Original Research Article

Design of a Novel Shield of Nuclear Medicine with New Alloy

Abstract

Background: protecting patients and healthcare workers from harmful ionizing radiation, has been an important concern. Due to high efficacy, for many years lead has been used as the best choice for this purpose. Lead has been always considered as a traditional choice to protect both workers and patients from any unnecessary exposure to ionizing radiation. Recently there has been a great deal of concern expressed about the toxicity of lead. The aim of this study was to design a novel shield of nuclear medicine with different alloy as a desire replacement for traditional lead base protectors.

Methods: A combination of Cadmium, Bismuth, Lead (only 15%) and Copper ~~was~~ were selected by studying of metals and calculation of the amount of protection to reduce the dose and ~~calculation~~ of dose reduction and metals' HVL by Monte Carlo N-Particle Transport Code (MCNP4C) modeling.

Results: The results of the tests were evaluated and determined that the designed shield reduces considerably the received dose by a thousand times.

Conclusion: This novel shield with a much less lead produced in this study is considerably safer and offer effective protection in diagnostic energy ranges and may replace the traditional lead-based protectors.

Key Words: Ionizing Radiation, Lead-Base Protectors, Cadmium, Bismuth.

Introduction

Exposure limits in recent years have changed by learning more about the biological effects of ionizing radiation and alterations in social attitude which advised to limit radiation exposure. The concept of tolerable dose was considered in the 1930s; the dose that radiation worker could be continuously exposed to without showing acute lethal effects such as skin erythema. In the early 1950s, the emphasis was on long-term effects. Maximum radiation from allowable dose was defined in order to probability of damage becomes very low and is acceptable on average for a person(1).

Comment [VU1]: Re-phrase

As usage of radioactive materials spread, providing a portable effective shield for protection of operating personnel became vital. Gamma radiation is emitted in all directions from its source as an expanding spherical front of energy, with great powers of penetration (). High energy gamma radiation will not be wholly blocked by these shields, while lower energy levels can be safely blocked (). The most hazardous radiations are gamma rays, x-rays, and neutron particles. If a shield can be effective toward these types of radiation, there would be a negligible hazard from other types. An effective shield should induce sufficient attenuation of the radiation intensity caused by a particular installation to a tolerable level. Lead density, high atomic number, high level of stability, ease of fabrication, high degree of flexibility in application, and its availability has rendered it ~~to~~ an excellent shielding material. High levels of ionizing radiations from radioactive substances are dangerous for living organisms, including human kind. The first people that worked with X-rays and radioactive substances ~~are~~ clearly observed that these substances can cause burns or scarring and there is a possibility of chromosomal mutation and subsequent

cancer even at low levels (2). In some cases, the easiest way to reduce the amount of radiation exposure to people who are working in this field is putting a shield between the source of radiation and the person. Lead has been always considered as a traditional choice for the radiological protection. It has long been used in radiology departments to protect both workers and patients from any unnecessary exposure to ionizing radiation (3-5). In reviewing the previous using lead as shielding materil will redound an effective, light-weight, low-volume attenuation barrier. These factors, combined with its versatility, makes lead an ideal choice for x-ray shielding applications.

However, over the past years a great deal of concern has been expressed about the toxicity of lead and the need for transition from flexible lead protectors to environmentally friendly nontoxic lead-free shields has been proposed by many scientists (6-9). Recently, Mortazavi and his colleagues in Iran were able to build a lead-free protective shield with name a Tapron which mainly practical in diagnostic radiology(10).

Materials and Methods

Firstly, Energy threshold that must be controlled and managed was obtained by calculating the maximum energy emitted from the vials, syringes and radioactive waste in nuclear medicine and immunology sectors. Its level in ideal conditions was between 1 to 1000 mCi which is relatively at

Comment [VU2]: Ref.

Comment [VU3]: Ref.

Comment [VU4]: Re-phrase and check spellings.

Comment [VU5]: Lead-Free Protective Shield or use Lead-Free Protector high dose. An alloy (2 mm thickness) of Cadmium (40%), Bismuth (40%), Lead (15%) and Copper (5%) wired with Nichrome (1 mm thickness) (an alloy of nickel and chromium) were selected by studying of metals. ~~and~~ ~~c~~Calculation of the amount of protection to reduce the dose and ~~calculation~~ of dose reduction and metals' HVL (Half Value Layer) were done by Monte Carlo N-Particle Transport Code (MCNP4C) modeling. It should be noted that the presence of copper in the alloy increases its protection to some extent. Then between the two layers of alloy, a carbon based polymeric layer (4 mm thickness) of the mentioned heavy metals was placed (combination of used metals in the context of a carbon polymer material that increases protection several times). Geometry of the desired system was plotted by MCNP4C modeling. Dimensions and exact location of the source ~~was~~ were simulated based on the actual size. The number of studied particles in the simulation ~~were~~ was considered 80 million in order to reduce the statistical error. Source energy was defined as 662 KeV in the input file and F1 Tali was used in order to calculate the integral of the intensity based on the studied surface. Desired Tali was calculated at a distance of 1 meter from the shield with the assumption that no one will not be next to the shield within less distance for long time. Moreover, program was calculated once again in ~~a~~ case ~~that~~ there is not any protection against mentioned source. ~~in order~~ ~~t~~To compare and illustrate the impact of shield, the output was measured at a distance of 1 meter.

Comment [VU6]: Expunge and place it in the RESULTS

Comment [VU7]: Check and re-phrase

Results

Values prepared by the National Bureau of Standards may be used to determine the required thicknesses for shielding from gamma ray sources in the laboratory. In practice such calculations should be made only under the direction of a qualified expert; the resulting installation may subsequently require measurements of actual radiation levels obtained. As stated earlier energy threshold that must be managed was obtained between 1 to 1000 mCi which is relatively high dose. The alloy of Cadmium, Bismuth, Lead and Copper wired with Nichrome selected and Monte Carlo N-Particle Transport Code (MCNP4C) modeling used for calculation of dose reduction and metals Half Value Layer. The presence of copper in the alloy increases its protection to some extent. Geometry of the desired system was plotted by MCNP4C modeling.

Dimensions and exact location of the source was simulated based on the actual size. The number of studied particles in the simulation were considered 80 million in order to reduce the statistical error. Source energy was defined 662 KeV in the input file and F1 Tali was used in order to calculate the integral of the intensity based on the studied surface. Desired Tali was calculated at a distance of 1 meter from the shield with the assumption that no one will not be next to the shield within less distance for long time. Moreover, program was calculated once again in a case that there is not any protection against mentioned source in order to compare and illustrate the impact of shield, the output was measured at a distance of 1 meter.

Comment [VU8]: Expunge: Repetition of Procedure.

The results of the tests were evaluated and determined that the shield reduces the received dose by a thousand times (Table 1).

Discussion

When there is a risk of exposure with harmful amounts of radionuclide, personal protective equipment (PPE) should be worn. The type of PPE depends on the quantity, type, and nature of the radiation and health care facility design. For low and medium level work, coveralls, caps, gloves and either special shoes or shoe covers are suggested. For close or contact work with radioactive materials emitting radiation of low penetrating power, shielded clothing such as leather, eye protection or leaded gloves and aprons may be used to increase allowable exposure time. As we try to increase the protection level of shields, the inevitable result is weight increase and flexibility reduction which leads to inability to use shielded attire. Because of the penetrating ability of the radiation used in nuclear medicine, shielding is necessary. The most important role of a protecting shield is preventing rays penetration. Density of shield material has the most important role in preventing penetration of rays. Currently, the ~~dentest~~ densest available substance is lead. Lead and some of its alloys are generally the most cost-effective shielding materials to protect against the effects of γ- and x-rays. The properties of lead that make it an excellent shielding material are its density, high atomic number, level of stability, ease of~~f~~ fabrication, high degree of flexibility in application, and availability. ~~l~~Lead is more uniform in density in comparison with other aggregate materials. Hence, generally lead products show smooth surfaces that lead~~s~~ to contamination risk reduction and therefore, less radioactive hazard. (11). Lead is heavier than roughly 80 per cent of the periodic table. It could be assumed therefore that shield constructions making use of lead will tend to be heavier than constructions making use of lighter elements. This concept may be true in static shielding structures where weight and volume restrictions are of lesser importance, and concrete and water are often used. In portable shielding systems that low weight and volume are two important factors, selection of lighter materials may adversely affect the protective property of the shield. Recently there has been a great deal of concern expressed about the toxicity of lead and human lead toxicity is well documented (12-14). Lead is a systemic toxicant with no known beneficial biological function and, for several endpoints, no identified threshold of toxicity. The fetus, children, pregnant and elderly are particularly susceptible to some of the toxic effects of Pb (15). Owing to this reality, there is a necessity for transition from conventional lead protectors to environmentally friendly non-toxic lead-free shields.

In this study a specific combination of Cadmium (40%), Bismuth (40%), Lead (15%) and Copper (5%) wired with Nichrome as a novel alloy with a slight amount of lead compared to the traditional lead-based protectors introduced as a possible suitable replacement. Moreover, the carbon based polymeric layer of Cadmium, Bismuth and Lead that is placed in the middle of the two layers of mentioned alloy increases protection several times. In addition, the extra weight of

lead aprons results in low back pain and neck pain among radiologists and cardiologists in the long term. Likewise, Lead based protectors, protective shields for radioiodine vials in particular, are very heavy and long-term moving of the m results in plenty of adverse physical effects. However, the designed nuclear medicine shield in this study is significantly lighter in comparison with lead based shields as a result of less lead usage and considerable thinner thickness. Compared with lead based protectors, the present new shield is so flexible that can be easily customized into arbitrary shapes. Moreover, this new alloy is environmentally friendly and can be recycled conveniently. Therefore, the designed shield can be considered as an elastic, resistant to erosion, environmentally friendly, lightweight substitute for conventional lead shields.

Conclusion:

This novel shield with a much less lead produced in this study is considerably safer and offer effective protection in diagnostic energy ranges and may replace the traditional lead-based protectors.

Table 1: MCNP4C results of radiation intensity without shield and after passing shield.

Used geometry	Radiation intensity ± Error
Without shield	$4.860\times10^{-1} \pm 0.0001$
With shield	$5.172\times10^{-4} \pm 0.0049$

Comment [VU9]: Move table to RESULTS

References

1. Mortazavi SMJ IT, Sharafi AA. Radiation hormesis and adaptive responses induced by low doses of ionizing radiation. Journal of Kerman University of Medical Sciences. 1999;6:50-60.
2. Guidelines on patient dose to promote the optimisation of protection for diagnostic medical exposures : report of an Advisory Group on Ionising Radiation Great Britain: Didcot England 1999.
3. McGinley PH, Miner MS. A history of radiation shielding of x-ray therapy rooms. Health physics. 1995 Nov;69(5):759-65. PubMed PMID: 7558866. Epub 1995/11/01. eng.
4. Ngaile JE, Uiso CB, Msaki P, Kazema R. Use of lead shields for radiation protection of superficial organs in patients undergoing head CT examinations. Radiation protection dosimetry. 2008;130(4):490-8. PubMed PMID: 18375945. Epub 2008/04/01. eng.
5. Scuderi GJ, Brusovanik GV, Campbell DR, Henry RP, Kwon B, Vaccaro AR. Evaluation of non-lead-based protective radiological material in spinal surgery. The spine journal : official journal of the North American Spine Society. 2006 Sep-Oct;6(5):577-82. PubMed PMID: 16934731. Epub 2006/08/29. eng.

Comment [VU10]: Expunge: This applies to all references with months in it.

6. McCaffrey JP, Shen H, Downton B, Mainegra-Hing E. Radiation attenuation by lead and nonlead materials used in radiation shielding garments. Medical physics. 2007 Feb;34(2):530-7. PubMed PMID: 17388170. Epub 2007/03/29. eng.

Comment [VU11]: Initials of names in the references should take full stop. Applies to all.

7. Schlattl H, Zankl M, Eder H, Hoeschen C. Shielding properties of lead-free protective clothing and their impact on radiation doses. Medical physics. 2007 Nov;34(11):4270-80. PubMed PMID: 18072491. Epub 2007/12/13. eng.

8. Warren-Forward H, Cardew P, Smith B, Clack L, McWhirter K, Johnson S, et al. A comparison of dose savings of lead and lightweight aprons for shielding of 99m-Technetium radiation. Radiation protection dosimetry. 2007;124(2):89-96. PubMed PMID: 17525062. Epub 2007/05/26. eng.

9. Yue K, Luo W, Dong X, Wang C, Wu G, Jiang M, et al. A new lead-free radiation shielding material for radiotherapy. Radiation protection dosimetry. 2009 Feb;133(4):256-60. PubMed PMID: 19329510. Epub 2009/03/31. eng.

10. Aghamiri M, Mortazavi S, Tayebi M, Mosleh-Shirazi M, Baharvand H, Tavakkoli-Golpayegani A, et al. A Novel Design for Production of Efficient Flexible Lead-Free Shields against X-ray Photons in Diagnostic Energy Range. Journal of Biomedical Physics and Engineering. 2011;1(1 Dec).

11. Hulbert SM, Carlson KA. Is lead dust within nuclear medicine departments a hazard to pediatric patients? Journal of nuclear medicine technology. 2009 Sep;37(3):170-2. PubMed PMID: 19692455. Epub 2009/08/21. eng.

12. Heath LM, Soole KL, McLaughlin ML, McEwan GT, Edwards JW. Toxicity of environmental lead and the influence of intestinal absorption in children. Reviews on environmental health. 2003 Oct-Dec;18(4):231-50. PubMed PMID: 15025188. Epub 2004/03/18. eng.

13. Millstone E, Russell J. Lead toxicity and public health policy. Journal of the Royal Society of Health. 1995 Dec;115(6):347-50. PubMed PMID: 8568780. Epub 1995/12/01. eng.

14. Murata K, Iwata T, Dakeishi M, Karita K. Lead toxicity: does the critical level of lead resulting in adverse effects differ between adults and children? Journal of occupational health.

2009;51(1):1-12.
PubMed PMID: 18987427. Epub 2008/11/07. eng.
15. Healey N. Lead toxicity, vulnerable subpopulations and emergency preparedness. Radiation protection dosimetry. 2009 Jun;134(3-4):143-51. PubMed PMID: 19398444. Epub 2009/04/29. eng.