COMPLIANCE IN QUALITY HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT IN PATIENT MANAGEMENT AND RADIATION SAFETY PRACTICES: A NARRATIVE REVIEW

Saad Dhafer A Alshehri[1], Maher Faleh Assaj Alanazi[2], Abdulrahman Saad Nasser Alaseri[3], Saad Saed Othman Alshahrani[4], Abdulaziz Ali Alarem[5]

Abstract

This manuscript provides a comprehensive narrative review of compliance, and quality management within hospital settings and radiation safety practices in clinical radiology, focusing on protocols,. Beginning with an exploration of the historical background of radiation safety since the discovery of X-rays, the manuscript delves into the importance of stringent radiation safety protocols in mitigating risks associated with ionizing radiation. It discusses international guidelines, national regulations, and the pivotal role of regulatory bodies in shaping radiation safety standards. The review extensively covers radiation safety protocols, including patient preparation and education, equipment calibration and maintenance, personnel training, and quality assurance measures. It also explores methods for radiation dose measurement, dose reporting and documentation, and strategies for dose reduction. Compliance assessment procedures, audit frequencies, non-compliance issues, and corrective actions are thoroughly examined, highlighting the significance of staff awareness and a culture of compliance in ensuring patient safety.

Keywords: Radiation safety, clinical radiology, protocols, compliance, quality management, dose reduction, technology advancements, patient outcomes, cost-effectiveness, ethics.

[1*]Specialist of Management of Health Services and Hospitals, Al Faisaliah Primary Health Care Center, Arar, Saudi Arabia

[2]Technician of Medical secretary, Emergency management and medical coordination, Northern Border Health Cluster, Arar, Saudi Arabia

[3]Medical imaging technologist, Commitment management, Aseer, Abha, Saudi Arabia

[4,5]Medical Imaging Technologist, Medical Imaging Department, Khamis Mushait Children And Maternity Hospital, Aseer, Khamis Mushait, Saudi Arabia

***Corresponding Author:** Saad Dhafer A Alshehri

*Specialist of Management of Health Services and Hospitals, Al Faisaliah Primary Health Care Center, Arar, Saudi Arabia

DOI: 10.53555/ecb/2022.11.10.199

I. Introduction

Quality has become an increasingly predominant part of our lives. People are constantly looking for quality products and services. Quality is difficult to define. Healthcare service quality is even more difficult to define and measure than in other sectors but it can be understood as a comprehensive customer evaluation of a particular service and the extent to which it meets their expectations and provides satisfaction (1). There are many definitions of quality used both in relation to health care and health systems, and in other spheres of activity. There is also a language of quality, with its own frequently-used terms.Distinct healthcare industry characteristics such as intangibility, heterogeneity and simultaneity make it difficult to define and measure quality (2). The complex nature of healthcare practices, the existence of many participants with different interests in the healthcare delivery and ethical considerations add to the difficulty (3).

Quality in healthcare is a human right. Higher healthcare quality results in satisfaction for the clients (patients and the community in general), employees, suppliers and better performance for the organization. If quality of healthcare services improves, costs decrease, productivity increases and a better service would be available for clients, which in turn enhances organizational performance and provides long-term working relationships for employees and suppliers (4).

SERVQUAL model can be used to measure customer satisfaction, and the effect of the dimensions of quality on customer satisfaction.

A wealth of knowledge and experience in enhancing the quality of health care has accumulated globally over many decades. In spite of this wealth of experience, the problem frequently faced by policy-makers at country level in both high- and low-middle-income countries is to know which quality strategies – complemented by and integrated with existent strategic initiatives – would have the greatest impact on the outcomes delivered by their health systems. This guide promotes a focus on quality in health systems, and provides decision makers and planners with an opportunity to make informed strategic choices to advance quality improvement. There are two main arguments for promoting a focus on quality in health systems at this time. (5)

Even where health systems are well developed and resourced, there is clear evidence that quality remains a serious concern, with expected outcomes not predictably achieved and with wide variations in standards of health-care delivery within and between health-care systems. (6)

Where health systems – particularly in developing countries – need to optimize resource use and expand population coverage, the process of improvement and scaling up needs to be based on sound local strategies for quality so that the best possible results are achieved from new investment. (7)

Radiation safety in clinical radiology is a paramount concern given the ubiquitous use of ionizing radiation in diagnostic and therapeutic procedures. The history of radiation safety traces back to the discovery of X-rays by Wilhelm Roentgen in 1895, marking the beginning of medical imaging [8,9]. Initially, the potential hazards of radiation exposure were not fully understood, leading to uncontrolled usage and consequent health risks for both patients and healthcare workers. However, over the decades, advancements in technology and growing awareness of radiation's harmful effects have prompted the development of stringent safety protocols and regulations [10,11].

The importance of radiation safety protocols cannot be overstated in the context of clinical radiology. Ionizing radiation, while indispensable for medical imaging and treatment, carries inherent risks such as tissue damage, genetic mutations, and increased cancer incidence [9]. Therefore, implementing effective safety measures is crucial to minimize these risks and ensure the well-being of patients, healthcare providers, and the general public. Adherence to established protocols not only enhances patient safety but also promotes confidence in radiological procedures and contributes to overall healthcare quality [12,13].

The primary objective of this review is to comprehensively examine radiation safety practices in clinical radiology, focusing on protocols and compliance within quality hospital management. By analyzing international guidelines, national regulations, and institutional protocols, the review aims to identify gaps, challenges, and best practices in radiation safety. Furthermore, the review seeks to highlight the role of regulatory bodies, technological advancements, and quality assurance measures in ensuring optimal radiation safety standards. Ultimately, the review intends to provide insights and recommendations for enhancing radiation safety protocols and promoting a culture of safety in clinical radiology.

II. Regulatory Framework

Internationally recognized guidelines and standards play a fundamental role in shaping radiation safety practices in clinical radiology. Organizations such as the International Atomic

Energy Agency (IAEA), the World Health Organization (WHO), and professional societies like the American College of Radiology (ACR) and the European Society of Radiology (ESR) have developed comprehensive guidelines covering various aspects of radiation safety. These guidelines encompass dose optimization, equipment standards, personnel training, and quality assurance protocols, providing a framework for healthcare institutions to establish and maintain safe radiological practices [8,9,13].

In addition to international guidelines, each country has its own set of regulations and compliance requirements pertaining to radiation safety in healthcare settings [14]. These regulations are often enforced by government agencies such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in the United States, the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in the United Kingdom, and similar bodies globally. National regulations address aspects such as licensing of radiological facilities, radiation dose limits, radiation safety training for personnel, and periodic inspections to ensure compliance with established standards [14,16].

Regulatory bodies play a pivotal role in overseeing and enforcing radiation safety standards within healthcare facilities. They are responsible for issuing licenses, conducting inspections, reviewing radiation safety protocols, and imposing penalties for non-compliance [9,11]. Furthermore, regulatory bodies collaborate with professional organizations and industry stakeholders to update guidelines, incorporate technological advancements, and address emerging challenges in radiation safety. Their proactive involvement is essential in maintaining a safe and accountable environment for radiological procedures [17].

III. Radiation Safety Protocols

Effective radiation safety protocols begin with thorough patient preparation and education. This includes obtaining informed consent, explaining the benefits and risks of the procedure, and ensuring patient cooperation during imaging or treatment [9,18]. Educating patients about radiation safety measures, such as wearing lead aprons and shields, maintaining proper positioning, and minimizing unnecessary exposures, helps mitigate potential risks and fosters a sense of trust in the healthcare provider [19].

Ensuring the accuracy and reliability of radiological equipment is a critical aspect of radiation safety protocols. Regular calibration, quality assurance checks, and preventive maintenance are essential to minimize equipment malfunctions, reduce radiation dose variations, and optimize image quality [20]. Healthcare facilities must adhere to manufacturer recommendations, perform routine inspections, and promptly address any equipment issues to uphold safety standards and enhance diagnostic accuracy [11,21].

Radiation safety protocols necessitate comprehensive training and certification programs for healthcare personnel involved in radiological procedures. Radiologists, radiologic technologists, nurses, and support staff must undergo rigorous training on radiation principles, safety protocols, dose optimization techniques, and emergency procedures. Certification bodies such as the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT) and national licensing boards ensure that healthcare professionals meet competency standards and adhere to ethical practices in radiation safety [20].

Implementing robust quality assurance measures is paramount to maintaining high standards of radiation safety. Quality assurance encompasses regular audits, performance evaluations, dose monitoring, image quality assessments, and feedback mechanisms to identify areas for improvement and ensure compliance with established protocols [21,22]. By continuously monitoring and optimizing radiation practices, healthcare institutions can enhance patient safety, optimize resource utilization, and mitigate potential risks associated with radiological procedures [23].

IV. Radiation Dose Monitoring

The accurate measurement of radiation doses is essential for assessing and optimizing patient safety in clinical radiology. Various methods are employed for dose measurement, including dosimeters, dose tracking software, and radiation monitoring devices integrated into imaging equipment [24]. Dosimeters, such as thermoluminescent dosimeters (TLDs), optically stimulated luminescence dosimeters (OSLDs), and electronic personal dosimeters (EPDs), are used to measure radiation exposure received by healthcare personnel and patients during procedures. These devices provide real-time or cumulative dose readings, allowing for precise dose monitoring and compliance with dose limits set by regulatory authorities [25].

For patients, modern imaging equipment is equipped with dose-tracking software that calculates and displays radiation doses in real time. This software incorporates factors such as patient size, exam type, and exposure parameters to estimate cumulative dose values and alert operators to potential dose exceedances [26]. Additionally,

radiation monitoring devices integrated into imaging systems continuously measure and adjust radiation output based on patient anatomy and image quality requirements, further optimizing dose delivery while maintaining diagnostic efficacy [18,27].

Accurate and comprehensive dose reporting and documentation are integral components of radiation safety protocols. Radiology departments are required to maintain detailed records of radiation doses delivered to patients, including dose indices, exposure factors, imaging protocols, and patient demographics [28]. These records serve multiple purposes, such as facilitating dose audits, ensuring compliance with dose limits, evaluating imaging trends, and providing data for research and quality improvement initiatives [21,29].

Furthermore, standardized dose reporting formats, such as DICOM dose structured reports (SR), enable seamless integration of dose data into electronic health records (EHRs) and radiology information systems (RIS). This integration promotes data accessibility, interoperability, and continuity of care by allowing healthcare providers to review patient radiation histories, monitor dose trends over time, and make informed decisions regarding imaging appropriateness and optimization [21,30].

Radiation dose reduction strategies are paramount in minimizing patient exposure while maintaining diagnostic image quality. These strategies encompass a multidisciplinary approach involving technologists, radiologists, medical physicists, and radiation safety officers [15,29]. One key strategy is protocol optimization, where imaging parameters such as exposure settings, scan protocols, and image reconstruction techniques are tailored to each patient's clinical indication and body habitus. This personalized approach ensures that radiation doses are optimized for diagnostic accuracy while minimizing unnecessary exposures [30].

Additionally, advancements in imaging technology, such as iterative reconstruction algorithms, dose modulation techniques, and low-dose imaging protocols, contribute significantly to dose reduction efforts. These technologies enhance image quality at reduced radiation doses, allowing for safer and more efficient imaging practices [31,32]. Furthermore, patient-centered initiatives, such as dose tracking and dose awareness programs, empower patients to participate in their healthcare decisions and advocate for lower radiation doses when appropriate [24].

V. Implications

The implementation of effective radiation safety practices has a significant impact on patient outcomes across various healthcare settings. By adhering to stringent safety protocols, healthcare providers can minimize the risk of radiation-induced adverse effects, such as tissue damage, radiation dermatitis, and long-term cancer risks [10,12]. Optimizing imaging protocols and dose reduction strategies not only improve patient safety but also enhance diagnostic accuracy, leading to more timely and accurate diagnoses, treatment planning, and patient management [19,32].

Moreover, effective radiation safety practices contribute to patient satisfaction and trust in the healthcare system. Patients who are well-informed about radiation risks, involved in shared decision-making, and treated in facilities with strong safety cultures are more likely to have positive experiences and outcomes. Therefore, investing in radiation safety infrastructure, ongoing training, and quality assurance programs is not only a regulatory requirement but also a strategic imperative for delivering high-quality, patient-centered care [8,13,22].

Compliance with radiation safety protocols is not only ethically imperative but also cost-effective in the long term. Preventing radiation-related incidents or errors through robust safety measures reduces the potential costs associated with patient harm, medical liability claims, regulatory fines, and reputational damage to healthcare institutions [10,19]. Additionally, optimizing imaging protocols and dose reduction strategies can lead to resource savings by reducing unnecessary repeat imaging, minimizing equipment downtime due to malfunctions, and improving workflow efficiency [22,24].

Furthermore, investments in radiation safety training, quality management systems, and technology upgrades yield returns in terms of improved patient outcomes, increased staff competency, enhanced patient satisfaction, and strengthened regulatory compliance. While initial investments may be required to implement and maintain safety protocols, the long-term benefits outweigh the costs and contribute to a sustainable healthcare delivery model focused on safety, quality, and value.

VI. Recommendations for Future Research

Future research in radiation safety should focus on several key areas to advance knowledge and improve practice. One area is the development of novel dose monitoring technologies, such as real-time dose tracking systems or automated dose

optimization algorithms, that enhance patient safety and workflow efficiency [6-9]. Additionally, research on patient-centered outcomes, such as patient satisfaction, anxiety levels, and decision-making preferences related to radiation exposure, can inform strategies for optimizing risk communication and shared decision-making processes [12,19,22].

Furthermore, investigating the long-term effects of low-dose radiation exposure on specific patient populations, such as pediatric patients, pregnant women, and individuals with underlying health conditions, is crucial for refining dose guidelines and imaging protocols. Collaborative research initiatives between healthcare institutions, regulatory agencies, industry partners, and academic researchers can facilitate data sharing, standardization of dose metrics, and development of evidence-based guidelines for optimizing radiation safety practices [17,25].

XI. Conclusion

In conclusion, this narrative review has provided a comprehensive overview of radiation safety practices in clinical radiology, emphasizing the importance of adherence to protocols, compliance with regulatory requirements, and continuous improvement initiatives. Key findings include the critical role of international guidelines, national regulations, and regulatory bodies in shaping radiation safety standards. The review also highlighted the significance of risk communication, staff training programs, quality management systems, and technological advancements in optimizing radiation safety and patient outcomes. Continuous improvement in radiation safety is essential to address evolving challenges, technological advancements, and patient safety considerations. Healthcare institutions must prioritize ongoing training, quality assurance measures, dose optimization strategies, and interdisciplinary collaboration to maintain high standards of radiation safety. Embracing a culture of safety, transparency, and accountability fosters innovation, drives quality improvement, and enhances patient-centered care in clinical radiology.

References

1. Andaleeb SS. Determinants of customer satisfaction with hospitals: a managerial model. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance.* 2003;6(11):181–187. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Conley H, Kubsch SM, Ladwig J, Torres C. Patients' and Nurses, perceptions of quality nursing activities. *British Journal of Nursing.* 2003;12(19):1122–1129. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. Harteloh P. The meaning of quality in health care: A concept analysis. Health Care Analysis. 2003;11(3):259–267. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Curry A, Sinclair E. Assessing the quality of physiotherapy services using SERVQUAL. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance.* 2002;15(5):197–205. [Google Scholar]
5. Hudelson P, Cléopas A, Kolly V, Chopard P, et al. What is quality and how is it achieved? Practitioners' views versus quality models. *Quality and Safety in Health Care.* 2008;17(1):31–36. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Eiriz V, Figueiredo JA. Quality evaluation in healthcare services based on customer-provider relationships. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance.* 2005;18(6-7):404–412. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Evans D B, Edejer TT, Lauer J, Frenk J, Murray CJL. Measuring quality: From the system to the provider. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care.* 2001;13:439–446. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. van Rooijen BD, de Haan MW, Das M, Arnoldussen CW, De Graaf R, van Zwam WH, Backes WH, Jeukens CR. Efficacy of radiation safety glasses in interventional radiology. Cardiovascular and interventional radiology. 2014 Oct;37:1149-55.
9. Morin RL, Seibert JA, Boone JM. Radiation dose and safety: informatics standards and tools. Journal of the American College of Radiology. 2014 Dec 1;11(12):1286-97.
10. Larson DB, Kruskal JB, Krecke KN, Donnelly LF. Key concepts of patient safety in radiology. Radiographics. 2015 Oct;35(6):1677-93.
11. Srinivasan D, Than KD, Wang AC, La Marca F, Wang PI, Schermerhorn TC, Park P. Radiation safety and spine surgery: systematic review of exposure limits and methods to minimize radiation exposure. World neurosurgery. 2014 Dec 1;82(6):1337-43.
12. Faggioni L, Paolicchi F, Bastiani L, Guido D, Caramella D. Awareness of radiation protection and dose levels of imaging procedures among medical students, radiography students, and radiology residents at an academic hospital: results of a comprehensive survey. European journal of radiology. 2017 Jan 1;86:135-42.

13. Trattner S, Pearson GD, Chin C, Cody DD, Gupta R, Hess CP, Kalra MK, Kofler Jr JM, Krishnam MS, Einstein AJ. Standardization and optimization of CT protocols to achieve low dose. Journal of the American College of Radiology. 2014 Mar 1;11(3):271-8.
14. Einstein AJ, Pascual TN, Mercuri M, Karthikeyan G, Vitola JV, Mahmarian JJ, Better N, Bouyoucef SE, Hee-Seung Bom H, Lele V, Magboo VP. Current worldwide nuclear cardiology practices and radiation exposure: results from the 65 country IAEA Nuclear Cardiology Protocols Cross-Sectional Study (INCAPS). European heart journal. 2015 Jul 7;36(26):1689-96.
15. Walker JS. Permissible dose: a history of radiation protection in the twentieth century. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; 2018.
16. Singh VK, Seed TM. A review of radiation countermeasures focusing on injury-specific medicinals and regulatory approval status: part I. Radiation sub-syndromes, animal models and FDA-approved countermeasures. International journal of radiation biology. 2017 Sep 2;93(9):851-69.
17. Tsai LL, Grant AK, Mortele KJ, Kung JW, Smith MP. A practical guide to MR imaging safety: what radiologists need to know. Radiographics. 2015 Oct;35(6):1722-37.
18. Kumar TP, Azmi R, Premkumar A, Sujatha S, Devi BK, Rakesh N, Shwetha V. Radiation safety protocol in dentistry: A neglected practice. Journal of Orofacial Sciences. 2018 Jan 1;10(1):24-30.
19. Behal S. Perception of dental undergraduates and interns on radiation protection safety protocol-A questionnaire based cross-sectional study. IAIM. 2016 Dec 1;3(12):68-74.
20. Bartal G, Vano E, Paulo G, Miller DL. Management of patient and staff radiation dose in interventional radiology: current concepts. Cardiovascular and interventional radiology. 2014 Apr;37:289-98.
21. Hirshfeld JW, Ferrari VA, Bengel FM, Bergersen L, Chambers CE, Einstein AJ, Eisenberg MJ, Fogel MA, Gerber TC, Haines DE, Laskey WK. 2018 ACC/HRS/NASCI/SCAI/SCCT expert consensus document on optimal use of ionizing radiation in cardiovascular imaging: best practices for safety and effectiveness: a report of the American College of Cardiology Task Force on Expert Consensus Decision Pathways. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2018 Jun 19;71(24):e283-351.
22. Patel AR, Ganley J, Zhu X, Rome JJ, Shah M, Glatz AC. Radiation safety protocol using real-time dose reporting reduces patient exposure in pediatric electrophysiology procedures. Pediatric cardiology. 2014 Oct;35:1116-23.
23. Fetterly KA, Mathew V, Lennon R, Bell MR, Holmes DR, Rihal CS. Radiation dose reduction in the invasive cardiovascular laboratory: implementing a culture and philosophy of radiation safety. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions. 2012 Aug;5(8):866-73.
24. E. Chambers C, A. Fetterly K, Holzer R, Paul Lin PJ, C. Blankenship J, Balter S, K. Laskey W. Radiation safety program for the cardiac catheterization laboratory. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions. 2011 Mar 1;77(4):546-56.
25. Domenech H. Radiation Safety. Managment and Programs. Suiza: Springer. 2017.
26. Steele JR, Jones AK, Ninan EP. Quality initiatives: establishing an interventional radiology patient radiation safety program. Radiographics. 2012 Jan;32(1):277-87.
27. Glaser ZZ. Organization and Management of a Nonionizing Radiation Safety Program. InCRC Handbook of Management of Radiation Protection Programs, Second Edition 2020 Aug 11 (pp. 43-52). CRC Press.
28. Stecker MS, Balter S, Towbin RB, Miller DL, Vañó E, Bartal G, Angle JF, Chao CP, Cohen AM, Dixon RG, Gross K. Guidelines for patient radiation dose management. Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology. 2009 Jul 1;20(7):S263-73.
29. Miller DL, Balter S, Wagner LK, Cardella JF, Clark TW, Neithamer Jr CD, Schwartzberg MS, Swan TL, Towbin RB, Rholl KS, Sacks D. Quality improvement guidelines for recording patient radiation dose in the medical record. Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology. 2009 Jul 1;20(7):S200-7.
30. Shafiq J, Barton M, Noble D, Lemer C, Donaldson LJ. An international review of patient safety measures in radiotherapy practice. Radiotherapy and Oncology. 2009 Jul 1;92(1):15-21.
31. Eubig C, Corley J, Wilson L, Yoder J. Management of radiation safety records using custom designed computer forms. Journal of nuclear medicine technology. 1993 Jun 1;21(2):75-83.
32. CDA Practice Support. Frequently Asked Radiation Safety Questions. Journal of the

California Dental Association. 2023 Dec 31;51(1):2233134.