

The Editor

Journal of Nuclear Medicine

Dear Sir

THE LINEAR NO-THRESHOLD (LNT) HYPOTHESIS

Thank you for publishing the Special Contribution entitled "Subjecting Radiologic Imaging to the Linear No-Threshold Hypothesis: a Non Sequitur of Non-Trivial Proportions", which appeared in your January issue. Siegel, Pennington and Sacks have produced a comprehensively researched, timely review of the evidence which deserves wide dissemination. I hope it is read and understood by all members of regulatory bodies.

As a diagnostic radiologist I have been frustrated for many years by the incomplete, over simplistic approach of the Linear No-Threshold (LNT) hypothesis. Administratively convenient and currently politically acceptable it may be; scientifically accurate it is not. Attempts to discuss with colleagues the LHT hypothesis, and the "As Low As Reasonably Achievable" (ALARA) strategy which follows from it, have invariably produced a resigned shrug of the shoulders and a "we can't change the regulations so you might as well accept it" type of comment.

Well, let's review and hopefully change the regulations. And while we're at it can we persuade our regulators to become a little more positive in their outlook? The "it's-all-nasty-stuff" atmosphere promulgated by LNT is depressing, ignoring as it does the incalculable benefits of radiation, particularly in the low dose diagnostic range. Can I suggest that the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) be rebranded? Perhaps ICRE – the International Commission on Radiological Education? Just a thought.

Christopher Feltham

Diagnostic Radiologist (Retired)

cfeltham@xtra.co.nz

13 January 2017