



## **SORF (Society of Radiographers in Finland) comments and observations on ICRP: Radiological Protection in Veterinary Practice**

SORF would like to point out the importance of the personnel at Veterinary Clinics.

The text needs to be checked out prior to publishing, as it is not running consistently and some generally used terms have slightly different meanings to commonly used, as general radiography procedure instead of standard radiological imaging procedure.

There are some new terms in the document, and the concepts of these are not explained. This leaves some uncertainty to the reader. For instance, terms layperson and occupational medical exposure need more explanation.

Also, term “non-medical exposure” is well known among the human side, we recommend adding them to the list of terms or phrases to be explained what it means with it.

As this document is about veterinary practices, we recommend veterinary clinical practice used throughout the text.

As veterinary practice employees are most likely not the experts in the radiation safety education on radiation, safe use of radiation and radiation protection should be mandatory – at least highly recommended and minimum levels given.

Radiological exposure of personnel involved in veterinary procedures, especially these days as CT-examinations, nuclear medicine and radiotherapy is more common and increasing among veterinary clinics.

Justification of a specific procedure can become problematic as it is considered from the animal's perspective, but this specific procedure may cause also significant human exposure not only the personnel but to the animal care and owners. It should be stated clearly that even if a specific procedure could be justified in the meaning of justification (this is the current definition in the document), the procedure may be unjustified if the risks to humans are considered.

The chapter 6.1.3. on benefit and risk of radiological procedures investigates the risks and benefits to be considered in the justification from many different aspects, also including human exposure. But then the justification levels are defined through the harms and benefits to the animal only. This leaves somehow open how risks to humans should be brought into the justification assessment. So, in addition to the assessment, an overall assessment considering also human exposure should be done separately.

SORF

Päivi Wood  
CEO