Patients Exposure Doses for CT examination in Japan 2011

Yuta Matsunaga
E-mail : i6euqj27@yahoo.co.jp
abstract number : 2355843

Y. Matsunaga [1], T. Otsuka [2] , Y. Takikawa [1], M. Yamada [1] , M. Kobayashi [3] ,Y. Kataoka [3], S. Suzuki [4]

[1] **Department of Imaging, Nagoya Kyouritsu Hospital, Aichi, 454-0933, Japan.**
[2] **Department of Radiology, Daido hospital**
[3] **Department of Radiology, Fujita Health University hospital**
[4] **School of Health Sciences, Fujita Health University**

1. Objective

Published diagnostic reference levels (DRLs) for X-ray computed tomography (CT) examinations available in Japan include the target dose levels for medical settings involving radiography (scout and contrast-enhanced), interventional radiology, CT examination, and nuclear medicine examination as specified in the Guideline for Medical Exposure 2006[1)] by the Japan Association of Radiological Technologists (JART). Internationally, DRLs for adults and children are specified by the International Commission on Radiological Protection in its publications ICRP publ. 87[2)] and ICRP publ. 102[3)] (table 1. table 2).

According to OECD Health Data 2011[4)], which contains a wide variety of comparative data from 34 countries, the number of X-ray CT systems available per million population has been increasing(Fig. 1). It is notable that Japan, which reported 14.4 systems per million population in 1981, had increased this rate to 97.3 by 2008, significantly higher than even the second-ranking country, Australia, which reported a rate of 42.5 in 2010. In Japan, 350.37 X-ray CT examinations per thousand population were undertaken in 2011 (Fig. 2).

The objective of this study was to acquire basic data for generating DRLs and for assessing the currently available exposure doses in X-ray CT examinations in Japan.

Table 1. CTDIvol Adult guideline and DRL [mGy]

Examination	JART	ICRP.87
Head	65	60
Chest	–	30
Abdomen	20	35

※Head is Calculated values of CTDIvol relate to the 16cm diameter dosimetry phantom
※Japan's Abdomen Calculated values of CTDIvol relate to the 30cm diameter dosimetry phantom
※ICRP.87's Chest and Abdomen Calculated values of CTDIvol relate to the 32cm diameter dosimetry phantom

Table 2. CTDIvol Child DRL [mGy]

Examination	ICRP.102
Head	43
Chest	13

※Calculated values of CTDIvol relate to the 16cm diameter dosimetry phantom



Figure1. The possession number of CT examination equipments of each country



Fig. 2 The number of CT exaninations of each country

2.Methods

2.1. Questionnaire-based survey

Data on CT examination systems and imaging conditions were obtained from a questionnaire-based survey undertaken at 3,000 medical institutions throughout Japan. Questionnaires were sent to 3,000 randomly selected institutions. The survey focused on the names of radiographic systems, tube voltage, tube amperage, pitch factor, rotating time, monitor-displayed CT dose index volume (CTDIvol), and other items. Target parts of the body were child/adult heads, child/adult chests, and child/adult abdomens.

2.2. Dose assessments

Doses were assessed in terms of CTDIvol as calculated with the ImPACT dose estimation program. CTDIvol values for the head, chest, and abdomen of children and adults were calculated from the imaging condition data obtained from the questionnaire-based survey.

2.3. Doses by irradiation site at the same institution

Doses at various irradiation sites were calculated from the imaging conditions used at a selected representative institution (institution-A) and compared with the results of the nationwide survey.

3.Results

3.1. Questionnaires were recovered from 1,306 institutions, the recovery rate being 43.6% among the 3,000 institutions in Japan. The number of institutions providing calculable data was 291 for child heads with non-helical scans, 140 for child heads with helical scans, 178 for child chests, and 182 for child abdomens. Regarding adult data, the number of institutions was 544 for adult heads with non-helical scans, 331 for adult heads with helical scans, 353 for adult chests, and 392 for adult abdomens. The mean, standard deviation, textile/quartile dose (75% dose), maximum values, and minimum values of CTDIvol as calculated with the ImPACT program were tabulated by irradiation site for both children and adults(Table 3 and 4). CTDIvol values calculated with the ImPACT program from cranial CT data are shown in histograms(Fig.3). The mean for cranial non-helical scans was 82.3 mGy for adults and 42.2 mGy for children. The mean for cranial helical scans was 74.1 mGy for adults and 45.4 mGy for children. The helical values were lower than the non-helical values. CTDIvol values calculated from thoracic and abdominal CT data are also shown in histograms(Fig.4). The mean for thoracic scans was 14.6 mGy for adults and 7.2 mGy for children. The mean for abdominal scans was 18.6 mGy for adults and 6.6 mGy for children. A comparison of these national means with the guideline values for adult CT examinations specified in the JART Guideline 2006 reveals that the cranial CTDIvol was 1.14 times for helical scans and 1.27 times for non-helical scans; the abdominal CTDIvol was 0.93 times. Meanwhile, a comparison of the national means with the DRLs specified in the international standard ICRP Publ. 87, 102 reveals the cranial CTDIvol in children was 1.05 times for helical scans and 0.98 times for non-helical scans; and the thoracic CTDIvol for children was 0.55 times. For adults, the cranial CTDIvol was 1.37 times for helical scans and 1.23 times for non-helical scans; the thoracic CTDIvol was 0.49 times and the abdominal CTDIvol 0.53 times.

3.2 Adult cranial, thoracic, and abdominal CTDIvol values obtained at representative institution-A were tabulated (Table.5). The national means and the institution-A data for CTDIvol values were graphically represented(Fig.5). The thoracic and abdominal values were lower than the national means, whereas the cranial values exceeded the national means for both helical and non-helical scans. A comparison of our findings with the JART Guideline 2006 reveals that the cranial CTDIvol was 2.06 times for helical scans and 3.32 times for non-helical scans; the abdominal CTDIvol was 0.47 times. A comparison of the institution-A data and the DRLs specified in ICRP publ. 87 reveals that the cranial CTDIvol was 2.23 times for helical scans and 3.60 times for non-helical scans; the thoracic CTDIvol was 0.39 times, and the abdominal CTDIvol was 0.27 times.









Figuire 3 The histogram of CTDIvol for a Head X-rays CT examination





Figuire 4 The histogram of CTDIvol for a Chest･Abdomen X-rays CT examination

Table 3. CTDIvol of each parts for a Child [mGy]

Examination	Average	Standard deviation	Maximum	Minimum	75%dose
Head (Non-Helical scan)	42.2	19.5	161.3	4.3	50.3
Head (Helical scan)	45.4	29.1	231.9	0.5	50.9
Chest	7.2	4.7	28.0	0.2	9.8
Abdomen	6.6	3.2	14.2	1.1	13.9

Table 4. CTDIvol of each parts for a Adult [mGy]

Examination	Average	Standard deviation	Maximum	Minimum	75%dose
Head (Non-Helical scan)	82.3	29.0	250.3	11.1	97.2
Head (Helical scan)	74.1	36.3	207.7	1.1	101.6
Chest	14.6	10.0	111.2	0.5	19.3
Abdomen	18.7	9.3	69.8	3.6	23.7

Table5 CTDIvol of adult's head, a chest, and an abdomen in the institution A

Examination	CTDIvol[mGy]
Head (Non-Helical scan)	215.7
Head (Helical scan)	133.7
Chest	11.7
Abdomen	9.3



Figuire 5 CTDIvol of average value and the institution A (adult)

4.Conclusion

The Japanese national mean CTDIvol values for adult chest and abdomen were lower than the DRLs specified in JART Guideline 2006 and ICRP publ. 87. However, the national mean CTDIvol value for adult head exceeded the DRLs specified in JART Guideline 2006 and ICRP publ. 87.

Many institutions in Japan have endeavored to reduce thoracic and abdominal exposures and have recognized the need to reduce cranial exposures. Child CTDIvol values — whether of the head, chest, or abdomen — were 30% to 50% of the corresponding adult doses. Furthermore, mean child CTDIvol values were lower than, or equivalent to, the DRLs specified in ICRP publ. 102. We attribute this to institutional efforts to reduce exposure doses in children. The cranial (both helical and non-helical) CTDIvol values obtained at institution-A were higher than the DRLs specified in JART Guideline 2006 and ICRP pub. 87, as well as the national means. On the other hand, the thoracic CTDIvol value was lower than the national mean, and the abdominal CTDIvol was lower than both the national mean and the target value specified in the Guideline. It was therefore necessary to establish appropriate imaging conditions at each institution in order to optimize exposure doses in CT examinations.

The present study provides basic data for assessing exposure doses of patients undergoing CT examinations in Japan and for generating diagnostic reference levels (DRLs).