequently used as a cancer indicator in the Japanese population. Researchers discovered that those who got radiation doses less than approximately 100 mSv did not have an increase in colon cancer incidence (Doss, 2012). It has been proposed that other risk variables for malignancy within a particular population can confuse the relationship between cancer risks and radiation exposures of less than 100 mSv (Hendee & O’Connor, 2012).

The threshold-quadratic model of radiation-induced cancer and the REFR data were more in agreement than the LNT model. The inherent baseline differences in cancer risk among Japanese people vs populations of a different ethnic distribution (for example, stomach cancer is 10 times more prevalent in the Japanese community compared with United States subjects, while breast cancer is three times more prevalent in the United States than in Japan) present another challenge in extrapolating the experience of atomic bomb survivors in Japan to those exposed to ionizing radiation in the medical setting (Preston, 2007).

The linear-no-threshold model was initially used to evaluate radiation risk because of its simplicity and conservative nature (i.e., the model is more likely to over-predict than under-predict the neoplastic risk associated with imaging), rather than because it has a strong biological and scientific foundation (Scott, 2008). There has been controversy around the LNT model since since Muller accepted his Nobel Prize in 1946 for his work analyzing genetic mutations in Drosphilia brought on by the action of X-rays (proposing the LNT model as a foundation for projecting oncogenesis). Global civilizations are starting to question its veracity. According to the Health Physics Society, "risks of health impacts are either too minor to be seen or are non-existent" for doses below 50–100 mSv (Calabrese, 2011).

The American Association of Physicists in Medicine endorsed this point of view, stating that predictions of hypothetical cancer incidence and deaths in patient populations exposed to such low doses are "highly speculative" and "should be discouraged" at dosages less than 50 mSv for single procedures and less than 100 mSv for multiple procedures. The most telling evidence is that the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, one of the leading international authorities on the effects of radiation on health, has endorsed this position and stated that "statistically significant elevations in risk are observed at doses of 100 to 200 mGy and above" and that at dose ranges lower than this, no definitive risk can be ascribed to ionizing radiation (Power & Moloney, 2016).

Despite earlier claims that even low radiation doses were linked to an increased risk of oncogenesis and that this risk increased linearly with exposure, it now appears that a threshold-model of risk may be more appropriate, with the risk increasing exponentially once cumulative doses of 100 mSv or more are reached. This does not, however, eliminate the risk posed by radiation or permit complacency when determining whether an indication is valid for a certain scan (Doss, 2014).

Patients who require recurrent imaging, such as those with long-term chronic medical issues, are more likely to be exposed to radiation in the range of > 100 mSv. A similar study examining maintenance haemodialysis patients discovered that 13% of this population experienced a cumulative dose of > 75 mSv over a median follow-up of 3.4 years (Kinsella, 2010). Crohn's patients were studied over a 15-year period (this patient subgroup has an increased risk of small bowel lymphoma at baseline). The total effective dose administered to each patient in critically ill trauma victims averages 106 59 mSv (although in this patient group the risks of avoiding imaging usually far outweigh the potential risk of future malignancy). The doses incurred by each individual exam can quickly add up given that the majority of CT scans

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

might average two to three imaging phases each study, especially in patients with chronic medical problems requiring continuing radiologic evaluation (Power & Moloney, 2016).

An observational study of CT scanning in .5 psychiatric patients

The appropriate application of brain scans in psychiatry is a topic of dispute. The authors of this study examined CT imaging in typical psychiatric situations in a district hospital. About 64% of brain scans in their study had some abnormalities. Patient diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment were affected by CT scanning. Additionally, roughly 3% of patient scans revealed possibly reversible intracranial disease that was previously undetected. Certain brain abnormalities may initially or exclusively manifest as psychiatric indications and symptoms. The use of brain imaging in psychiatric practice has been motivated by the prospect that some of these may be reversible. The question of how to properly employ brain computerized tomography (CT) imaging in psychiatry has been covered in a number of published researches (Al-sharify, 2020).

These studies made a variety of recommendations, ranging from encouraging imaging scans as a screening procedure for all patients while taking a chance on low yield to limiting the recommendation to only those patients who had obvious focal neurological abnormalities on examination while taking a chance on missing a rare diagnosis. As a result, there is a huge difference of opinion regarding how to use brain scans in mental illnesses. Additionally, the majority of hospitals in the UK now offer CT scans. They are commonly requested for psychiatric patients and are a reasonably affordable, fast, sensitive imaging diagnostic for the majority of brain abnormalities. CT is a diagnostic method that, if performed carelessly, may turn up incidental results with significant clinical ramifications. While more sensitive for a variety of disorders, newer, more advanced brain imaging techniques including magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), positron emission tomography (PET), and single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) are expensive, difficult to use, and not universally accessible (Armao & Smith, 2014).

When treating common mental illnesses, CT brain scanning continues to offer important insights into diagnosis and prognosis as well as management. The scans also have added utility in clinical treatment, albeit it appears that their major value is in excluding improbable diagnosis options. Most of the participants in our study were dementia patients. Given the psychological and financial toll that dementia causes, CT scans could nevertheless offer valuable data for clinical management, and their use would be made justifiable. The widespread use of CT scanners in most UK hospitals may also be supported by the rising need for cholinesterase inhibitor therapies for dementia patients. To ascertain the relative effectiveness of using this diagnostic resource, further

ISSN: 2707-7675

research required given the high prevalence of CT abnormalities in psychiatric illnesses (Ai, 2020).

Despite the high percentage of excellent outcomes, we don't think all psychiatric patients need to have routine CT scans. Making the most economical use of this method is crucial because brain scanning may be one of the most expensive diagnostic tests that psychiatrists request. Future, larger studies might be beneficial in determining the most appropriate clinical and other criteria to further define the appropriateness for CT brain scanning in psychiatry. The development of clinical predictors is required to serve as markers for neuroimaging that may affect patient care (Elheis, 2007).

Strategies for CT Radiation Dose Reduction .6

Despite the fact that it is hard to envision modern medicine without CT, there is solid evidence that a significant portion of the 80 million CT tests that are conducted yearly in the United States are ordered without a valid medical reason. Since 20% to 50% of CT scans may be substituted by another form of imaging or avoided altogether, according to reliable authorities like the Radiological Society of North America (RSNA) and the American College of Radiology (ACR), appropriateness criteria for CT scans are crucial (Einstein, 2012). Recent meaningful use regulations, which included computerized radiology order entry with embedded decision support, have shown promise in lowering the growth rate of CT imaging (Armao, Elias, & Semelka, 2013).

Additionally, complementary imaging techniques like magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or ultrasound should always be taken into account (Newman & Callahan, 2012). In many pediatric therapeutic contexts, such as the assessment of abdominal pain or acute appendicitis, ultrasound is a helpful and adaptable modality because it does not involve radiation exposure or the use of sedatives. Additionally, for many patients, a properly conducted and interpreted MRI is just as excellent as or even superior than a CT scan conducted in the same clinical setting. The FDA has now mandated the use of dose-reduction technologies in new CT machines as part of the push for patient-centered treatment and safety (Amis, 2011).

The most recent CT scanners include features like automatic exposure control, iterative reconstruction, safety cutoffs to prevent excessive doses, and reminders for coupling protocols to patient size (which are crucial for CT scanning pediatric patients). Because they enable CT scans to be conducted with much lower radiation doses while maintaining diagnostic quality, recent iterative reconstructive approaches have been a godsend to radiation dose-reduction efforts. Future targets include bringing CT effective doses down to less than 1 mSv, which is below the annual dose typical from naturally occurring radiation sources (McCollough, 2012).

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

Unquestionably, CT has had a substantial impact on diagnostic radiology over the past few decades, but there is serious worry that the radiation associated with CT scans may represent serious health hazards, both to the patient and to the general public. Despite the wide range of views on the precise nature of this health danger, it is ultimately the responsibility of healthcare professionals to protect patients (Elias & Semelka, 2013). "If we assume there are radiation risks when there are none, we will be expending effort and resources to minimize nonexistent risks; however, if there truly are radiation risks that we chose to ignore, we will have exposed our patients to long-term detrimental consequences," Semelke and Elias wrote in a recent textbook on radiology and health care. A collaborative learning quality improvement effort has just been started by UNC Hospitals and its community hospital affiliates as a step toward the standardization and optimization of radiation doses in pediatric CT. It has been made possible by leaders from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina, the Cecil G. Sheps Center for Health Services Research, the UNC Gillings School of Global Public Health, and Chatham Hospital Imaging Center (Armao & Smith, 2014).

7. Computed tomography: recommendations for the future

The relationship between radiation exposure and oncogenesis is still not completely understood. Nevertheless, using a dose that is "as low as reasonably practicable" should always be the aim when imaging patients. Imaging should only be utilized when the possible clinical benefit outweighs the potential harm, regardless of the risk. The International Commission of Radiologic Protection outlines the following three fundamental radiation principles: (1) justification; (2) dose optimization; and (3) dose limitation (Power & Moloney, 2016).

Low-dose procedures must become the norm as it has been demonstrated that they have no effect on diagnostic yield. A single scan has a modest danger, according to recent evidence, but cumulative doses can increase with CT expansion. The popular media frequently sensationalizes the extrapolation of small carcinogenic risks in the individual to cumulative cancer rates in the population, causing significant distress and anxiety among the public and making patients and their families reluctant to undergo scans that may be in their best interests (Kim, 2012).

Education of doctors and patients will be a part of radiation optimization in the future. The Image Wisely® and Image Gently® campaigns are two examples of such programs. Parents and doctors can get information about the radiation safety of the pediatric population from Image Gently®, which also gives dosage optimization advice. The Image Wisely® campaign advocates for radiation protection among adults and has created an honor roll for organizations and facilities that have promised to "image wisely" in their work (Applegate & Cost, 2013).

Under the name Step Lightly®, the Image Gently® effort has been expanded to include detailed instructions on pediatric interventional procedures (Sidhu, 2010). The Food and Drug Administration has also started a nationwide program to lessen needless radiation exposure to patients in reaction to the Cedar-Sinai scandal in the United States. It is clear that doctors are failing to adequately inform their patients, no matter how minor, of the possible consequences of radiation exposure. Radiation risk must be included in the consent process before the procedure where there is a significant danger of radiation dose exposure, such as during interventional procedures. The medical profession must address patient education regarding the dangers of radiation exposure as radiologic tests become more common in order to appropriately express potential risk (Caverly, 2013).

Several organizations, including the Interventional Radiology Patient Safety Program, have released guidelines that have led to practice changes in cases where high radiation doses were being administered intraprocedurally (teele, 2012). The dose given to each patient can be reduced by incorporating audit into radiology departments as normal practice. It will also be helpful when educating our patients about these scans. The creation of national reference standards for particular CT exams will enable auditing at the local, state, and worldwide levels (McCollough, Branham, & Herlihy V, 2011). Even though there is ongoing debate over the precise oncogenic risk connected to CT scanning, ignoring the problem is unacceptable; instead, audit, education, and reassessment are crucial for better comprehension and safer practices (Power & Moloney, 2016).

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

Conclusion .8

It is common knowledge that the majority of illnesses that affect both humans and animals have a biological basis. Therefore, the most accurate method for forecasting these diseases is frequently a biochemical one. To fully comprehend a subject's health, a diagnosis is crucial in the field of medicine. Comprehending a patient's metabolic profile is essential for understanding the condition. Several imaging techniques are available to accomplish this. Due to their improved sensitivity and specificity, computed tomography (CT) is a commonly used imaging method that has been successful in diagnostic tests. These methods can provide insight into a patient's medical condition and accurately and precisely predict a variety of diseases.

Overall, CT is a well-known imaging method that employs computer processing and a succession of X-ray pictures taken from various angles. Through this integration, cross-sectional images of the tissues, bones, and blood arteries inside the body can be created using CT scans. As a result, this method is more effective and accurate than a standard X-ray. Nevertheless, it is anticipated that any potential problems with their utilization may be removed or decreased if enhancement efforts are pursued in these procedures. Additionally, there is a lot of room for these imaging techniques to develop with potential cost savings and improved research.

Ionizing radiation is used in computed tomography (CT) scans to provide fine-grained cross-sectional images of the body. The usage of diagnostic

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

pictures has rapidly increased over the past 20 years due to the ability to diagnose diseases early and with greater accuracy. Concerns have been expressed about the potential for patient harm and the overuse of CT scans. Ionizing radiation, a recognized human carcinogen, is given to patients during CT scans. The majority of the current data used to estimate the cancer risk brought on by low-dose radiation comes from atomic bomb survivors. One or two CT scans' worth of radiation exposure, or about 20 mSv on average for radiation workers in the nuclear business, was shown to represent a risk in a few occupational studies. Studies have shown that pediatric CTs increase the risk of leukemia and brain malignancies. Studies evaluating the impact of low-level ionizing radiation exposure from medical procedures on people, however, are scarce.

Reference

Ai, T. Y. (2020). Correlation of chest CT and RT-PCR testing in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: a report of 1014 cases. Radiology, 200642.

Al-sharify, Z. T.-s. (2020). A critical review on medical imaging techniques (CT and PET scans) in the medical field. IOP Conference Series Materials Science and Engineering. 870. 012043. 10.

Amis, E. J. (2011). CT radiation dose: trending in the right direction. Radiology. ;261(1):5-8.

Applegate, K., & Cost, N. (2013). Image Gently: a campaign to reduce children’s and adolescents’ risk for cancer during adulthood. J Adolesc Health. ;52:S93–S97.

Armao, D., & Smith, J. (2014). The health risks of ionizing radiation from computed tomography. N C Med J.;75(2):126, 128-31. doi: 10.18043/ncm.75.2.126. PMID: 24663135.

Armao, D., Elias, J., & Semelka, R. (2013). Are we doing the right study? In: Semelka RC, Elias J Jr, eds. Health Care Reform in Radiology. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.; :86-114.

Berrington Gonzále, A., & Darby, S. (2004). Risk of cancer from diagnostic X-rays: estimates for the UK and 14 other countries. Lancet. ;363:345–351.

Berrington, d. G. (2009). Projected cancer risks from computed tomographic scans performed in the United States in 2007. Arch Intern Med. ;169:2071–2077. .

Bogdanich, W. (2014). West Virginia hospital overradiated brain scan patients, records show. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/06/health /06radiation.html. .

Brenner, D., & Hall, E. (2007). Computed Tomography - An Increasing Source of Radiation Exposure. N Engl J Med. ;357:2277–2284.

Brenner, D., & Hricak, H. (2010). . Radiation exposure from medical imaging: time to regulate? JAMA. ;304(2):208-209.

Calabrese, E. (2011). Muller's Nobel lecture on dose-response for ionizing radiation: ideology or science? Arch Toxicol. ;85:1495–1498.

Caverly, T. P.-S. (2013). Weighing the potential harms of computed tomography: patient survey. JAMA Intern Med. ;173:588–590; discussion 590.

Doss, M. (2012). Shifting the paradigm in radiation safety. Dose Response. ;10:562–583.

Doss, M. (2014). Linear no-threshold model may not be appropriate for estimating cancer risk from CT. Radiology. ;270:307–308.

Einstein, A. (2012). Effects of radiation exposure from cardiac imaging: how good are the data? J Am Coll Cardiol. ;59(6):553-565.

Elheis, M. &. (2007). An observational study of CT scanning in psychiatric patients. Progress in Neurology and Psychiatry. 11. 24 - 31. 10.1002/pnp.18. .

Elias, J. J., & Semelka, R. (2013). Radiation dose reduction. In: Semelka RC, Elias J Jr, eds. Health Care Reform in Radiology. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.; :22-35.

Esses, D. B. (2004). Ability of CT to alter decision making in elderly patients with acute abdominal pain. Am J Emerg Med. 22:270–272.

ISSN: 2707-7675

Fazel, R. K. (2009). Exposure to low-dose ionizing radiation from medical imaging procedures. N Engl J Med. 361:849–857.

Freudenberg, L., & Beyer, T. (2011). Subjective perception of radiation risk. J Nucl Med. ;52 Suppl 2:29S–35S.

Freudenberg, L., & Beyer, T. (2011). Subjective perception of radiation risk. J Nucl Med. 52 Suppl 2:29S–35S.

Ginat, D., & Gupta, R. (2014). Advances in Computed Tomography Imaging Technology. Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering. 16:1,431-453.

Hendee, W., & O'Connor, M. (2012). Radiation risks of medical imaging: separating fact from fantasy. Radiology. ;264:312–321.

Hricak, H. B. (2011). Managing radiation use in medical imaging: a multifaceted challenge. Radiology. ;258:889–905.

Karatas, O. H., & Toy, E. (2014). Three-dimensional imaging techniques: A literature review. European journal of dentistry, 8(1), 132–140. doi:10.4103/1305-7456.126269.

Kim, K. K. (2012). Low-dose abdominal CT for evaluating suspected appendicitis. N Engl J Med. ;366:1596–1605.

Kinsella, S. C. (2010). Maintenance hemodialysis patients have high cumulative radiation exposure. Kidney Int. ;78:789–793.

Mathews, J. F. (2013). 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.

McCollough, C. C. (2012). Achieving routine submillisievert CT scanning: report from the summit on management of radiation dose in CT. Radiology. ;264(2):567-580.

McCollough, C., Branham, T., & Herlihy V, B. M.-G. (2011). Diagnostic reference levels from the ACR CT Accreditation Program. J Am Coll Radiol. ;8:795–803.

Mettler, F. T. (2008). Medical radiation exposure in the U.S. in 2006: preliminary results. Health Phys. 2008;95:502–507.

Moorrees, J., & Bezak, E. (2012). Four dimensional CT imaging: a review of current technologies and modalities. Australasian Physical & Engineering Sciences in Medicine, 35(1), pp.9-23.

Newman, B., & Callahan, M. (2012). Reply to commentary—"CT radiation dose reduction: can we do harm by doing good?" Pediatr Radiol. ;42(4):399-401.

Power, S. M. (2016). Computed tomography and patient risk: Facts, perceptions and uncertainties. World J Radiol. 28;8(12):902-915. doi: 10.4329/wjr.v8.i12.902. PMID: 28070242; PMCID: PMC5183924.

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

Power, S. P., & Moloney, F. T. (2016). Computed tomography and patient risk: Facts, perceptions and uncertainties. World journal of radiology, 8(12), 902–915. doi:10.4329/wjr.v8.i12.902 21.

Preston, D. R. (2007). Solid cancer incidence in atomic bomb survivors: 1958-1998. Radiat Res. ;168:1–64.

Royal, H. (2008). Effects of low level radiation-what’s new? Semin Nucl Med. ;38:392–402.

Scott, B. (2008). Low-dose radiation risk extrapolation fallacy associated with the linear-no-threshold model. Hum Exp Toxicol. ;27:163–168.

Semelka, R. A. (2007). Imaging strategies to reduce the risk of radiation in CT studies, including selective substitution with MRI. J Magn Reson Imaging. ;25(5):900-909.

Sidhu, M. (2010). Radiation safety in pediatric interventional radiology: Step Lightly. Pediatr Radiol. ;40:511–513.

Sodickson, A. B. (2009). Recurrent CT, cumulative radiation exposure, and associated radiation-induced cancer risks from CT of adults. Radiology. ;251(1):175-184.

teele, J. J. (2012). Quality initiatives: Establishing an interventional radiology patient radiation safety program. Radiographics. ;32:277–287.

Journal of University Studies for inclusive Research (USRIJ)
مجلة الدراسات الجامعية للبحوث الشاملة
ISSN: 2707-7675

Tubiana, M. (2005). Dose-effect relationship and estimation of the carcinogenic effects of low doses of ionizing radiation: the joint report of the Académie des Sciences (Paris) and of the Académie Nationale de Médecine. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. ;63:317–3.