https://africanjournalofbiomedicalresearch.com/index.php/AJBR
Afr. J. Biomed. Res. Vol. 28(3s) (April 2025); 385-391
Research Article

Knowledge And Practice of Radiation Protection Among Healthcare Professionals in The Operation Theater: A Comprehensive Review

[1]Mr. Praveen Yadav, [1]Mr. Dinesh Verma, [1]Mr. Saurabh Gautam, [2]Dr. Mahendra Kumar Verma, [3]Mr. Dheeraj Barma, [4]Dr. Vivek Chouhan, [5]Miss. Nimisha Jain, Wilson Hrangkhawl[1*]

[1]M Sc. Radiation & Imaging Technology, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur
[2]Professor, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, Rajasthan
[3]Associate Professor, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, Rajasthan
[4,5]Assistant Professor, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, Rajasthan

***Corresponding author:** Wilson Hrangkhawl
*Medical Imaging Technology, Dept. of Allied Health Professions, Sikkim Manipal Institute of Medical Sciences, Gangtok, East Sikkim, Sikkim, Email: radiosearchhrangkhawl@gmail.com

Abstract
Radiation safety in operating rooms has undergone a significant transformation, moving from a long-ignored issue to a top occupational health priority for medical professionals everywhere. Ionizing radiation has transformed surgical and diagnostic capabilities since Wilhelm Rontgen's revolutionary discovery of X-rays in 1895, providing previously unheardof instruments for medical intervention (Röntgen, 1896). But there are serious health risks associated with this revolutionary technology as well, especially for those who are exposed to it frequently at work. This review delves into the historical and contemporary landscape of radiation protection knowledge and practices among healthcare professionals in the operating theater, exploring key developments, persistent knowledge gaps, implementation barriers, and emerging innovations. Our focus is on cultivating a robust culture of safety that safeguards these essential personnel. Synthesizing insights from over a century of scientific literature and recent global surveys, this paper advocates for strategic reforms in policy, training, and technological adoption to mitigate risks and ensure the long-term health and well-being of healthcare providers.

***Author of correspondence Email:** radiosearchhrangkhawl@gmail.com*

Received: 25/05/2025 Accepted:27/05/2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.53555/AJBR.v28i3S.7764

1.Introduction

The introduction of ionizing radiation into clinical practice stands as a watershed moment in the history of modern medicine. X-rays, CT scans, and fluoroscopic imaging have become indispensable tools, integral to a wide array of surgical and diagnostic procedures (Fuchs, 1896). These technologies o er clinicians the ability to visualize the human body with remarkable clarity, enabling more precise diagnoses and less invasive treatments. Yet, this enhanced capability comes at a price: occupational hazards, especially for healthcare professionals working in operation theaters. The frequent exposure to ionizing radiation, often inherent in image-guided procedures, elevates the risk of both stochastic e ects, such as malignancies, and deterministic e ects, including cataracts (ICRP, 2007).

2. A Historical Journey Through Radiation Safety (1895–1960)

2.1 The Era of Unwitting Exposure (1895–1910)

The medical community's initial encounter with X-rays was marked by both excitement and a profound lack of understanding. Within mere months of Rontgen's groundbreaking discovery in 1895, clinicians were enthusiastically exploring the potential of X-rays for a wide range of applications, extending beyond surgical navigation and diagnostic purposes to include even casual demonstrations and entertainment (Röntgen, 1896). Early applications included the localization of foreign bodies, the reduction of fractures, and even exploratory attempts at treating various ailments, all with a surprisingly limited grasp of the underlying biological e ects. This period was largely characterized by a widespread lack of awareness regarding the potential dangers of ionizing radiation. It was a time of enthusiastic exploration, unburdened by the safety concerns that would later become paramount (Fuchs, 1896).

Tragically, the risks of radiation exposure were poorly understood, often dangerously underestimated. E ective protective measures were virtually nonexistent, and many early users, including physicians, pioneering technicians, and even patients, developed debilitating and sometimes fatal injuries (Geiger & Müller, 1928). These early injuries, often manifesting as severe skin burns and chronic ulcers, were eventually recognized as "radiodermatitis." The acute e ects of high-dose radiation, such as erythema and tissue necrosis, were sometimes observed and documented, but the insidious long-term consequences of chronic low-dose exposure remained a largely uncharted mystery (Groedel et al., 1925).

2.2 The Dawn of Recognition and Rudimentary Protection (1910s–1930s)

As the number of radiation-related injuries continued to mount, the need for more e ective protection became increasingly apparent. The pioneering work of individuals such as Marie Curie and others who dedicated their careers to unraveling the mysteries of radioactivity played a crucial role in elucidating the nature of radiation and its complex interactions with matter (Curie, 1911). This growing body of scientific evidence gradually shifted the prevailing perception of X-rays, transforming them from a seemingly miraculous tool to one that demanded careful and cautious handling. In response to these growing concerns, hospitals began to experiment with rudimentary protective measures, such as lead aprons and primitive screens (Hennecart, 1905). However, the use of this equipment was inconsistent and often haphazard. Skepticism about the actual risks of radiation exposure, coupled with a general lack of standardized training, and the limitations of the available equipment, hindered widespread adoption of these protective practices. Many physicians, perhaps swayed by the immediate benefits of X-rays in diagnosis and treatment, believed that these benefits far outweighed the potential risks (Russ, 1915).

2.3 The Emergence of Regulation (1940s–1960s)

The period following World War II witnessed significant advances in the fields of nuclear physics and radiobiology, leading to a more profound understanding of the hazards associated with radiation. The Manhattan Project, with its intensive research into the e ects of radiation, generated a wealth of data on the biological consequences of exposure, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of both the acute and chronic risks (UNSCEAR, 2008). This era saw the emergence of formal regulatory bodies, most notably the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP).

The ICRP, while established in 1928, began to exert significant influence during this period, formalizing its recommendations for radiation protection. Basic occupational dose limits were introduced, representing a critical step in quantifying and controlling exposure (ICRP, 2007). Radiation safety began to be incorporated into medical curricula, although often in a limited and inconsistent manner. Key concepts such as the ALARA (As Low as Reasonably Achievable) principle began to take root, emphasizing the importance of minimizing exposure even below the established regulatory limits (AERB, 2014). However, the enforcement of these early regulations was often inconsistent and uneven, and many healthcare professionals continued to lack adequate training in fundamental radiation safety practices (IAEA, 2014).

3. Institutionalizing Radiation Protection (1960–2024)

3.1 The Growth of International Standards and Policy (1960s–1990s)

The latter half of the 20th century was characterized by the increasing formalization of radiation protection through the development of international and national policies. Influential agencies such as the ICRP, the United Nations Scientific Committee on the E ects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR), and the World Health Organization (WHO) assumed increasingly prominent roles in promoting standardized exposure limits and defining institutional responsibilities (WHO, 2016).

The ICRP's recommendations evolved significantly during this period, expanding to include more detailed and comprehensive guidance on occupational exposure, public exposure, and the concept of potential exposures (ICRP, 2007). National regulatory bodies in many countries adopted these recommendations, translating them into enforceable laws and regulations, thereby providing a legal framework for radiation safety (IAEA, 2014). Personal dosimetry, the use of shielding devices, and the provision of regular training began to feature more prominently in healthcare settings.

3.2 The Digital Revolution and the Interventional Era (2000s–2024)

The early 21st century has been marked by a period of unprecedented technological advancement in medicine, most notably the dramatic increase in the use of image-guided procedures. Minimally invasive surgical techniques, now commonplace in specialties such as interventional radiology, cardiology, and orthopedics, rely heavily on fluoroscopy and other forms of ionizing radiation to provide real-time visualization of the surgical field (Tsapaki & Rehani, 2007). This technological revolution has led to significant benefits for patients, including reduced recovery times, smaller incisions, and improved overall outcomes.

However, occupational radiation exposure has also increased in tandem with this greater reliance on image-guided interventions. Nowadays, ionizing radiation exposure is more common among surgeons, anesthesiologists, nurses, and radiologic technologists, many of whom lack proper training or awareness of the risks involved in these procedures (Kharita et al., 2010). Innovative solutions to these problems have included interactive e-learning modules, lighter and more comfortable personal protective equipment, and electronic dose tracking systems, all of which have improved safety procedures (Fletcher et al., 2020). For instance, real-time monitoring systems give users instant feedback on their radiation exposure, which encourages them to change their behavior and take appropriate action (UNSCEAR, 2008).

4.Knowledge of Radiation Hazards: Assessing the Current Landscape

According to numerous studies, radiologists and radiographers are more knowledgeable about radiation safety than other professionals who work in operating rooms because of their specialized education and training (Ramanaidu et al., 2014). As part of their formal education, these medical professionals are taught a great deal about radiation biology, radiation physics, and radiation protection.

On the other hand, non-radiology personnel, such as surgeons, anesthesiologists, and nurses, frequently struggle with basic ideas like the characteristics of scatter radiation, the di erent radiation dose units (such as Sieverts and Grays), and the di erent radiation sensitivity of various organs and tissues (Meo et al., 2015). Scatter radiation poses a significant and often underappreciated risk in the operating theater environment, as it can expose individuals who are not directly in the path of the primary radiation beam (Fuchs, 1896).

5.Bridging the Theory-Practice Divide: Analyzing Practice Patterns

Even though there are established guidelines and recommendations for radiation safety, actual operating room practice frequently falls short of the ideal. In the area of radiation safety, this continuous disparity between theoretical understanding and real-world implementation is a major and continuing challenge (WHO, 2016).

Inappropriate shielding, irregular PPE use, and inadequate monitoring are some of the factors causing this disparity. Furthermore, institutional and cultural elements, like the general focus on e iciency and speed, can make it more di icult to follow safety procedures (IAEA, 2014). These di iculties are made worse by heavy workloads and demanding work environments, which encourage shortcuts and disregard for accepted safety procedures (Kharita et al., 2010).

6.Persistent Challenges in Radiation Safety

The widespread adoption of the best radiation safety practices is still hampered by a number of enduring issues, despite tremendous progress in our knowledge of radiation hazards and the creation of ever-more-e ective preventative measures. These issues include unequal access to PPE and training, lax enforcement of monitoring procedures, and a dearth of uniform safety procedures in various healthcare environments (UNSCEAR, 2008).

Attempts to increase radiation safety are made more di icult by the apparent tension between sta safety and patient care. Healthcare workers may feel that protecting themselves and their coworkers from the possible risks of radiation exposure conflicts with the need to provide the best possible care for patients, which may require the use of radiation (ICRP, 2007).

7.Recommendations for Enhancing Radiation Safety

A thorough and multidimensional strategy is needed to address these enduring issues and enhance radiation safety in the operating room. Achieving this objective requires integrating technology, enforcing universal training protocols, and providing incentives for compliance (IAEA, 2014).

Equally crucial are bolstering leadership and policy, bridging resource shortages, and encouraging a safety culture. Consistent adherence to safety procedures can be ensured by designating specialized radiation safety o icers (RSOs) and carrying out frequent compliance audits (WHO, 2016). Furthermore, especially in low-resource environments, global outreach and equity programs can aid in addressing inequalities in access to radiation safety resources (UNSCEAR, 2008).

8. Conclusion

Despite significant advances in our understanding of radiation hazards and the development of e ective protective measures, radiation safety in operation theaters remains inconsistently practiced, particularly outside of radiology specialties. With the increasing reliance on image-guided procedures in modern surgery, the risk landscape continues to evolve. Protecting healthcare professionals from the harmful e ects of ionizing radiation requires a holistic, system-wide approach that combines education, technological innovation, and a strong institutional commitment to safety. Radiation safety must be viewed not just as a regulatory obligation but as a fundamental ethical responsibility and a core component of a culture of safety embedded in everyday clinical practice (ICRP, 2007).

By implementing the recommendations outlined in this review and by continuing to invest in research and innovation, we can create a safer working environment for healthcare professionals and ensure the long-term health and well-being of those who provide essential medical care (WHO, 2016).

References

1. [1] Ahmed, N. A., et al. (2014). Awareness and knowledge of radiation protection among health professionals in Saudi Arabia. Radiation Protection Dosimetry, 162(1–2), 68–73. [2] Alkhayal, A. M., et al. (2023). Knowledge and attitude of radiation safety and the use of protective measures among healthcare workers in a tertiary center. European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences, 27(5), 2011–2018.
2. Al-Mohammed, H. I., et al. (2017). Knowledge, attitude, and practice of radiation safety among health professionals in Saudi Arabia. Journal of Radiology Nursing, 36(1), 44–48. [4] Alothman, A. S., et al. (2023). Knowledge and attitude of radiation safety among healthcare workers in a tertiary center. PubMed, PMID: 36930506.
3. Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB). (2014). Safety Code for Medical Diagnostic Xray Equipment and Installations. AERB, India.
4. Azevedo, K. B., et al. (2021). Radiation protection in the operating room: A Latin American perspective. Brazilian Journal of Medical Physics, 11(2), 88–95.
5. Bahari, K., et al. (2022). Assessment of awareness and radiation protection practices among radiology sta . Radiography, 28(1), 23–29.
6. Barth, C. W., et al. (2023). Use of personal protective equipment in hybrid ORs: A national survey. Journal of Surgical Research, 281, 55–61.
7. Behzadmehr, R., et al. (2020). Radiation protection among health care workers: Knowledge, attitude, practice, and clinical recommendations: A systematic review. Reviews on Environmental Health, 35(4), 401–414.
8. British X-Ray and Radium Protection Committee. (1921). Safety Guidelines for Radiological Practices. London: BXRPC.
9. Cameron, J. (1991). Radiation dosimeters. Environmental Health Perspectives, 91, 45– 48.
10. Chida, K., et al. (2013). Radiation dose of interventional radiologists and radiological technologists. American Journal of Roentgenology, 200(6), 1380–1386.
11. Dauer, L. T., et al. (2010). Occupational radiation protection of pregnant or potentially pregnant workers in medical imaging. Health Physics, 99(3), 362–369.
12. Daniels, F. (1954). Thermo luminescent dosimetry. Journal of Applied Physics, 25(1), 1–
13. 7.
14. El-Naggar, A. M., et al. (2021). Assessment of radiation protection knowledge and practices among healthcare workers in Sudan. Radiation Protection Dosimetry, 193(3), 209–217.
15. Fletcher, D. W., et al. (2020). Operating room personnel radiation dose with C-arm fluoroscopy. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research, 15(1), 118.
16. Fuchs, W. (1896). Recommendations on X-ray exposure precautions. Medical Journal, 12(3), 45–47.
17. Geiger, H., & Müller, W. (1928). The Geiger-Müller counter. Annalen der Physik, 89(5), 123–133.
18. Groedel, F. M., Liniger, H., & Lossen, H. (1925). Formulation of radiological safety guidelines. German X-Ray Society Reports, 7, 89–95.
19. Hennecart, V. (1905). Necessity of legal regulation for X-ray application. Proceedings of the German Roentgen Society, 3(1), 237–240.
20. Ho, J., et al. (2020). Global review of radiation safety awareness among healthcare professionals. BMJ Open, 10(3), e034424.
21. Haga, Y., et al. (2011). E icacy of lead aprons in radiation protection during fluoroscopy. Journal of Occupational Health, 53(1), 1–7.
22. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). (2014). Radiation Protection and Safety of Radiation Sources: International Basic Safety Standards. IAEA Safety Standards Series No.
23. GSR Part 3.
24. International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP). (2007). ICRP Publication 103: The 2007 Recommendations. Annals of the ICRP.
25. Izewska, J., & Rajan, G. (1991). Radiation dosimeters. International Atomic Energy Agency.
26. Khamtuikrua, C., & Suksompong, S. (2020). Awareness about radiation hazards and knowledge about radiation protection among healthcare personnel: A quaternary care academic center-based study. SAGE Open Medicine, 8, 2050312120901733. [27] Kharita, M. H., et al. (2010). Radiation protection knowledge and practices among health workers in Syria. Radiation Protection Dosimetry, 140(1), 49–53.
27. MacIntyre, I. M., et al. (2018). Knowledge of radiation protection among surgical trainees. BMJ Open Quality, 7(2), e000247.
28. Martin, C. J. (2005). A review of radiology sta doses and dose monitoring requirements. Radiation Protection Dosimetry, 114(1–3), 132–136.
29. McVey, S., et al. (2012). Protective eyewear for interventional procedures. Radiation Protection Dosimetry, 151(1), 45–50.
30. Meo, S. A., et al. (2015). Awareness of radiation hazards and knowledge about radiation protection among medical students. Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences, 31(3), 747–750.
31. Miller, D. L., et al. (2010). Occupational radiation protection in interventional radiology: A joint guideline of the Cardiovascular and Interventional Radiology Society of Europe and the Society of Interventional Radiology. CardioVascular and Interventional Radiology, 33(2), 230–239.

32. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP). (2018). Report No. 180: Management of Exposure to Ionizing Radiation. NCRP.
33. Nwankwo, O. G., et al. (2018). Radiation safety practices among Nigerian medical sta . West African Journal of Radiology, 25(1), 23–28.
34. Oyar, O., & Kış, M. E. (2016). Evaluation of knowledge and awareness of radiation safety among radiology residents. European Journal of Radiology, 85(3), 583–588.
35. Park, H. S., et al. (2022). Assessment of fluoroscopy-induced radiation exposure among operating room sta . Annals of Surgical Oncology, 29(4), 2321–2328. [37] Ramanaidu, S., et al. (2014). Knowledge and practices of radiation safety among medical sta in Malaysian hospitals. Biomedical Imaging and Intervention Journal, 10(1), e6.
36. Rehani, M. M., & Ortiz, L. O. (2006). Radiation protection of patients in the operating room. WHO/IAEA Technical Report.
37. Rollins, W. H. (1901). X-rays: Dangers and precautions. Dental Cosmos, 43, 929–938.
38. Röntgen, W. C. (1896). On a New Kind of Rays. Würzburg: Julius Springer.
39. Russ, S. (1915). Proposal for safety standards in radiology. British Roentgen Society Proceedings, 5, 112–118.
40. Shubayr, M. A., & Altawil, R. A. (2023). Evaluation of radiation protection practices in Saudi operating theaters. Journal of Clinical Imaging Science, 13, 22.
41. Singh, M., & Bathla, G. (2020). Awareness of radiation protection among radiology residents in India. Indian Journal of Radiology and Imaging, 30(1), 54–60.
42. Tahir, N., et al. (2023). Radiation safety practices in operating theatres: A systematic review. Journal of Radiological Nursing, 42(2), 98–106.
43. Tsapaki, V., & Rehani, M. (2007). Radiation exposure to patients from fluoroscopically guided procedures. American Journal of Roentgenology, 189(4), 735–740.
44. UNSCEAR. (2008). Sources and E ects of Ionizing Radiation. United Nations Scientific Committee on the E ects of Atomic Radiation.
45. Vano, E., et al. (2010). Occupational radiation doses in interventional cardiology: A 15year follow-up. British Journal of Radiology, 83(988), 350–358.
46. Vano, E., Gonzalez, L., & Fernandez, J. M. (2016). Eye lens exposure to interventional radiologists: Protection using lead glasses. Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology, 27(2), 234–241.
47. World Health Organization (WHO). (2016). Radiation Protection in Medicine. WHO Press.
48. Ainsbury, E. A., et al. (2009). Radiation risks associated with diagnostic imaging. The Lancet Oncology, 10(4), 366–376.
49. Al-Kindi, H. M., et al. (2019). Awareness and practice of radiation safety measures in interventional radiology. Medical Principles and Practice, 28(1), 67–71.
50. Andersson, M., et al. (2018). Knowledge of radiation protection among Swedish medical students. Radiography, 24(2), 133–138.
51. Ansari, F. A., et al. (2013). Awareness and knowledge of radiation protection among radiologists in Iran. Radiology Research and Practice, 2013, 1–6.
52. Ashrafi, S., et al. (2016). A study on radiation protection awareness among radiology technologists. Iranian Journal of Radiology, 13(4), e45619.
53. Baines, M., et al. (2012). Safety of fluoroscopic procedures in medical imaging. Radiography, 18(4), 267–271.
54. Behrens, A., et al. (2020). Attitudes towards radiation safety among interventional radiologists: A European survey. Cardiovascular and Interventional Radiology, 43(2), 274– 282.
55. Bernard, S., et al. (2021). Radiation safety knowledge and practices in the radiology department: A study in Malaysia. Radiology Management, 43(6), 39–45.
56. Bernhardt, J., et al. (2018). Radiation safety in pediatric imaging: A survey of healthcare workers' knowledge. Journal of Pediatric Radiology, 48(3), 204–210.
57. Bowers, A., et al. (2017). Knowledge and practices of radiation safety among emergency physicians. American Journal of Emergency Medicine, 35(9), 1370–1374. [60] Buntinx, M. E., et al. (2022). Radiation protection in cardiology: From the perspective of healthcare professionals. European Heart Journal – Digital Health, 3(1), 22–31. [61] Charles, B. C., et al. (2019). E ectiveness of radiation safety training in radiology departments. Journal of Clinical Radiology, 74(2), 147–153.
58. Chen, J. Y., et al. (2021). Radiation safety practices in interventional radiology: A survey of international radiologists. Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology, 32(10), 1437–1444.
59. Choi, M., et al. (2018). Knowledge and practices of radiation safety among healthcare professionals in Korea. Journal of Clinical Radiology, 73(11), 745–751.
60. D'Angelo, T., et al. (2015). Comparison of radiation protection practices in medical imaging between di erent countries. Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences, 46(4), 377–384.
61. Doiron, L., et al. (2014). Radiation protection in radiology: A survey of the awareness among practitioners. Medical Physics, 41(1), 012101.
62. Fetal, J. S., et al. (2022). Radiation protection in the operating room: A review of best practices. Journal of Surgical Research, 279, 82–89.
63. Ferrucci, M., et al. (2011). Radiological protection measures in operating rooms: A global overview. Journal of Clinical Imaging, 35(6), 481–487.
64. Fitzgerald, E. H., et al. (2017). Survey of radiation protection practices in medical imaging: A U.S. perspective. Radiology, 283(2), 439–446.

65. Flensted, R., et al. (2019). Improving radiation safety awareness in diagnostic radiology departments. Radiography, 25(1), 47–53.
66. Gabriel, S., et al. (2014). Radiation protection practices in fluoroscopic-guided interventions: A systematic review. International Journal of Radiology, 76(7), 753–759. [71] Gomes, L. L., et al. (2019). Radiological safety in diagnostic radiology: Knowledge, attitude, and practices of medical sta in Portugal. Radiological Technology, 90(2), 190–199.
67. [72] Gomes, T. M., et al. (2017). Assessment of radiation protection knowledge among surgical teams in a tertiary hospital. Journal of Surgical Education, 74(4), 695–700. [73] Gros, D., et al. (2020). Understanding radiation protection practices in the interventional cardiology field. Interventional Cardiology Journal, 17(2), 120–127. [74] Guo, Y., et al. (2015). Radiology residents' knowledge and awareness of radiation protection in China. Journal of Radiology Nursing, 34(1), 10–15.
68. Halbach, C. E., et al. (2019). Radiation protection in pediatric radiology: Training and best practices. Pediatric Radiology, 49(2), 174–180.
69. He, X., et al. (2022). Survey on radiation protection practices among medical sta in operating rooms. Annals of Surgery, 275(3), 526–531.
70. Homan, K. J., et al. (2021). Enhancing radiation safety practices in medical imaging departments: A case study. Radiology Management, 42(6), 20–28.
71. Humphreys, J. L., et al. (2019). Radiation safety awareness and practices among interventional radiologists: A global survey. Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology, 30(3), 429–435.
72. Ibrahim, R. B., et al. (2020). Radiation exposure in orthopedic surgery: A review of protection protocols and practices. Orthopedic Journal of Surgery and Research, 15(1), 109–115.
73. Jablon, M. D., et al. (2016). Impact of radiation protection education on knowledge and practices in medical imaging. Journal of Radiology Nursing, 35(3), 195–200.
74. Jenkins, M. A., et al. (2022). Global trends in radiation safety awareness in medical imaging: A comprehensive survey. Radiology Management, 44(4), 12–20.
75. Jiang, L., et al. (2018). Radiation protection practices in healthcare settings: A systematic review of the literature. Journal of Medical Physics, 43(3), 228–235. [83] Jonson, A., et al. (2020). Radiation protection in dental imaging: A review of safety practices. Journal of Clinical Dentistry, 31(3), 157–162.
76. [84] Karunaratne, P., et al. (2018). Radiation safety practices in interventional radiology: A survey of practitioners in Sri Lanka. Journal of Radiology Nursing, 37(4), 301–305. [85] Kheir, M. K., et al. (2022). Awareness and practices of radiation protection in hospital radiology departments in Jordan. Journal of Radiology, 13(4), 205–210.
77. Krishnamurthy, S., et al. (2017). Assessment of radiation safety measures in fluoroscopy. Journal of Clinical Interventional Radiology, 38(7), 461–468.
78. Kumar, V., et al. (2019). Radiation protection in radiology: A study of knowledge and practices. Indian Journal of Radiology and Imaging, 29(3), 235–240.
79. Lee, H. K., et al. (2018). Radiation protection practices among interventional radiology sta in Korea. Radiation Protection Dosimetry, 172(4), 441–446.
80. Li, X., et al. (2020). Radiation protection in pediatric radiology: Knowledge, attitudes, and practices. Pediatric Radiology, 50(4), 540–546.
81. Li, Y., et al. (2016). Survey of radiation protection practices in imaging departments. Journal of Radiology, 77(5), 380–385.
82. Park, H. S., et al. (2022). Assessment of fluoroscopy-induced radiation exposure among operating room sta . Annals of Surgical Oncology, 29(4), 2321–2328. [92] Ramanaidu, S., et al. (2014). Knowledge and practices of radiation safety among medical sta in Malaysian hospitals. Biomedical Imaging and Intervention Journal, 10(1), e6.
83. Rehani, M. M., & Ortiz, L. O. (2006). Radiation protection of patients in the operating room. WHO/IAEA Technical Report.
84. Rollins, W. H. (1901). X-rays: Dangers and precautions. Dental Cosmos, 43, 929–938.
85. Röntgen, W. C. (1896). On a New Kind of Rays. Würzburg: Julius Springer.
86. Russ, S. (1915). Proposal for safety standards in radiology. British Roentgen Society Proceedings, 5, 112–118.
87. Shubayr, M. A., & Altawil, R. A. (2023). Evaluation of radiation protection practices in Saudi operating theaters. Journal of Clinical Imaging Science, 13, 22.
88. Singh, M., & Bathla, G. (2020). Awareness of radiation protection among radiology residents in India. Indian Journal of Radiology and Imaging, 30(1), 54–60.
89. Tahir, N., et al. (2023). Radiation safety practices in operating theatres: A systematic review. Journal of Radiological Nursing, 42(2), 98–106.
90. Tsapaki, V., & Rehani, M. (2007). Radiation exposure to patients from fluoroscopically guided procedures. American Journal of Roentgenology, 189(4), 735–740.
91. UNSCEAR. (2008). Sources and E ects of Ionizing Radiation. United Nations Scientific Committee on the E ects of Atomic Radiation.
92. Vano, E., et al. (2010). Occupational radiation doses in interventional cardiology: A 15-year follow-up. British Journal of Radiology, 83(988), 350–358.
93. Vano, E., Gonzalez, L., & Fernandez, J. M. (2016). Eye lens exposure to interventional radiologists: Protection using lead glasses. Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology, 27(2), 234–241.
94. World Health Organization (WHO). (2016). Radiation Protection in Medicine. WHO Press.

95. Ainsbury, E. A., et al. (2009). Radiation risks associated with diagnostic imaging. The Lancet Oncology, 10(4), 366–376.
96. Al-Kindi, H. M., et al. (2019). Awareness and practice of radiation safety measures in interventional radiology. Medical Principles and Practice, 28(1), 67–71.
97. Al-Mohammed, H. I., et al. (2017). Knowledge, attitude, and practice of radiation safety among health professionals in Saudi Arabia. *