

Table of Contents

| | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Table of contents | i |
| Dedication | v |
| Acknowledgement | vi |
| Abstract | vii |
| Abstract in Arabic | viii |
| <i>Chapter 1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION</i> | |
| 1.1. Introduction | 2 |
| 1.2. Problem statement | 2 |
| 1.3. Hypothesis | 2 |
| 1.4. General Objectives | 3 |
| 1.5. Specific Objectives | 3 |
| 1.6. Methodology | 3 |
| 1.7. Source of data | 5 |
| 1.8. Materials of the study | 5 |
| 1.8.1. Equipments | 5 |
| 1.8.2. Method of data analysis | 5 |
| <i>Chapter 2. LITERATURE REVIEW</i> | |
| 2.1. Historical background | 7 |
| 2.2. Conventional x-ray systems for general purposes | 8 |
| 2.2.1. General purpose radiography equipment | 9 |
| 2.2.2. Specific equipment requirements | 10 |
| 2.3. Radiology physics and Equipment | 10 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.3.1. X-ray generation ant tube design | 10 |
| 2.3.2. X-ray generators | 17 |
| 2.3.3. The x-ray spectrum | 17 |
| 2.3.4. Collimation | 20 |
| 2.3.5. Scatter & attenuation of the x-ray and grids | 20 |
| 2.3.6. Film screen integrity | 21 |
| 2.3.7. Contrast | 23 |
| 2.3.8. Resolution | 23 |
| 2.4. Structural Shielding in Diagnostic Imaging | 24 |
| 2.4.1. Theory of Shielding | 24 |
| 2.4.2. Basic shielding calculation data | 25 |
| 2.4.3. Construction of Shielding | 28 |
| 2.5. The Darkroom | 29 |
| 2.5.1. Minimum requirements for a Darkroom | 30 |
| 2.5.2. Preparing processing solutions | 33 |
| 2.5.3. Under & over processing | 33 |
| 2.5.4. Cleaning processing tanks | 34 |
| 2.5.5. Automatic processor | 34 |
| 2.6. Repeat analysis | 35 |
| 2.6.1 Reject-repeat analysis | 35 |
| 2.6.2 Reasons for repeat | 36 |
| 2.7 Staff radiation exposure & personal monitoring | 36 |
| 2.7.1 Objectives of personal monitoring | 37 |
| 2.7.2 Benefits of personal monitoring | 37 |
| 2.7.3 Classification of radiation areas | 37 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.7.4 Methods of monitoring | 37 |
| 2.7.5 Thermoluminescence dosimeters TLD | 38 |
| 2.7.6 TLD reader | 39 |
| 2.7.7 Proper care of personal dosimeter | 40 |
| 2.7.8 The dosimetry report | 40 |
| 2.8. Quality assurance | 41 |
| 2.8.1 Quality Assurance Program | 41 |
| 2.8.2 Quality Control | 42 |
| 2.8.3 Quality Control Program | 42 |
| 2.8.4 QC techniques | 44 |
| 2.8.5 Routine QC tests for conventional radiographic equipments | 45 |
| 2.9. Review of conventional QC tests | 47 |
| 2.9.1 kVp Accuracy | 47 |
| 2.9.2 Timer accuracy | 47 |
| 2.9.3 Relative mA & mAs linearity | 48 |
| 2.9.4 mAs consistency | 49 |
| 2.9.5 kVp & time reproducibility and linearity test | 49 |
| 2.9.6 Half Value Layer test | 51 |
| 2.9.7 Radiation field test | 52 |
| 2.9.8 Focal spot size | 53 |
| 2.10. Review of Darkroom QC tests | 54 |
| 2.10.1. Intensifying screens/cassettes/films | 54 |
| 2.10.2. Darkroom fog check | 57 |
| 2.10.3. Grids (grid alignment test) | 59 |
| 2.11. Review of reject film analysis procedure | 60 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.12. Personnel monitoring for the radiation workers | 62 |
| 2.13. Quality Control Economics | 62 |
| 2.13.1. Costs of Quality Control | 63 |
| 2.13.2. Calibration of test equipments | 64 |
| 2.13.3. Benefits of quality control program | 64 |

Chapter 3. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.1. Introduction | 66 |
| 3.2. Machine Quality Control results | 66 |
| 3.3. Darkroom Quality Control results | 72 |
| 3.5. Cost Analysis results | 78 |
| 3.6. Personal monitoring results | 79 |
| 3.7. Quality Assurance review work sheet results | 81 |

Chapter 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| 5.1. Discussion | 84 |
| 5.2. Conclusion | 88 |
| 5.3. Recommendations | 89 |
| References | 94 |
| Appendices | 96 |

DEDICATION

This research document is dedicated to the efforts to improve Quality Assurance Programs in Sudan were instrumental in bringing about this program. Also I dedicate it for my parents, brothers; and all those who patient care is their responsibility.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was prepared through the efforts, advice and input of many people. I offer my thanks to all of the contributors. In particular, I thank my supervisor; Mr. Mamdouh Yassin Osman, Medical Physicist; and all my colleagues in Radiation Safety institute; especially Nada Abbas, Radiation Physicist; Enas Hamed, Radiation physicist; Alghazali Abdallah, Omayma Gaafar, Hiba Hashim, Nahla Suleiman. Also my regards are to the Medical Corps in Omdurman medical base, especially Brigadier General Omer Adam, senior medical engineer; Brigadier General Dr. Ahmed Elawad, Chief of Medical Imaging Departments; Brigadier general Abdurrahman Mobie, Colonel Amera Atta.

And great thanks for the staff in the radiographic imaging department in both casualty and main centers.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Quality Assurance procedures in the Military Corps in Khartoum state, through the comprehensive Quality Control QC procedures of the x-ray machines and darkrooms in the x-ray departments, and to provide a Quality Assurance Manual to support the federal ministry of Health running QA program.

This study is the first time that the departments of the Military Corps apply Qc tests on their x-ray machines. The total number of x-ray machines in Khartoum state is 10 machines with 4 darkrooms. Only three of the x-ray machines are tested and the results showed that there are unacceptable parameters of the major exposure factors which determine the image quality. The percentage of accuracy defects are 67% for kVp Accuracy, 67% for Time Accuracy, 33% for Relative mA Linearity, 33% for Relative mAs Linearity, 67% for kVp Reproducibility, 67% for Collimator test. Also the tested darkrooms showed that the percentage of unacceptable parameters as: 15% for tested intensifying screens, 18% for tested Cassettes, 100% for light leakage, 67% for Safelight.

Reject film Analysis showed that 5.3% & 10% is the reject percentage during four months for the main and casualty centers respectively.

Personal monitoring showed that the dose is within the dose limits the maximum and minimum Dose equivalent in 2001 is $4.231\mu\text{Sv}$, $0.154\mu\text{Sv}$ and in 2002 is $2.736\mu\text{Sv}$, $0.167\mu\text{Sv}$ consequently, and the monitoring is stopped since July 2002.

The study gives a review of all definitions and QC procedures needed for the QA manual and can be referenced as a QA Manual for the Military Corps or any other hospital.

Through this study it has been obviously clear that there is no QAP or any other parts of QA, such as QCP.

الخلاصة

الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو تقييم وضع عمليات تأمين الودة في أقسام التصوير بالأشعة السينية العامة بمستشفيات السلاح الطبي ولاية الخرطوم، وذلك من خلال عمليات ضبط الودة لأجهزة الأشعة والغف المظلمة وتحليل سجلات الرقابة الفنية للحوئات الإشعاعية للعاملين في تلك الأقسام. كما تهدف إلى وضع أساسيات دليل لتأمين الودة لدعم ونامج تأمين الودة المطبق حالياً وزارة الصحة الاتحادية.

ووفت هذه الدراسة ولأول مرة إجراء اختبارات ضبط الودة لأجهزة الأشعة والغف المظلمة بمستشفيات السلاح الطبي ولاية الخرطوم. حيث وجد 10 أجهزة تم إجراء اختبارات ضبط الودة لثلاث منها و هناك 4 قيد التشغيل كما تم إجراء قياسات ضبط الودة على جميع الغاف المظلمة المتاحة بتلك الأقسام.

بيّنت الاختبارات وجود ضعف في عوامل التوضُّع المؤثرة مباشرة على ودَّة الصور، ونسبة الضعف هي، 67% لدقَّة الجهد العالي، 67% لدقَّة المؤقت، 33% لخطية التيار النسبية، 33% لخطية التيار والذروة (mA_s)، 67% لإمكانية إعادة ضبط الجهد العالي و 67% لمحدود الأشعة. وكذلك كانت نسبة ضعف أداء الغاف المظلمة كالتالي، 15% لأواح التوكيز، 18% لحافظ أفلام الأشعة، 100% لتسوب الضوء، 67% لضوء الأمان.

كما أظهرت نتائج تحليل الأفلام المعادة أن نسبة إعادة التصوير بلغت 5.3% و 10% وذلك خلال فترة أربعة أشهر بالمركز الرئيسي والوحادي على القوالى.

كما وجد أن الحوئات الإشعاعية المكافئة السوية العليا والدنيا هي لعام 2001 هي 4.231 ملي سيفوت و 0.15 ملي سيفوت على القوالى؛ ولعام 2002 هي 2.7 ملي سيفوت و 0.167 ملي سيفوت على القوالى وأن رقابة الحوئات الإشعاعية مقرفة منذ يونيو 2002.

وأتصح من خلال الواسة عدم وجود ونامج تأمين الودة أو أي خروء منه وال الحاجة المطردة له للمحافظة على التطور الذي تشهده مستشفيات السلاح الطبي على امتداد البلاد.