THE HIDDEN PSYCHOLOGY OF RADIATION SAFETY - HOW FEAR SHAPES DOSE DECISIONS IN MEDICAL IMAGING

A.D. Llerena[1]

[1] Medical Physicist and Senior Application Specialist, Qaelum NV

I. INTRODUCTION

Radiation dose optimization is a critical component of medical imaging, aiming to balance diagnostic accuracy with patient safety by minimizing radiation exposure. Medical professionals, including radiologists, technologists, and referring physicians, continually strive to adhere to the ALARA principle – keeping radiation exposure "as low as reasonably achievable." Yet, despite advancements in technology and established safety protocols, achieving this balance remains challenging, partly due to complex psychological factors that influence clinical decision-making.

Balancing diagnostic certainty with patient safety involves confronting not only technical and procedural challenges but also the hidden psychological pressures healthcare professionals face. This article explores these often-overlooked psychological dimensions – such as risk aversion, fear of diagnostic errors, and liability concerns – that shape decisions related to radiation dose. By highlighting these factors, we aim to encourage integration of psychological awareness into training programs and organizational policies to foster more informed, confident, and safer imaging practices.

II. PSYCHOLOGICAL DRIVERS BEHIND DOSE DECISIONS

Healthcare providers frequently encounter psychological influences that subtly guide their radiation dose decisions. One prominent factor is risk aversion, particularly the fear of uncertainty or missing a critical diagnosis. Radiologists and other medical professionals may unconsciously favor higher radiation doses to enhance diagnostic confidence, often selecting advanced imaging modalities over lower-dose alternatives. Cognitive biases such as availability bias – where recent rare cases significantly influence decision-making – further reinforce this cautious, dose-intensive approach [1].

A closely related driver is the fear of diagnostic errors. Medical professionals often worry that lower radiation doses might compromise image quality, potentially leading to missed findings. This anxiety, especially prominent among radiologists, is well-documented. A recent analysis underscores that radiologists – deeply aware of the consequences of diagnostic errors – often lean toward higher radiation doses or follow-up studies to ensure accuracy [2].

Another major influence is liability concern, which fuels a culture of defensive medicine. Physicians may order unnecessary imaging tests to protect themselves against potential litigation. This medico-legal fear leads to over-imaging and elevated radiation exposure. Expert discussions confirm that legal concerns often override adherence to evidence-based best practices [3,4]. Referring physicians are particularly susceptible, as legal fears and patient expectations contribute to excessive imaging orders [5].

By openly acknowledging and addressing these psychological drivers – fear of errors, legal repercussions, and ingrained cognitive biases – medical imaging departments can better manage radiation safety, ensuring decisions align more closely with evidence-based best practices and patient well-being.

III. RADIOLOGISTS' DILEMMA: QUALITY VS. RISK

Radiologists face a unique challenge in balancing image quality with patient safety due to their direct role in interpreting imaging studies. Unlike other healthcare providers, their diagnostic interpretations carry immediate clinical and legal weight, often heightening anxiety over uncertainty.

To mitigate this, radiologists benefit from specialized training in uncertainty management and structured peer-review programs that validate image adequacy even at lower doses. Role-specific strategies, such as confidence-building through decision-making simulations, and active engagement with dose optimization guidelines, can help reinforce that lower-dose imaging can still yield high diagnostic value.

Organizational support is also key. A strong safety culture that encourages second opinions, shared decision-making, and transparent error reporting can empower radiologists to resist fear-driven choices and uphold ALARA principles without compromising diagnostic confidence.

IV. TECHNOLOGISTS ON THE FRONTLINE: ADHERENCE VS. AUTONOMY

Radiologic technologists, who implement imaging protocols directly, face their own set of psychological pressures. A key factor is the fear of producing suboptimal image quality, which could lead to repeated exams,

criticism, or compromised patient outcomes. Technologists often default to familiar, higher-dose protocols rather than risk subpar results from dose-reduced methods [4].

Studies reveal significant knowledge gaps in advanced dose management strategies, such as diagnostic reference levels. While many technologists recognize the ALARA principle, fewer understand or apply quantitative dose metrics in daily practice. This gap highlights the need for targeted education to enhance technologists' confidence in optimizing dose [1].

Building a supportive organizational culture that values technologists' input, promotes communication with radiologists, and offers continuous education can alleviate these pressures, helping them confidently apply optimization techniques without sacrificing diagnostic quality.

V. REFERRING PHYSICIANS: THE FEAR FACTOR IN OVER-IMAGING

Referring physicians play a pivotal role in determining whether imaging is ordered in the first place. Unlike radiologists or technologists, they often lack detailed training in imaging appropriateness or radiation dose considerations. This knowledge gap, combined with medico-legal fears and pressure from patients or families, makes them particularly vulnerable to over-imaging due to uncertainty.

Addressing this requires focused education on evidence-based imaging guidelines, including campaigns like Choosing Wisely and the ACR Appropriateness Criteria. Integrating clinical decision support systems (CDSS) into electronic ordering platforms can provide real-time feedback on imaging choices and reduce unnecessary referrals.

Additionally, risk communication training can equip referring physicians to manage patient expectations more effectively, shifting conversations from "more testing equals better care" to informed, safety-first dialogue.

VI. TOWARDS A CULTURE OF CONFIDENCE AND CLARITY

Addressing psychological barriers to radiation dose optimization requires cultivating confidence and clarity in decision-making. Training should include psychological awareness, helping professionals manage anxiety around uncertainty and liability.

As emphasized by the WHO and IAEA, developing a robust radiation safety culture involves not just policies but the emotional empowerment of staff through education, collaboration, and supportive leadership [6].

Decision-making simulations, peer feedback sessions, and role-playing are useful for helping radiologists and technologists gain confidence in using lower-dose protocols. Similarly, risk communication workshops can empower referring physicians to make decisions less driven by fear.

Initiatives like the Image Gently and Image Wisely campaigns demonstrate effective ways to institutionalize such approaches, blending psychological insight with practical tools for safer imaging.

VII. CONCLUSION: REFRAMING RADIATION SAFETY

Integrating psychological insight into radiation safety represents an untapped opportunity to improve imaging practices. Recognizing and addressing fear-based decision-making – whether related to diagnostic confidence, legal exposure, or cognitive biases – can lead to more rational, evidence-based choices.

Leadership in imaging departments and healthcare institutions must support training and policies that promote psychological resilience. A culture that emphasizes transparency, team collaboration, and continuous education will allow imaging professionals to act confidently in the best interest of patient care.

Reframing radiation safety through a psychologically informed lens provides a clearer path toward optimized, patient-centered imaging – where low-dose decisions are not feared, but trusted.

REFERENCES

1. Vosshenrich J, Wurslin C, Reiser MF, et al. "Investigating cognitive biases in radiology: how risk aversion and diagnostic uncertainty shape imaging decisions." *European Journal of Radiology*, 2023.
2. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). "Error and cognitive bias in diagnostic radiology." *Patient Safety Network (PSNet), Expert Commentary*, 2021.
3. Srinivasan A, Duncan JR, Swenson SJ, et al. "Strategies for dose optimization: views from health care systems." *Journal of the American College of Radiology (JACR)*, 2022.
4. Alzen G, Benz-Bohm G. "Evaluation of radiation dose reduction strategies in pediatric radiology." *Journal of Biomedical Physics & Engineering*, 2019.
5. Larson DB, Langlotz CP, Boland GW. "Fears, feelings, and facts: interactively communicating benefits and risks of medical radiation." *American Journal of Roentgenology (AJR)*, 2021.
6. World Health Organization (WHO). A framework for mental health and psychosocial support in radiological and nuclear emergencies. WHO Technical Guidance; 2020.

Contacts of the corresponding author:

Author: Ana Dolcet Llerena
Institute: Qaelum NV
Country: Latin America
Email: scarlette.ye@qaelum.com