



# Determinants of radiation dose during right transradial access: Insights from the RAD-MATRIX study

Alessandro Sciahbasi, MD, PhD,<sup>a</sup> Enrico Frigoli, MD,<sup>b</sup> Alessandro Sarandrea, Eng,<sup>c</sup> Paolo Calabrò, MD, PhD,<sup>d</sup> Paolo Rubartelli, MD,<sup>e</sup> Bernardo Cortese, MD,<sup>f</sup> Francesco Tomassini, MD,<sup>g</sup> Dennis Zavalloni, MD,<sup>h</sup> Matteo Tebaldi, MD,<sup>i</sup> Paolo Calabria, MD,<sup>j</sup> Stefano Rigattieri, MD, PhD,<sup>a</sup> Antonio Zingarelli, MD,<sup>k</sup> Gennaro Sardella, MD,<sup>l</sup> Alessandro Lupi, MD,<sup>m</sup> Martina Rothenbühler, M. Sc,<sup>n</sup> Dik Heg, PD, PhD,<sup>n</sup> and Marco Valgimigli, MD, PhD<sup>o</sup>  
*Rome, Forlì, Naples, Genova, Milan, Rivoli, Rozzano, Grosseto, Ferrara, Domodossola, Italy; and Bern, Switzerland*

**Background** The RAD-MATRIX trial reported a large operator radiation exposure variability in right radial percutaneous coronary procedures. The reasons of these differences are not well understood. Our aim was to appraise the determinants of operator radiation exposure during coronary right transradial procedures.

**Methods** Patient arrangement during transradial intervention was investigated across operators involved in the RAD-MATRIX trial. Operator radiation exposure was analyzed according to the position of the patient right arm (close or far from the body) and in relation to the size of the upper leaded glass.

**Results** Among the 14 operators who agreed to participate, there was a greater than 10-fold difference in radiation dose at thorax level (from 21.5 to 267  $\mu\text{Sv}$ ) that persisted after normalization by dose-area product (from 0.35 to 3.5  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$ ). Among the operators who positioned the instrumented right arm far from the body (110.4  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , interquartile range 71.5–146.5  $\mu\text{Sv}$ ), thorax dose was greater than that in those who placed the instrumented arm close to the right leg (46.1  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , 31.3–56.8  $\mu\text{Sv}$ ,  $P = .02$ ). This difference persisted after normalization by dose-area product ( $P = .028$ ). The use of a smaller full glass shield was also associated with a higher radiation exposure compared with a larger composite shield (147.5 and 60  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , respectively,  $P = .016$ ).

**Conclusions** In the context of the biggest radiation study conducted in patients undergoing transradial catheterization, the instrumented right arm arrangement close to the leg and greater upper leaded shield dimensions were associated with a lower operator radiation exposure. Our findings emphasize the importance of implementing simple preventive measures to mitigate the extra risks of radiation exposure with right radial as compared with femoral access. (*Am Heart J* 2018;196:113-8.)

The use of radial, instead of femoral, access for coronary angiography and percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) has recently gained worldwide acceptance due to lower risks of bleeding, vascular complications, and patients discomfort.<sup>1-3</sup> The MATRIX trial<sup>1</sup> showed a greater survival in patients with acute coronary syndrome undergoing invasive management treated by transradial rather than transfemoral approach. This observation, in

conjunction with prior evidence, has led the European clinical practice guidelines to endorse the use of radial access in patients with acute coronary syndromes undergoing invasive management with a class I recommendation.<sup>4,5</sup>

However, the right radial access site, which is by far the most frequently used transradial route worldwide, is associated to higher radiation exposure, especially for

From the <sup>a</sup>Interventional Cardiology, Sandro Pertini Hospital, ASL RM2, Rome, Italy, <sup>b</sup>Eustrategy Association, Forlì, Italy, <sup>c</sup>HSE Management, Rome, Italy, <sup>d</sup>Department of Cardio-Thoracic Sciences, Second University of Naples, Naples, Italy, <sup>e</sup>Villa Scassi Hospital, Genova, Italy, <sup>f</sup>Interventional Cardiology, Fatebenefratelli Hospital, Milan, Italy, <sup>g</sup>Department of Cardiology, Infermi Hospital, Rivoli, Italy, <sup>h</sup>Humanitas Research Hospital, IRCCS, Rozzano, Italy, <sup>i</sup>Cardiology Unit, Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria di Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy, <sup>j</sup>Cardiology Unit, Misericordia Hospital, Grosseto, Italy, <sup>k</sup>Interventional Cardiology Unit, IRCCS AOU San Martino, IST, Genova, Italy, <sup>l</sup>Department of Cardiovascular Sciences, Policlinico Umberto I, Rome, Italy, <sup>m</sup>Cardiology, ASL VCO, Domodossola, Italy, <sup>n</sup>CTU Bern, and Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine—University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland, and <sup>o</sup>Swiss Cardiovascular Center, Bern University Hospital, Bern, Switzerland.

**Conflicts of interest:** Dr Cortese reports personal fees from The Medicines Company during the conduct of the study; Dr Valgimigli reports grants from Terumo and grants from The Medicines Company during the conduct of the study. The other authors report nothing to disclose related to the content herein. The MATRIX program is conducted with support from The Medicines Company and Terumo. The RAD MATRIX substudy did not receive additional funding and has been co-supported by Alessandro Sciahbasi, the substudy principal investigator. Submitted September 18, 2017; accepted October 25, 2017.

Reprint requests: Alessandro Sciahbasi, MD, PhD, Sandro Pertini Hospital, ASL RM2, 00157, Rome, Italy. E-mail: [alessandro.sciahbasi@fastwebnet.it](mailto:alessandro.sciahbasi@fastwebnet.it)  
0002-8703

© 2017 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ahj.2017.10.014>

operators, as compared with the femoral approach.<sup>6-9</sup> A possible explanation of the higher dose in radial access is due to the operators' difficulty in adequately shielding themselves from the scatter radiation coming from the patient. The use of adjunctive protective drapes placed on the patient has been proven to be an effective method to significantly reduce this scatter radiation coming from the patient, reducing the operator radiation exposure in transradial procedures.<sup>10,11</sup>

A significant variability in operator radiation dose has been documented among operators performing transradial procedures in the largest study evaluating operator radiation exposure during PCIs.<sup>12</sup> The reasons of this heterogeneity are likely multifactorial (position of the operator, use of adequate shield, positioning of the shield, radiation dose used, etc) but not completely understood.

At variance with the transfemoral approach, the arrangement for patients undergoing right radial access lacks standardization. In particular, some operators position the patient right arm along to the patient right leg, whereas other operators prefer to undertake catheterization while the right arm lies abducted from the patient leg. These 2 different arrangements reflect a different positioning of the operator during the procedure and differential use of the upper mobile leaded glass. No studies, to date, have evaluated the role of the different patient arrangements in terms of operator radiation dose.

The aim of this analysis of the RAD-MATRIX study is to appraise the determinants of operator radiation exposure during right transradial approach.

## Methods

### Study design and population

The designs of the MATRIX trial and of the radiation (RAD-MATRIX) substudy have been previously reported.<sup>13,14</sup> In brief, all patients with an acute coronary syndrome with or without ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) were randomly allocated to radial or femoral access.

Operators participating in the radiation substudy were asked to follow central randomization in regard to radial or femoral access for the primary end point comparison (operator radiation exposure at thorax) and for the patient radiation exposure comparison. A further randomization was performed in patients centrally allocated to radial access based on the patient identification (ID) number with odd ID numbers assigned to right radial and even ID numbers to left radial access. In the present analysis, we considered only the right radial access procedures.

### Procedures

Access site management during and after the diagnostic or therapeutic procedure was left to the discretion of the treating physician. Patient and operator positioning

during transradial catheterization was according to institutional standards.

In all procedures, radioprotection was ensured using a lead apron, a thyroid lead collar, lower-body x-ray curtain fixed on the angiographic table, and an upper mobile leaded glass suspended from the ceiling.

### Radiation measurement

Each operator was equipped with dedicated lithium fluoride thermoluminescent dosimeters with a range of linearity from 1  $\mu$ Gy to 10 Gy placed at left wrist, at mid thorax level, in the breast pocket outside the lead apron and at head level (in the middle front to measure the eye dose). At the end of the study, all the dosimeters were collected for central reading at TECNORAD Co (Verona, Italy) and represent cumulative exposure during all procedures performed by the operator that were divided by the number of procedures performed to obtain the operator mean radiation dose. The results were expressed as equivalent doses in microsievert after correction for the radiation weighting factor (for x-rays, this factor is 1).

Procedural dose was estimated using the dose-area product (DAP) expressed in  $\text{Gy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$ . The DAP is the product of the absorbed dose to air and the cross-sectional area of the x-ray field for all segments of an interventional radiology procedure. This parameter was measured using specially designed ionization chambers mounted at the collimator system and calculated by the software present in each angiographic system.

There were no significant differences in operator positioning in relation to the radiation source.

### Patient setup and upper mobile leaded glass

Description of patient setup was performed asking to the operators involved in the study to take representative pictures illustrating the positions of patient's right arm as well of the operator's during transradial catheterization. After centralized analysis of each operator's representative pictures, 2 different arrangements of the patient right arm were identified: straight close to the right leg (group A) or far from the body (group B) (Figure 1).


In addition, 2 different upper mobile leaded shields were identified across participating centers: a full glass shield (60 cm of height) or a combined glass and curtain leaded shield (35 cm each for a total height of 70 cm) (Figure 2).

### Statistical analysis

Continuous variables are reported as mean and SD and compared using *t* test. Categorical variables are indicated as the absolute number and percentage and were compared by Pearson  $\chi^2$  test or, if the number expected of patients was less than 5, with the Fisher exact test.

Operator radiation dose and fluoroscopy time were presented as median with interquartile range (IQR) and compared by Mann-Whitney *U* test. The operator radiation dose was also normalized by DAP to exclude a possible bias

Figure 1



Right arm setup for transradial percutaneous coronary procedure. Two different right arm arrangements have been observed: a right arm positioning along the right leg (A) and an external abducted arrangement (B).

due to the complexity of the procedure or to the anthropometric characteristics of the patients.

The analyses were performed using SPSS 21.0 software (SPSS, Chicago, IL).

### End points

The primary end point of the study was operator radiation exposure at thorax level during right radial procedures comparing the 2 arrangements of patient right arm (group A vs B) as previously described. Secondary end point was operator radiation exposure comparing the 2 identified upper mobile shields across participating institutions.

### Extramural funding

The MATRIX program is conducted with support from The Medicines Company and Terumo.

The RAD MATRIX substudy did not receive additional funding and has been co-supported by Alessandro Sciahbasi, the substudy principal investigator.

The authors are solely responsible for the design and conduct of this study, all study analyses, the drafting and editing of the paper, and its final contents.

### Results

From a total of 18 operators involved in the study, 1 operator did not qualify because of refusal to perform right


transradial procedures, and 3 operators declined participation because of impossibility to provide representative pictures while the recruitment in the RAD-MATRIX trial took place.

Overall, the 14 included operators performed 139 procedures ( $10 \pm 7$  procedures per operator) through the right transradial access. Among these operators, there were a more than 12-fold variability in the procedural radiation exposure at thorax level (range 21.5-267  $\mu\text{Sv}$ ) and a roughly 5-fold difference for DAP (range 37-167  $\text{Gy} \cdot \text{cm}^2$ ). After normalization of radiation dose by DAP, a 10-fold interoperator variability still persisted ranging from 0.35 to 3.5  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy} \cdot \text{cm}^2$ .

### Patient preparation and operator dose

Six operators arranged the patient right arm along the patient right leg (group A), whereas 8 operators were used to install the patient right arm far from the body (Group B). The 2 groups did not differ significantly for clinical and procedural characteristics except for a higher STEMI rate in group A (Table D).

In group A, the operator procedural radiation dose at thorax level was significantly lower compared with group B (46.1  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , IQR 31.3-56.8  $\mu\text{Sv}$  and 110.4  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , IQR 71.5-146.5  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , respectively;  $P = .02$ ). After normalization by DAP, the difference still persisted (0.55  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy} \cdot \text{cm}^2$ , IQR 0.49-0.62  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy} \cdot \text{cm}^2$  in group A and 0.91  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy} \cdot \text{cm}^2$ ,

**Figure 2**

Upper mobile shields. In the centers involved in the study, 2 different upper mobile shields have been used: a combined leaded glass with leaded curtain screen (A) and a full leaded glass shield (B).

IQR 0.73-1.24  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$  in group B;  $P = .028$ ). Similar results were observed at head level, whereas at left wrist, despite numerically higher level in group B, the difference was not statistically significant (Table II).

#### Dimension of the upper mobile leaded glass

The 3 operators who used the full glass shield had a significantly higher radiation dose compared with the 11 operators that used the combined (glass and curtain) shield (147.5  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , IQR 135.5-207.3  $\mu\text{Sv}$  and 60  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , IQR 44.1-73.8  $\mu\text{Sv}$ , respectively;  $P = .016$ ). After normalization by DAP, a trend was still noted toward higher radiation dose in operators using full glass shield (1.05  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$ , IQR 0.9-2.28  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$  vs 0.71  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$ , IQR 0.48-0.76  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Gy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$ ;  $P = .07$ ).

**Table I.** Clinical and procedural characteristics

	Group A (n = 6)	Group B (n = 8)	P
Patients (n)	69	68	
Procedures (n)	69	70	
Male (%)	49 (71)	53 (76)	.46
Age (y)	66 $\pm$ 8	65 $\pm$ 6	.71
Height (cm)	171 $\pm$ 5	168 $\pm$ 4	.22
Weight (kg)	80 $\pm$ 7	77 $\pm$ 5	.46
BMI	27 $\pm$ 2	27 $\pm$ 1	.96
STEMI (%)	36 (52)	20 (29)	.008
PCI (%)	55 (80)	60 (86)	.48
Contrast (mL)	191 $\pm$ 40	175 $\pm$ 36	.46
Fluoroscopy time (min)*	11 (8.5-13.2)	14 (11.5-16.8)	.09
DAP ( $\text{Gy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$ )*	93 (61-97)	97 (90-127)	.17

Results expressed as mean with SD or absolute numbers and percentage in brackets.

Group A: right arm close to the body.

Group B: right arm abducted from the body.

BMI, Body mass index.

\* Medians with IQR.

**Table II.** Radiation dose absorbed by operators during right radial access.

	Group A (n = 6)	Group B (n = 8)	P
Operator dose ( $\mu\text{Sv}$ )			
Thorax	46.1 (25.4-64)	110.4 (70.9-147.1)	.02
Left wrist	97 (30-143)	168 (104-302)	.09
Head	15.5 (6.1-26.9)	43.9 (35-54.5)	.003
Dose normalized by DAP ( $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{Cy}\cdot\text{cm}^2$ )			
Thorax	0.55 (0.46-0.66)	0.91 (0.72-1.6)	.03
Left wrist	1.05 (0.34-2.18)	1.75 (0.91-2.55)	.30
Head	0.25 (0.071-0.28)	0.38 (0.27-0.61)	.01

Results expressed as medians with IQR (25%-75%).

Group A: right arm close to the body.


Group B: right arm abducted from the body.

## Discussion

At variance with transfemoral access, transradial procedures are associated with a large variability across centers in terms of patient preparation and radioprotective measures used during catheterization.

In the setting of the largest study evaluating the radiation exposure in patients and operators during PCIs with radial or femoral access, we previously reported that radial, especially when accessed in the right arm, as compared with femoral access is associated with greater operator and patient radiation exposure. The key and novel information provided by this study is that a different patient setup for percutaneous coronary procedures through the right radial access has a remarkably large impact on the operator radiation exposure. The lower operator exposure was observed when the instrumented right arm was positioned along the right leg as compared with operators

**Figure 3**



Positioning of the upper mobile shield. When the patient right arm is placed externally, the operator positioned the upper mobile shield laterally (**A**), creating a gap between the shield and the radiation area that exposes the operator to the scatter radiation coming from the patient (dotted triangle). Differently, when the right arm is along the leg, the operator positioned the upper shield more medially (arrows), blocking most of the scatter radiation coming from the patient (**B**).

instrumenting the right radial arm while abducted from the thorax.

Our findings are independent from the anthropometric patient characteristics or procedural radiation dose because these observations have been confirmed when the operator radiation dose was normalized by DAP.

The possible explanation of this difference in radiation dose between the 2 setups is based on the different use of the upper mobile shield in the 2 arrangements. Indeed, in case of external position of the patient arm, the operator generally placed the upper mobile shield more laterally, in a position that could be less effective (**Figure 3, A**). Differently, when the arm was placed along and very close to the right leg, the operator had no difficulty to place the upper shield more medially, increasing its efficacy as radiation shield (**Figure 3, B**). The results observed at head and wrist level confirmed our interpretation: previous studies showed that the upper mobile shield is very effective to reduce thorax and head radiation, whereas the efficacy at left wrist level is weak.<sup>15,16</sup>

According to our findings, a simple measure such as the arm setup before the procedure can reduce operator radiation exposure. This measure is cost saving and effective and should be considered for all programs aimed to reduce radiation exposure in the catheterization laboratory.

The role of the upper mobile shields to reduce operator radiation exposure has been observed in different previous studies with a possible dose reduction that, in some cases, reaches even 90% of the dose.<sup>15,16</sup> However, no study evaluated the role of dimensions and shape of the shield in terms of operator radiation exposure. For the first time, in our study, we observed that a combined shield with a leaded glass and a leaded curtain is more effective for operator radioprotection compared with a full leaded glass shield. There are 2 the possible reasons of this differences: first of all, the combined shield is probably more ergonomic and can be better adapted to the different patients, whereas the full glass shield sometimes cannot cover all the scattered radiation from the patient because of its fixed shape. Another possible explanation is the shield dimension. Among the centers involved in the study, the combined shield was 10 cm longer as compared with the full glass shield, and this increase in dimension could have had a significant effect on operator shielding efficacy.

Some limitations of our study should be considered. Our study is a secondary analysis of the main study, and it was not prespecified. The number of operators per group was limited (in particular for the comparison of the 2 upper mobile shields), which has prevented us from performing multivariable analysis to appraise the independent value of each of the 2 dose determinates investigated in this

analysis. At the same time, the sample size was small, and the analysis was limited to patients with acute coronary syndromes. Another important limitation of our study is the observational nature, and consequently, our data should be confirmed in a dedicated randomized study.

## Conclusions

In conclusion, the patient setup during right transradial procedures was identified as key factor associated to greater operator radiation exposure. In particular, the patient right arm arrangement close to the right leg and the use of more ergonomic and longer upper shields were associated with a lower operator radiation exposure. Our findings emphasize the importance of implementing simple preventive measures to mitigate the extra risks of radiation exposure with right radial as compared with femoral access.

## References

1. Valgimigli M, Gagnor A, Calabro P, et al. Radial versus femoral access in patients with acute coronary syndromes undergoing invasive management: a randomised multicentre trial. *Lancet* 2015;385:2465-76.
2. Mehta SR, Jolly SS, Cairns J, et al. Effects of radial versus femoral artery access in patients with acute coronary syndromes with or without ST-segment elevation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;60:2490-9.
3. Sciahbasi A, Fischetti D, Picciolo A, et al. Transradial access compared with femoral puncture closure devices in percutaneous coronary procedures. *Int J Cardiol* 2009;137:199-205.
4. Roffi M, Patrono C, Collet JP, et al. 2015 ESC guidelines for the management of acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment elevation: Task Force for the Management of Acute Coronary Syndromes in Patients Presenting Without Persistent ST-Segment Elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:267-315.
5. Ibanez B, James S, Agewall S, et al. 2017 ESC guidelines for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation: The Task Force for the Management of Acute Myocardial Infarction in Patients Presenting with ST-Segment Elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehx393>. [Epub ahead of print].
6. Bertrand OF, Rao SV, Pancholy S, et al. Transradial approach for coronary angiography and interventions: results of the first international transradial practice survey. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2010;3:1022-31.
7. Sciahbasi A, Romagnoli E, Burzotta F, et al. Transradial approach (left vs right) and procedural times during percutaneous coronary procedures: TALENT study. *Am Heart J* 2011;161:172-9.
8. Sciahbasi A, Romagnoli E, Trani C, et al. Operator radiation exposure during percutaneous coronary procedures through the left or right radial approach: the TALENT dosimetric substudy. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv* 2011;4:226-31.
9. Plourde G, Pancholy SB, Nolan J, et al. Radiation exposure in relation to the arterial access site used for diagnostic coronary angiography and percutaneous coronary intervention: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2015;386:2192-203.
10. Sciahbasi A, Rigattieri S, Sarandrea A, et al. Determinants of operator radiation exposure during percutaneous coronary procedures. *Am Heart J* 2017;187:10-8.
11. Sciahbasi A, Rigattieri S, Sarandrea A, et al. Radiation dose absorbed by operators during transradial percutaneous coronary procedures comparing different protective drapes: the RADIATION study. *EuroIntervention* 2017;12:e2253-61.
12. Sciahbasi A, Frigoli E, Sarandrea A, et al. Radiation exposure and vascular access in acute coronary syndromes: the RAD-Matrix Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;69:2530-7.
13. Valgimigli M, MATRIX investigators. Design and rationale for the minimizing adverse haemorrhagic events by transradial access site and systemic implementation of angioX program. *Am Heart J* 2014;168:838-45.
14. Sciahbasi A, Calabro P, Sarandrea A, et al. Randomized comparison of operator radiation exposure comparing transradial and transfemoral approach for percutaneous coronary procedures: rationale and design of the minimizing adverse haemorrhagic events by transradial access site and systemic implementation of angioX-radiation dose study (RAD-MATRIX). *Cardiovasc Revasc Med* 2014;15:209-13.
15. Maeder M, Brunner-La Rocca HP, et al. Impact of a lead glass screen on scatter radiation to eyes and hands in interventional cardiologists. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv* 2006;67:18-23.
16. Sciahbasi A, Rigattieri S, Sarandrea A, et al. Operator radiation exposure during right or left transradial coronary angiography: a phantom study. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med* 2015;16:386-90.