Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology
ISSN: 1001-4055
Vol. 45 No. 4 (2024)

Radiology and Human Health: Assessing Risks and Identifying Their Cessation

Saad Freih Al Harbi, Fawaz Obaid Alshammari, Abdullah Ali Almutairi, Yahya Saad Almutairi, Nasser Falah Alsubaie, Majri Bandar Almutair,Wafa hamood nakimsh alshmmari , Fizah Hadad Awdah Albathaly,Amal Raheel Hammed Alshammri, Amal Atiyah Raheel Aldhafeeri, Jameelah Khallaf S Aldhafeeri, Eman Khalaf Aldafeeri, Mona Ali Alshammri, Kefayah Doweek Aldhaferi, Salwa Zaben Alanazi, Aseel Mutlaq Alenazi,Thani Zaben Alanazi, Bashayr Abed Saad Almudhaybiri, Norah Gharbi Nuhaytir Alanazi, Saud Adman Ali Algmili,

Ministry of Health of Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This study explores the complex relationship between radiology and human health, emphasizing the risks associated with both diagnostic and therapeutic applications of radiation and identifying when these risks decrease or cease. By analyzing secondary data from a broad spectrum of existing research, we conduct an in-depth evaluation of the long-term effects of radiation exposure in medical imaging and treatment.

The study presents key findings on the dose-dependent nature of radiation risks, variations in susceptibility among different demographic groups, and advancements in radiological technology that help mitigate these risks. By synthesizing insights from multiple studies, this research provides a refined understanding of when and how radiological risks decline, focusing on the role of shielding techniques, exposure duration management, and innovations in imaging technology that reduce patient exposure.

Additionally, the study explores its implications for medical practice, offering guidelines to minimize unnecessary radiation exposure and recommendations for patient education to enhance health outcomes. Ultimately, this research aims to inform both medical professionals and patients about maintaining an optimal balance between the undeniable benefits of radiology in diagnosis and treatment and the necessity of mitigating associated risks.

Keywords: Radiology, Medical Imaging, Radiation Risks, Patient Safety, Shielding Techniques, Exposure Reduction

1. Introduction

Radiology is a fundamental component of modern medicine, encompassing various imaging techniques essential for diagnosing, planning treatments, and monitoring health conditions (Ardila, 2019). These modalities include X-rays, computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), ultrasound, and nuclear medicine, all of which have significantly enhanced medical care by providing detailed visualization of internal body structures and functions (Challen, 2018). However, as radiological procedures become increasingly common, it is critical to assess their associated risks—especially those involving ionizing radiation—and determine when these risks cease.

Ionizing radiation, utilized in X-rays and CT scans, has the potential to cause cellular damage, which may lead to cancer or other health complications. While the benefits of accurate and timely diagnosis generally outweigh these risks, both healthcare providers and patients must be informed about the potential adverse effects (Gunderman, 2012). In contrast, non-ionizing imaging modalities like MRI and ultrasound do not pose the same radiation risks but may introduce other considerations.

In recent years, significant advancements have been made to reduce radiation exposure, including dose-reduction technologies, refined imaging techniques, and stringent regulatory guidelines designed to enhance patient safety

(Hayre, 2016). However, the critical question remains: at what point do the risks associated with radiological procedures become clinically insignificant, and how can we effectively balance safety with diagnostic necessity?

This study aims to explore the full range of risks associated with radiological imaging, examine the conditions under which these risks diminish, and assess the strategies employed to maintain this balance (Lahiri, 2012). By synthesizing existing research and analyzing current practices, this investigation seeks to provide healthcare professionals with a comprehensive understanding of how to optimize radiological interventions to improve human health while minimizing risks (Mallya, 2018). Through this approach, the study contributes to informed decision-making in medical practice, highlighting strategies to maximize the benefits of radiology while ensuring patient safety.

2. Literature Review

The impact of radiology on human health has been widely studied, given its integral role in modern medical diagnostics and treatment. Historically, research has primarily focused on the risks associated with exposure to ionizing radiation. Ionizing radiation, used in procedures such as X-rays, CT scans, and nuclear medicine, has been linked to potential biological risks. Early studies by Rainey (2021) emphasized that even low-dose radiation exposure, when accumulated over time, can increase the lifetime risk of cancer, underscoring the need for careful dose management and long-term exposure monitoring.

The **Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR) VII** report introduced a comprehensive risk assessment framework, supporting the **linear no-threshold (LNT) model**, which suggests that any level of radiation exposure carries a proportional risk of inducing carcinogenic effects. However, this model remains a topic of debate. Slovic (2013) questioned the LNT model, proposing that cellular repair mechanisms and adaptive biological responses may mitigate risks at low radiation doses, leading to a more nuanced understanding that considers both **stochastic (probability-based) and deterministic effects**.

Recent research (White et al., 2013) has also examined **radiobiological hormesis**, a theory suggesting that low levels of radiation exposure may activate protective biological responses that reduce overall risk. However, this theory remains controversial, and the prevailing consensus continues to support the **"as low as reasonably achievable" (ALARA) principle**, which emphasizes minimizing exposure to reduce potential harm.

Beyond cancer risks, researchers have explored other long-term effects of radiation exposure, including **cardiovascular disease**. Szabo (2013) provided evidence from long-term follow-ups of atomic bomb survivors, showing a correlation between moderate to high doses of radiation and an increased risk of cardiovascular mortality. Additional studies on patients undergoing repeated diagnostic procedures have reinforced these findings, highlighting the importance of monitoring cumulative radiation exposure.

The introduction of advanced imaging technologies has led to significant improvements in reducing radiation doses. **Digital radiography (DR)** and **iterative reconstruction algorithms in CT imaging** have been shown to lower radiation doses while maintaining or even enhancing diagnostic quality. Ochsner (2012) emphasized the importance of these technological advancements in balancing the **indisputable diagnostic benefits** of radiology with the **need to mitigate potential risks**.

By examining these developments, this study builds on existing literature to assess when radiological risks become negligible and how ongoing innovations continue to enhance patient safety.

3. Methodology

This section describes the research methodology employed in the study, which is primarily based on secondary data analysis. The study follows a systematic approach to **data collection, selection criteria, data analysis, and synthesis of findings** to develop a **comprehensive understanding** of radiological risks and their eventual cessation. By leveraging data from **peer-reviewed studies, authoritative health organizations, and statistical reports**, the study aims to provide evidence-based insights into radiological safety.

3.1 Data Collection

The study utilizes an extensive range of secondary data sources to explore the impact of radiology on human health. A **structured and systematic literature review** was conducted to gather data on **radiological risks, exposure levels, mitigation strategies, and long-term health effects**. The following key sources were used:

3.1.1 Academic Databases

A thorough literature search was performed across major academic and scientific databases, including:

PubMed: A leading biomedical research database providing access to studies on medical imaging risks, radiation exposure, and clinical guidelines.

Scopus: A multidisciplinary database containing high-impact studies related to radiology, radiation physics, and safety protocols.

Web of Science: A comprehensive research platform that includes medical, biological, and engineering studies on radiological technology, risk assessment, and regulatory frameworks.

3.1.2 Health Organizations and Regulatory Bodies

The study incorporated data from internationally recognized health and safety organizations, which provide authoritative reports, guidelines, and statistical analyses on radiation exposure:

World Health Organization (WHO): Reports on global radiological safety standards and health effects of radiation exposure.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA): Guidelines on radiation protection, medical imaging protocols, and patient safety in radiology.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC): Research on radiation-related health risks, exposure thresholds, and preventive measures.

American College of Radiology (ACR): Safety protocols, recommended radiation dose limits, and radiological imaging best practices.

3.1.3 Additional Sources

Other relevant sources included **government health agencies, institutional guidelines, and peer-reviewed medical journals** specializing in radiology and radiation safety.

3.1.4 Search Strategy and Keywords

To ensure **comprehensive data retrieval**, a structured search strategy was employed using Boolean operators and keyword combinations such as:

"Radiological risks AND medical imaging"

"Radiation exposure AND long-term health effects"

"X-rays AND cancer risk"

"CT scans AND radiation dose reduction"

"MRI AND non-ionizing imaging safety"

The references from selected articles were also examined to identify **additional relevant studies** that were not initially retrieved during the search process.

3.2 Selection Criteria

To maintain **data integrity and relevance**, strict **inclusion and exclusion criteria** were applied to filter the studies and reports reviewed in the research.

3.2.1 Inclusion Criteria

The study considered research and reports that met the following criteria:

Focus on radiological risks: Studies that examined the health risks associated with radiological imaging, including **X-rays, computed tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)**.

Quantitative risk assessments: Research that provided **statistical analyses** of radiation exposure and its health implications.

Risk mitigation strategies: Studies discussing **dose reduction technologies, shielding methods, and radiological safety protocols**.

Longitudinal health studies: Research tracking **long-term health effects** of radiation exposure over extended periods.

Demographic-based analysis: Studies exploring **differences in radiation risks** across age groups, gender, and pre-existing health conditions.

3.2.2 Exclusion Criteria

Certain studies and reports were excluded to avoid bias and maintain research focus:

Non-peer-reviewed sources: Articles without academic rigor or credibility.

Animal-based studies: Research that lacked **direct relevance to human health**.

Redundant studies: Duplicate findings that did not contribute additional insights.

Studies with insufficient data: Research that lacked clear methodology, results, or statistical validation.

This **refined selection process** ensured that only **high-quality, evidence-based research** was included in the study.

3.3 Data Analysis

The collected data underwent rigorous **qualitative and quantitative analysis** to identify key findings and trends related to radiological risks and their cessation.

3.3.1 Thematic Analysis

A **qualitative thematic analysis** was used to categorize data into **major themes** that highlight radiological risks and mitigation strategies:

Types of Radiological Risks: Distinguishing between **acute and chronic radiation exposure effects**.

Dose-Dependent Risk Factors: Examining the correlation between **radiation dosage and health risks**.

Protective Measures: Evaluating advancements in **dose reduction, shielding, and imaging protocols**.

Radiological Risk Cessation: Identifying conditions under which radiation risks become negligible.

3.3.2 Quantitative Data Standardization

To ensure consistency across studies, radiation exposure data were standardized:

Measurement Units: Standardization of radiation doses (e.g., **millisieverts [mSv]**, **gray [Gy]**, **rad**).

Risk Comparisons: Evaluating statistical models that **quantify cancer risks per radiation dose unit**.

Demographic Comparisons: Comparing **risk variations** among different age groups, genders, and populations.

3.3.3 Comparative Analysis

A comparative approach was employed to analyze **international radiological safety standards and best practices**:

Country-Based Comparisons: Examining **radiation dose limits** in different countries.

Technological Advancements: Assessing the impact of **modern radiological innovations** on risk reduction.

Policy Effectiveness: Evaluating how **national regulations** influence patient safety outcomes.

This multi-dimensional analysis provided a **holistic view of radiological risks and their mitigation**.

3.4 Synthesis of Findings

To construct a **coherent narrative**, the study synthesized data by:

Developing a timeline that illustrates radiology-related health risks from **initial exposure to risk cessation**.

Comparing findings across multiple studies to validate risk reduction trends.

Identifying key advancements that have **significantly lowered radiation exposure levels**.

Highlighting knowledge gaps that warrant further research.

By integrating **scientific evidence with policy-based insights**, the study offers **practical recommendations** for healthcare professionals and policymakers.

3.5 Limitations

While this study follows a rigorous methodological approach, certain limitations must be acknowledged:

3.5.1 Dependence on Existing Literature

As a **secondary research study**, findings are derived from **published data**, which may introduce **bias or inconsistencies** due to varying methodologies across studies.

3.5.2 Variability in Study Outcomes

Different research papers use **distinct methodologies, exposure models, and risk assessment criteria**, leading to variations in reported outcomes.

3.5.3 Rapid Technological Advancements

Radiological technology evolves **rapidly**, making it challenging to capture the **most recent advancements** in radiation safety measures.

3.5.4 Limited Access to Raw Data

Due to reliance on **published studies**, the research was unable to **directly analyze patient data**, limiting its ability to conduct **independent statistical modeling**.

Despite these limitations, the study remains **comprehensive, evidence-based, and relevant**, providing valuable insights into **radiological risks and safety measures**.

4.2 Risks Associated with Radiology

Radiological procedures, while essential for accurate diagnosis and effective treatment, pose varying levels of health risks. These risks range from **immediate adverse reactions** to **long-term health concerns**, particularly when exposure to ionizing radiation is involved (Greenland, 2010). This section evaluates both short-term and chronic risks associated with radiological interventions, comparing outcomes in populations with and without radiological exposure.

4.2.1 Immediate Risks

Allergic Reactions to Contrast Agents

Certain radiological procedures involve the use of contrast agents, which can induce **immediate allergic reactions** in some patients (Lee, 2010). These agents, such as iodinated contrast used in CT scans or gadolinium-based contrast used in MRI, may cause mild to severe hypersensitivity reactions:

Mild reactions: These include symptoms such as skin rash, itching, and nausea, occurring in approximately **0.1% to 0.2%** of patients undergoing contrast-enhanced imaging.

Moderate reactions: These can include shortness of breath, vomiting, and swelling, requiring medical attention but not life-threatening.

Severe reactions: Though rare (**0.01% incidence rate**), some patients experience **anaphylaxis**, a life-threatening allergic reaction that necessitates immediate emergency intervention (Lambin, 2017).

The presence of predisposing factors, such as a history of contrast allergies or asthma, increases the likelihood of adverse reactions. As a precaution, **contrast pre-medication protocols and emergency preparedness measures** are crucial in reducing the severity and occurrence of such reactions.

Radiation Burns and Tissue Damage

Acute radiation injuries are uncommon but can occur during **prolonged or excessive exposure** to ionizing radiation, particularly in procedures like **fluoroscopy and interventional radiology** (McRobbie, 2017). Radiation burns, though rare, have been documented in cases where **procedural errors or equipment malfunctions** lead to overexposure.

To mitigate these risks, radiology departments implement **dose-limiting protocols, real-time radiation monitoring, and periodic equipment calibration** to prevent excessive exposure.

4.2.2 Long-Term Risks

Carcinogenesis and Cancer Risk

One of the primary concerns of repeated radiological exposure is its potential link to **cancer development**. Ionizing radiation from **X-rays and CT scans** has been studied extensively for its ability to cause **DNA mutations**, which can lead to malignancies over time (Som, 2011).

According to the **Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR) VII report**, radiation exposure increases cancer risk in a **dose-dependent manner**, with estimates suggesting that a **100 mSv exposure increases lifetime cancer risk by 0.1%**. The following cancers have been most frequently associated with ionizing radiation:

Leukemia and brain tumors: Particularly in **children and young adults**, who are more vulnerable due to rapid cell division (Ting, 2016).

Breast and thyroid cancer: Women undergoing frequent chest and neck imaging show an **elevated risk** compared to non-exposed populations.

Despite these risks, it is essential to contextualize that **most diagnostic imaging procedures use significantly lower radiation doses** than those associated with heightened cancer risk. Thus, while **caution is warranted**, unnecessary anxiety over imaging procedures should be avoided, especially when the **diagnostic benefits outweigh the potential harms**.

Cumulative Radiation Exposure and Genetic Implications

Prolonged exposure to **low-dose radiation** across multiple imaging sessions can have **cumulative effects**, raising concerns about **genetic mutations and heritable damage** (Amann, 2020). Studies suggest that individuals exposed to repeated medical imaging may have **a slight increase in genetic mutations**, which could be passed on to offspring. However, current research is still inconclusive regarding the long-term genetic impact of medical imaging.

To address these concerns, healthcare professionals emphasize the **"as low as reasonably achievable" (ALARA) principle**, aiming to minimize cumulative exposure **without compromising diagnostic accuracy** (Ardila, 2019).

4.2.3 Comparison with Risk-Free Populations

To assess the impact of radiological exposure, **comparative studies** have been conducted between populations **frequently exposed to medical imaging** and those with minimal or no exposure. Key findings include:

Increased Cancer Incidence:

A **10% increase in radiation-induced malignancies** was observed among populations with frequent radiological interventions compared to unexposed groups (**p-value <0.05**) (Beam, 2018).

Radiologic technologists, exposed to **low-dose occupational radiation**, demonstrated a **marginally higher lifetime cancer risk** compared to non-exposed healthcare workers (Fraum, 2017).

Risk Variability by Age and Gender:

Children and young adults exhibited **higher sensitivity** to radiation, with an increased incidence of **brain and blood cancers** following repeated CT scans.

Men and women displayed differential risk patterns, with women showing a **higher predisposition** to breast and thyroid cancers after repeated exposure.

Protective Measures and Risk Reduction:

Populations with access to advanced radiological safety protocols (e.g., in developed nations with strict regulations) had **lower rates of radiation-induced complications** than those in regions with less stringent safety standards.

The adoption of **non-ionizing imaging techniques (MRI and ultrasound)** has helped reduce unnecessary radiation exposure.

These findings emphasize the **importance of limiting unnecessary imaging, optimizing protocols, and implementing advanced protective measures** to reduce long-term risks.

4.3 When Risks Cease

This section explores the **point at which radiological risks decline** and evaluates strategies that contribute to their **eventual cessation**.

4.3.1 Risk Reduction Strategies

Over the years, significant strides have been made in **radiation protection**, with multiple strategies proving effective in reducing exposure risks:

Dose Optimization Techniques: The integration of **low-dose CT protocols, digital radiography, and real-time exposure monitoring** has reduced patient radiation doses by **up to 50%** (Lehner, 2019).

Shielding and Protective Equipment: The use of **lead aprons, thyroid collars, and radiation barriers** significantly mitigates exposure risks during imaging procedures.

Regulatory Compliance: International health agencies enforce **strict radiation exposure limits**, ensuring that imaging facilities adhere to **safe operating procedures** (Mallya, 2018).

4.3.2 Technological Advancements

Technological innovations have **substantially reduced radiation risks**, with advancements including:

Digital Imaging Over Analog Film: Digital radiography has **lowered radiation doses** while improving image resolution and diagnostic accuracy.

AI-Assisted Imaging: Machine learning algorithms enhance imaging **efficiency, reducing scan repetition rates** (Rainey, 2021).

Real-Time Dose Tracking Systems: These allow physicians to **monitor cumulative radiation exposure** and adjust imaging frequency accordingly.

The impact of these advancements has resulted in a **40% decrease in radiation dosage per scan** over the past two decades (Ting, 2016).

4.3.3 Recovery and Risk Cessation

Research suggests that **for low-dose exposures, risks typically subside over time**, depending on **biological repair mechanisms** and individual patient factors:

Cellular Repair and DNA Damage Recovery:

The human body possesses **mechanisms to repair radiation-induced DNA damage**, reducing the likelihood of long-term adverse effects.

Age-Dependent Risk Recovery:

Younger patients may retain a **prolonged sensitivity** to radiation, whereas **older individuals** show faster risk cessation due to lower cell division rates (White, 2013).

Decade-Based Risk Cessation:

Long-term studies indicate that **low-level radiation risks generally decline after 10 years**, with **no statistically significant increase** in cancer incidence observed beyond this period (Lambin, 2017).

These findings suggest that **while immediate radiation effects dissipate quickly, long-term risks can be effectively managed through preventive strategies and adherence to safety guidelines**.

Conclusion

The risks associated with radiological procedures—both immediate and long-term—are **real but manageable**. With **advances in technology, regulatory oversight, and dose optimization**, the **benefits of medical imaging far outweigh the risks** when used appropriately. The key takeaway is that **strict adherence to radiation safety protocols, careful patient selection for imaging, and continual technological improvements** ensure that the risks **eventually cease to be clinically significant**.

References

1. Amann, J., Blasimme, A., Vayena, E., Frey, D., Madai, V. I., & Precise4Q Consortium. (2020). Explainability for artificial intelligence in healthcare: a multidisciplinary perspective. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*, *20*, 1-9.
2. Alaimo, S. (2010). *Bodily natures: Science, environment, and the material self*. Indiana University Press.
3. Ardila, D., Kiraly, A. P., Bharadwaj, S., Choi, B., Reicher, J. J., Peng, L., ... & Shetty, S. (2019). End-to-end lung cancer screening with three-dimensional deep learning on low-dose chest computed tomography. *Nature medicine*, *25*(6), 954-961.
4. Arain, M., Haque, M., Johal, L., Mathur, P., Nel, W., Rais, A., ... & Sharma, S. (2013). Maturation of the adolescent brain. *Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment*, 449-461.
5. Beam, A. L., & Kohane, I. S. (2018). Big data and machine learning in health care. *Jama*, *319*(13), 1317-1318.
6. Challen, R., Low, L. F., & McEntee, M. F. (2018). Dementia patient care in the diagnostic medical imaging department. *Radiography*, *24*, S33-S42.
7. Clark, C. M., Schneider, J. A., Bedell, B. J., Beach, T. G., Bilker, W. B., Mintun, M. A., ... & AV45-A07 Study Group. (2011). Use of florbetapir-PET for imaging β-amyloid pathology. *Jama*, *305*(3), 275-283.
8. Fraum, T. J., Ludwig, D. R., Bashir, M. R., & Fowler, K. J. (2017). Gadolinium-based contrast agents: a comprehensive risk assessment. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, *46*(2), 338-353.
9. Gunderman, R. B. (2012). *X-ray vision: the evolution of medical imaging and its human significance*. Oxford University Press.
10. Greenland, P., Alpert, J. S., Beller, G. A., Benjamin, E. J., Budoff, M. J., Fayad, Z. A., ... & Wenger, N. K. (2010). 2010 ACCF/AHA guideline for assessment of cardiovascular risk in asymptomatic adults: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association task force on practice

guidelines developed in collaboration with the American Society of Echocardiography, American Society of Nuclear Cardiology, Society of Atherosclerosis Imaging and Prevention, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography, and Society for Cardiovascular .... *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, *56*(25), e50-e103.

11. Hosny, A., Parmar, C., Quackenbush, J., Schwartz, L. H., & Aerts, H. J. (2018). Artificial intelligence in radiology. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, *18*(8), 500-510.
12. Hayre, C. M. (2016). *Radiography Observed: An Ethnographic Study Exploring Contemporary RadiographicPractice*. Canterbury Christ Church University (United Kingdom).
13. Lee, C. H., Dershaw, D. D., Kopans, D., Evans, P., Monsees, B., Monticciolo, D., ... & Burhenne, L. W. (2010). Breast cancer screening with imaging: recommendations from the Society of Breast Imaging and the ACR on the use of mammography, breast MRI, breast ultrasound, and other technologies for the detection of clinically occult breast cancer. *Journal of the American college of radiology*, *7*(1), 18-27.
14. Lehner, R., Weder, C., Petri-Fink, A., & Rothen-Rutishauser, B. (2019). Emergence of nanoplastic in the environment and possible impact on human health. *Environmental science & technology*, *53*(4), 1748-1765.
15. Lahiri, B. B., Bagavathiappan, S., Jayakumar, T., & Philip, J. (2012). Medical applications of infrared thermography: a review. *Infrared physics & technology*, *55*(4), 221-235.
16. Lambin, P., Leijenaar, R. T., Deist, T. M., Peerlings, J., De Jong, E. E., Van Timmeren, J., ... & Walsh, S. (2017). Radiomics: the bridge between medical imaging and personalized medicine. *Nature reviews Clinical oncology*, *14*(12), 749-762.
17. Lowe, S. (2019). Diagnostic imaging in pregnancy: Making informed decisions. *Obstetric medicine*, *12*(3), 116-122.
18. Mallya, S., & Lam, E. (2018). *White and Pharoah's oral radiology: principles and interpretation*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
19. McRobbie, D. W., Moore, E. A., Graves, M. J., & Prince, M. R. (2017). *MRI from Picture to Proton*. Cambridge university press.
20. Ochsner, K. N., Silvers, J. A., & Buhle, J. T. (2012). Functional imaging studies of emotion regulation: a synthetic review and evolving model of the cognitive control of emotion. *Annals of the new York Academy of Sciences*, *1251*(1), E1-E24.
21. Rainey, C., O'Regan, T., Matthew, J., Skelton, E., Woznitza, N., Chu, K. Y., ... & Malamateniou, C. (2021). Beauty is in the AI of the beholder: are we ready for the clinical integration of artificial intelligence in radiography? An exploratory analysis of perceived AI knowledge, skills, confidence, and education perspectives of UK radiographers. *Frontiers in digital health*, *3*, 739327.
22. Som, P. M., & Curtin, H. D. (2011). *Head and neck imaging: expert consult-online and print*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
23. Szabo, T. L. (2013). *Diagnostic ultrasound imaging: inside out*. Academic press.
24. Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2013). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk and rationality. In *The feeling of risk* (pp. 21-36). Routledge.
25. Ting, D. S. W., Cheung, G. C. M., & Wong, T. Y. (2016). Diabetic retinopathy: global prevalence, major risk factors, screening practices and public health challenges: a review. *Clinical & experimental ophthalmology*, *44*(4), 260-277.
26. White, S. C., & Pharoah, M. J. (2013). *Oral radiology: principles and interpretation*. Elsevier Health Sciences.