



## **Physician's Knowledge on X-ray Exposure from CT Scans in a Moroccan Hospital**

**Bouchra Amaoui<sup>1\*</sup>, Abdennasser El Kharras<sup>2</sup> and Slimane Semghouli<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Regional Center of Oncology, Agadir, Morocco.*

<sup>2</sup>*Faculty of Pharmacy and Medicine, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco.*

<sup>3</sup>*Higher Institute of Nursing Professions and Health Techniques, Agadir, Morocco.*

### **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Authors BA and SS designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors BA, AEK and SS managed the analyses of the study. Author SS managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

### **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/JAMMR/2019/v30i730215

#### Editor(s):

(1) Babatunde Olanrewaju Motayo, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

#### Reviewers:

(1) Mohammed Sidi, Bayero University Kano (BUK), Nigeria.

(2) Wiseman Bekelesi, Hiroshima University, Japan.

(3) Norbert Leitgeb, Graz University of Technology, Austria.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/50911>

**Review Article**

**Received 19 June 2019**

**Accepted 27 August 2019**

**Published 31 August 2019**

### **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Computed tomography (CT) is a major source of ionizing radiation exposure in medical diagnostic. Patients more exposed related to radiation are supposed to be more susceptible to health risks.

**Purpose:** The aim of this study was to assess physician's knowledge of radiation doses and potential health risks of radiation exposure from CT.

**Materials and Methods:** A standardized questionnaire was distributed to physicians. The questionnaire covered the demographic data of the prescriber, the frequency of referrals for CT scan examinations, the physicians' knowledge of radiation doses, the potential health risks of radiation exposure from CT scan and training on patients' radiation protection. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Microsoft Office Excel 2007.

**Results:** A total of 72 physicians (55%) completed the questionnaire. Ninety nine percent of the practitioners' prescribe CT examinations for patients during their exercises but only 10% of physicians use the guideline during CT prescriptions. Thirty eight percent of prescribers took into account the ratio benefit/risk related to x-rays during radiological exam prescription. While 4% of

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [bamaoui73gmail.com](mailto:bamaoui73gmail.com), [bamaoui73@gmail.com](mailto:bamaoui73@gmail.com);

prescribers' explained the risk related to x-rays to the patients during radiological exam prescription, 14% of physicians have correctly estimated the effective dose received during an abdomen pelvic scan compared to the dose of a standard chest x-ray radiograph in an adult. Fifty four percent of doctors underestimated the lifetime risk of fatal cancer attributable to a single computed tomography scan of the abdomen pelvic and 8% of practitioners have received formal training on risks to patients from radiation exposure.

**Conclusion:** The present study showed the limited knowledge of radiation exposure for the Physicians. Recurrent training in advanced radiation protection of patients could lead to significant improvements in knowledge and practice of CT prescribers.

*Keywords: CT scan examinations; patients' radiation protection; X-ray risks.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Every day in each hospital, physicians use various X-ray technologies to screen diagnose, stage and treat cancers with the aim of saving lives [1]. The use of CT in medical diagnosis delivers radiation doses to patients which are higher than those from other radiological procedures. Biological effects resulting from the accumulation of low doses received during repetitive diagnostic medicals imaging could be harmful. The cancer radiogenic is well documented [2,3], indeed the lifetime attribute to the risk of cancer is 1 for every 82 in high-use groups [4] and 1 in every 1000 CT abdomen pelvic examination [5]. For example, in the United Kingdom, it has been estimated that 100 to 250 death cases occur each year because of the radiological exposures [6,7].

In any diagnostic procedure the dose of radiation delivered should be [8,9] just enough to answer the relevant clinical question. Moreover, it should be as low as reasonably achievable to minimise the risk to the patient. It is very important that physicians who prescribe radiological imaging should be well trained in deciding whether diagnostic imaging is necessary and have an accurate knowledge of the associated risks.

The absence of studies on doctor's knowledge in Moroccan Hospitals and the lack of knowledge on the medical exposure per inhabitant in Morocco [10,11,12,13] initiated us to undertake the current study. The aim of this study is to assess knowledge of patient radiation exposure from CT examinations prescribed in Hassan II Hospital.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 The Study Population

Out of the 130 physician's practitioners in our hospital, 72 participated in the questionnaire

giving a response rate of 55%. There were 42 men (sex ratio 1.4). The study group contained the General practitioners, Interns, Surgeons and Medical specialists. The percentage of each specialty was respectively 10%, 19%, 36% and 37%. The average professional experience for all participants was  $10,29 \pm 0,83$  years with 58% of them having more than 10 years of experience.

### 2.2 The Questionnaire

The investigated population included the prescribers of CT scans in Hassan II hospital. In total, the entire population studied comprised 130 practitioners. The participants in this study have received a standardized questionnaire.

The 16 sections of the questionnaire were designed to evaluate the current practice regarding the prescriptions of CT examinations. The questionnaire covered five main areas:

The first requested demographic data of prescriber (department, gender, qualification, years of experiences). The second section included questions and it aimed at investigating how frequently doctors prescribe CT scans, use a guide of medical imaging examinations before prescription. Also the questionnaire focused on their knowledge of using x rays benefit / risk ratio and asked if patients were routinely informed about possible health risks. The third section tackled doctors' knowledge on radiation doses that can be evaluated by using two approaches: participants were asked to compare the average effective dose received during CT scan of Abdomen pelvic and Radiography Skull examinations which have been evaluated at  $\approx 11$  mSv and  $\geq 0,07$  mSv respectively<sup>5</sup>. On the other hand, evaluate the average effective dose received during CT scan of Abdomen pelvic examination. The fourth dealt with prescriber's knowledge of the risk of cancer induction after one CT scan Abdomen pelvic examination. Finally, we asked doctors if they had already

received training with regards to radiation protection.


### 2.3 Statistical Analysis

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Microsoft Office Excel 2007.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1 Current Prescribers Practice Regarding CT Examinations

Ninety nine percent of respondents to the survey were prescribers of CT examinations. The physicians non prescribers were Medical specialists in dermatology. Only 8% of our study group used a guideline for prescribing the less irradiating exam. It was constituted by 33% of Interns and 20% of General practitioners. Thirty eight percent of them said that they take into account the benefit /risk ratio of X-rays when prescribing a scanner, while 54% sometimes use it and 8% never. The benefit/risk of X-rays is still considered by 42% of senior doctors and only 17% of juniors. Only 4% of practitioners have always informed patients about the probable risks due to their exposure to X-radiation, while 68% did so occasionally and 28% never. Thus only 5% of Physicians seniors have always passed such information to the patient, while Interns represent 0%.



### 3.2 Knowledge of Doses and Health Risks Related to Radiations by Doctors

On the assessment of the effective dose received during an abdomen-pelvic CT compared to chest X-ray front, 14% of our practitioners had correctly assessed that dose. 11% had overestimated it while 54% of practitioners had underestimated it and 21% have no answers, regardless of the different specialties (Fig. 1).

During the absolute evaluation of the dose delivered during a standard abdomen-pelvic CT, with reference to natural radiation in Morocco estimated to average 2.5 mSv per year, 8% of practitioners had correctly assessed the dose. 10% of prescribers had overestimated it, 58% underestimated it while 21% had expressed no opinion (Fig. 2).

Estimations of doses delivered were misjudged, and the risk of radiation-induced cancer were greatly underestimated since a large majority of practitioners (58%) had replied that there was no risk of radiation-induced cancer due to the realization of one abdomen-pelvic CT (Fig. 3).

### 3.3 Further Education and Training

Only 8% of clinicians had already benefited from training in radiation protection of patients The more detailed analysis showed that neither




Fig. 1. Assessment of knowledge of the effective dose received during an abdomen-pelvic CT comparatively to an adult chest radiography by physicians per speciality




Fig. 2. Assessment of the knowledge of effective dose received during an abdomen-pelvic CT comparatively to annual background exposure in Morocco by physicians per speciality




Fig. 3. Assessment of knowledge on radiation-induced cancer after one abdomen-pelvic CT by physicians per speciality

Intern, General Doctor nor Surgeon had received training of this type while only 20% of Medical Specialists have received such training.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

Our study group showed that Physician's knowledge of radiation exposure from medical imaging is insufficient, and that is due to the fact that they don't inform their patients of the risks of radiation exposure, and they underestimate radiation exposure of frequently used diagnostic imaging and the associated risks.

Only 8% of physicians of this study used a guideline during prescriptions of CT exam. Yet the European directive on the radiation protection for medical purposes requires justification of the radiological procedure which is one of the necessary steps to obtain the radiation protection of patients as part of a quality assurance process [14]. The lack of use of referral guidelines could be explained by the Moroccan radiologists by the absence of national protocols [15]. Thirty eight percent of prescribers in our study group took into account the ratio benefit/ risk. This result is much lower than 70% reported by Gervaise et al. in a similar study for a population of French

hospital doctors [5]. As well, It is twice more than 15.6% reported by Faragai et al. in a similar study for a population of Nigerian doctors [16]. Only 4% of our physicians group have explained the x ray risk to the patients during prescription. This result is much lower than 22% reported by Lee et al. in a similar study for a population of emergency physicians in USA [17] and than 25% reported by Gervaise et al. in a similar study for a population of French hospital doctors [5]. The knowledge on radiation doses in our study group is limited. In detail, we asked to compare the average effective dose received during an abdomen pelvic CT scan in adults to a standard chest radiograph. Only 14% of the study participants answered correctly. This result is lower than 30% reported by Lee et al. in a similar study for a population of emergency physicians in USA [17]. And it is also less than 32,5% obtained by Merzenich et al. in a similar study in Germany [1] . It is more than 13% reported by Gervaise et al. in a similar study for a population of French hospital doctors [5]. The physician's knowledge on the lifetime risk for the development of cancer after one abdomen pelvic CT examination was answered correctly by only 42% (approx.1 cancer death per 1,000 deaths) of responds in our study group [18,19]. This result is higher than 12,5% reported by Jacob et al. for a population of hospital doctors [20]. It is approximately the same as the 31% obtained by Rice et al. for a population of paediatrics surgeons [21]. It is higher than 39% reported by Gervaise et al. in a similar study for a population of French hospital doctors [5]. The poor knowledge results achieved in this study could be explained by many factors: About 92% of the questioned doctors reported that they have never undergone formal training on patients' radioprotection. This reflects a poor knowledge of the principles of radiation protection by our clinicians. This result is higher than 75% reported by Gerben et al. for a physician population of the Australian emergency departments [22], and higher than 34% reported by Gervaise et al. in a similar study for a population of French hospital doctors [5].

## 5. CONCLUSION

The objective of this study was to explore physician's knowledge of patients' radiological protection when prescribing their CT exams. The results obtained showed limited knowledge of radiation exposure for the physicians. Recurrent training in advanced radioprotection of patients could lead to significant improvements in the knowledge and practice of CT prescribers.

## CONSENT

It is not applicable.

## ETHICAL APPROVAL

It is not applicable.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Merzenich H, Krille L, Hammer G, Kaiser M, Yamashita S, Zeeb H. Paediatric CT scan usage and referrals of children to computed tomography in Germany-a cross-sectional survey of medical practice and awareness of radiation related health risks among physicians. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2012;12:47. DOI: 10.1186/1472-6963-12-47
2. Ron E. Cancer risks from medical radiation. *Health Phys*. 2003;85:47-59.
3. Mather R. The physics of CT dose. Toshiba America Medical Systems Inc.
4. Griffey RT, Sodickson A. Cumulative radiation exposure and cancer risk estimates in emergency department patients undergoing repeat or multiple CT. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2009;192(4):887-92. Doi:10.2214/AJR.08.1351
5. Gervaise A, Esparbe-Vigneau E, Pernin M, Naulet T, Porton Y, Lampierre CM. Evaluation of knowledge prescribing CT examinations on the radiation protection of patients. *Radiology Journal*, 2011;92:671-678.
6. Einstein AJ, Henzlova MJ, Rajagopalan S. Estimated risk of cancer with radiation exposure from 64-slice computed tomography coronary angiography. *JAMA*. 2007;298:317-323.
7. Shiralkar S, Rennie A, Snow M, et al. Doctors' knowledge of radiation exposure: Questionnaire Study. *BMJ*. 2003;327. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7411.371>
8. Health Physics Society. ALARA. Available:<http://www.hps.org/public/information/radterms/radfact1.html> [Accessed Mar 2019]

9. Cember H. Introduction to health physics. McGraw-Hill: 3<sup>rd</sup> edition; 1996.
10. Semghouli S, Amaoui B, El Kharras A, Bouykhlaif K, Hakam OK, Choukr A. Evaluation of radiation risks during CT brain procedures for adults. Perspectives in Science Journal (in press); 2019. DOI: 10.1016/j.pisc.2019.100407
11. Semghouli S, Amaoui B, Hakam OK, Choukri A. Radiation exposure during pelvimetry CT procedures in Ibn Sina Children's Hospital of Rabat. Radiation Physics and Chemistry (in press); 2018. DOI: 10.1016/j.radphyschem.2018.12.007
12. Semghouli S, Amaoui B, Maamri. Estimated radiation exposure from medical imaging for patients of radiology service of Al Faraby Hospital, Oujda Morocco. International Journal of Cancer Therapy and Oncology. 2015;3(3):3325.
13. Semghouli S, Amaoui B, El Kharras, Shaim A, Choukri A, Hakam A. Physicians knowledge of radiation risk in prescribing CT imaging in Moroccan hospitals. Br.J. Appl. Sci. Technol. 2017;20(3):1.
14. Council Directive 97/43/EURATOM/ of 30 June 1997 on Health protection of individuals against the dangers of ionizing radiation in relation to medical exposure and repealing Directive 84/466/Euratom. (OJ L-180 of 9 July 1997).
15. Semghouli S, Amaoui B, El Fahssi M, Choukri A, Hakam OK. Practitioners' Knowledge on Patients' Radioprotection in Emergency and Radiology Services of Hassan II Hospital Agadir Morocco. International Journal of Modern Physics and Applications. 2015;1(5):205-209.
16. Faragai RA, Ugwu CA, Hassan M, Mohammed S. How Knowledgeable are Non-Radiology Doctors on Ionizing Radiation? J Rad & Radiat Sci. 2019;33(1): 17–20.
17. Lee CI, Haims AH, Monico EP, Brink JA, Forman HP. Diagnostic CT scans: Assessment of patient, physician, and radiologist awareness of radiation dose and possible risks. Radiology Journal. 2004;231(2):393-8.
18. Board on Radiation Effects Research Division on Earth and Life Studies, Committee to Assess Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation. Health Risks From Exposure To Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation Beir VII Phase 2. National Research Council of The National Academies Press, Washington, DC; 2006.
19. Brenner DJ, Doll R, Goodhead DT, Salle E J, Terre CE, Little JB, Lubin JH, Preston D L, Preston RJ, Puskin J, Ron E, Sachs RK, Samet JM, Setlow RB, Zaider M. Cancer risks attributable to low doses of ionizing radiation: Assessing what we really know. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2003;25:100(24): 13761-6.
20. Jacob K, Vivian G, Stell JR. X ray dose training: Are we exposed to enough? Clin Radiology. 2004;59:928–934.
21. Rice HE, Frush DP, Harker MJ, Farmer D, Waldhausen JH. Peer assessment of pediatric surgeons for potential risks of radiation exposure from computed tomography scans. J Pediatr Surg. 2007;42(7): 1157-64. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2007.02.007
22. Gerben B Keijzers, Charles J Britton. Doctors' knowledge of patient radiation exposure from diagnostic imaging requested in the emergency department. Medical Journal of Australia. 2010; 193(8):450-3.

© 2019 Amaoui et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*

*<http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/50911>*