European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies (ISSN: 2750-8587)

Received: 08 February 2026 | Accepted: 05 March 2026 | Published: 01 April 2026

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Evaluation of Malignancy Probability Under Varying Exposure Intensities: Updated Efficiency Coefficients Based on Reanalyzed Atomic Blast Measurement Datasets and Healthy Tissue Absorption Levels

Dr. Alexei V. Morozov
Department of Radiological Sciences, Institute of Medical Physics, Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

Dr. Elena S. Petrova
Department of Oncology and Radiation Epidemiology, National Research Medical University, Moscow, Russia

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue04 2026

PAGE: 01-09

Abstract

Accurate estimation of malignancy probability under varying radiation exposure intensities remains a fundamental challenge in radiological protection, epidemiology, and clinical risk modeling. Traditional dose-response frameworks, largely derived from atomic bomb survivor data, have provided foundational insights into cancer risk; however, limitations in historical dosimetry systems and assumptions regarding dose-rate effectiveness have introduced uncertainties. This study presents a comprehensive re-evaluation of malignancy probability by integrating revised atomic blast measurement datasets with refined models of healthy tissue absorption. The research focuses on deriving updated efficiency coefficients that account for dose-rate variability, biological repair mechanisms, and non-tumor dose thresholds.

The methodological framework combines statistical modeling of epidemiological datasets with theoretical radiobiological principles, emphasizing nonlinear dose-response relationships and threshold-like effects. Reanalyzed dosimetry systems, including DS86 and DS02, are utilized to reassess exposure distributions and their correlation with cancer incidence patterns. The study incorporates evidence from both human cohorts and experimental models to establish a multi-scale understanding of radiation-induced carcinogenesis.

Key findings indicate that traditional linear extrapolation models may overestimate malignancy probability at low dose rates, particularly when biological adaptation and repair processes are considered. The derived efficiency coefficients demonstrate variability across exposure intensities, suggesting that a single universal dose-rate effectiveness factor is insufficient. The integration of healthy tissue absorption metrics further refines risk estimation by accounting for differential energy deposition across biological structures.

The study contributes to ongoing debates regarding low-dose radiation risk, offering a revised framework that enhances predictive accuracy while addressing inconsistencies in previous models. Implications extend to radiation protection guidelines, medical imaging practices, and environmental exposure assessments. Limitations include uncertainties in historical data reconstruction and variability across population-based studies. Future research should focus on integrating molecular-level biomarkers and advanced computational modeling to further refine risk predictions.

KEYWORDS

Radiation risk, malignancy probability, dose-rate effectiveness, atomic bomb dosimetry, cancer epidemiology, nonlinear dose-response, healthy tissue absorption, radiobiology, low-dose radiation, risk modeling.

INTRODUCTION

Radiation-induced malignancy remains a central concern in both medical and environmental contexts, necessitating precise estimation of cancer risk across varying exposure intensities. The foundational understanding of radiation carcinogenesis has been largely derived from epidemiological studies of atomic bomb survivors, which provide extensive longitudinal data linking radiation dose to cancer incidence (Grant et al., 2017; Ozasa et al., 2019). These datasets have informed regulatory frameworks and clinical practices; however, their interpretation is complicated by uncertainties in dosimetry, biological variability, and assumptions underlying dose-response models.

Historically, risk estimation has relied on the linear no-threshold (LNT) hypothesis, which posits a proportional relationship between dose and cancer risk, even at low exposure levels (International Commission on Radiological Protection, 1991; National Research Council USA, 1990). While this model provides a conservative basis for radiation protection, it has been increasingly challenged by evidence suggesting nonlinear responses, threshold effects, and dose-rate dependencies (Tanooka, 2001; Rühm et al., 2018). The influence of dose rate, in particular, has emerged as a critical factor, affecting biological repair processes and ultimately modifying cancer risk (Brooks et al., 2009; Shore et al., 2017).

Advancements in dosimetry systems, such as the transition from DS86 to DS02, have enabled more accurate reconstruction of radiation exposure from atomic bomb events (Roesch, 1987; Young and Kerr, 2005). These revisions highlight discrepancies in earlier datasets and underscore the need for updated risk models that incorporate refined exposure measurements. Furthermore, emerging evidence from experimental studies and environmental exposure cohorts suggests that low-dose radiation may induce adaptive biological responses, complicating the interpretation of epidemiological data (Chen and Wei, 1991; Ina et al., 2005).

Another critical dimension in risk estimation is the role of tissue-specific absorption. Traditional models often treat radiation dose as a uniform metric, neglecting variations in energy deposition across different biological structures. Incorporating healthy tissue absorption levels provides a more nuanced understanding of how radiation interacts with biological systems, influencing both damage induction and repair mechanisms.

The present study addresses these challenges by developing an updated framework for evaluating malignancy probability under varying exposure intensities. It integrates reanalyzed atomic blast datasets with advanced modeling of dose-rate effects and tissue absorption. The primary objectives are to derive revised efficiency coefficients, assess the validity of existing dose-response models, and provide a comprehensive analysis of factors influencing radiation-induced cancer risk.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to refine risk estimation methodologies, thereby improving radiation protection standards and clinical decision-making. By bridging gaps between epidemiological data and radiobiological theory, the study contributes to a more accurate and context-sensitive understanding of radiation carcinogenesis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of radiation-induced malignancy has evolved through a combination of epidemiological observations, experimental investigations, and theoretical modeling. Early research focused on high-dose exposures, such as those experienced by atomic bomb survivors, establishing a direct link between radiation and increased cancer incidence (Preston et al., 1994; Thompson et al., 1994). Subsequent analyses expanded these findings, incorporating long-term follow-up data to assess lifetime risk and dose-response relationships (Pierce and Vaeth, 1991; Little et al., 2020).

A central aspect of radiation risk modeling is the characterization of the dose-response relationship. Traditional linear models have been widely adopted due to their simplicity and conservative assumptions (International Commission on Radiological Protection, 1991). However, evidence from both human and animal studies suggests that this approach may not adequately capture the complexity of biological responses to radiation. Nonlinear and threshold-like models have been proposed, particularly in the context of low-dose exposures (Tanooka, 2001; Ootsuyama and Tanooka, 1991).

Dose-rate effects have been extensively studied as a modifying factor in radiation risk. Research indicates that lower dose rates allow for greater biological repair, potentially reducing carcinogenic outcomes (Brooks et al., 2009; Rühm et al., 2018). Experimental studies in animal models further support this concept, demonstrating reduced tumor incidence under prolonged low-dose-rate exposure compared to acute high-dose exposure (Ina et al., 2005; Yamamoto et al., 1998). These findings challenge the assumption of dose-rate independence embedded in traditional models.

Epidemiological studies beyond atomic bomb cohorts provide additional insights into radiation risk. Investigations of occupational and environmental exposures, such as thorotrast patients and high-background radiation areas, reveal variability in cancer incidence that cannot be fully explained by linear models (Anderson and Storm, 1992; Nair et al., 2009). Similarly, studies of radium dial workers and nuclear industry cohorts highlight the influence of chronic exposure and internal radionuclide deposition (Rowland et al., 1978; Krestinina et al., 2013).

Advancements in dosimetry have played a crucial role in refining risk estimates. The transition from DS86 to DS02 introduced significant revisions in exposure calculations, affecting dose-response analyses (Imanaka, 2005). These updates underscore the importance of accurate measurement systems in epidemiological research.

Recent literature has also emphasized the role of biological mechanisms in shaping radiation risk. Concepts such as adaptive response, hormesis, and immune system modulation have gained attention, suggesting that low-dose radiation may induce protective effects under certain conditions (Chen and Wei, 1991; Tubiana, 2008). While these phenomena remain controversial, they highlight the need for models that integrate biological complexity.

Despite these advancements, several gaps persist in the literature. First, there is limited integration of updated dosimetry data with modern statistical modeling techniques. Second, the interaction between dose rate and tissue-specific absorption remains underexplored. Third, existing models often fail to reconcile discrepancies between epidemiological and experimental findings.

This study addresses these gaps by developing a comprehensive framework that combines reanalyzed atomic bomb data with refined modeling of dose-rate effects and tissue absorption. By synthesizing insights from diverse studies, it aims to provide a more accurate and theoretically grounded approach to radiation risk estimation.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF RADIATION-INDUCED MALIGNANCY

Radiobiological Basis of Carcinogenesis

Radiation-induced carcinogenesis is fundamentally driven by DNA damage, particularly double-strand breaks, which can lead to mutations if not properly repaired. The probability of malignancy depends on both the extent of initial damage and the efficiency of cellular repair mechanisms (Fabrikant, 1990). At low doses, repair processes often mitigate damage, while at higher doses, repair saturation increases the likelihood of mutation accumulation.

Dose-Response Modeling Paradigms

Three principal models dominate radiation risk assessment:

- Linear no-threshold model
- Threshold model
- Hormetic model

Empirical evidence suggests that each model may be valid under specific conditions, highlighting the need for a flexible framework. For example, threshold-like behavior has been observed in experimental studies involving chronic irradiation (Tanooka, 2001).

Dose-Rate Effectiveness and Efficiency Coefficients

Dose-rate effectiveness factors quantify the reduction in biological effect at lower dose rates. However, studies indicate that these factors vary depending on exposure conditions, challenging the use of a universal coefficient (Shore et al., 2017). This study introduces updated efficiency coefficients that account for variability in exposure intensity and biological response.

REANALYSIS OF ATOMIC BLAST DOSIMETRY DATA

Evolution of Dosimetry Systems

The DS86 and DS02 systems represent successive efforts to improve the accuracy of radiation dose estimation from atomic bomb exposures (Roesch, 1987; Young and Kerr, 2005). Reanalysis reveals significant differences in dose distribution, particularly for neutron and gamma radiation components.

Impact on Risk Estimation

Updated dosimetry data alter the interpretation of dose-response relationships, particularly at low doses. These revisions necessitate recalibration of risk models to ensure consistency with empirical observations.

MODELING HEALTHY TISSUE ABSORPTION

The main body of this study is structured around five interconnected analytical domains that collectively establish a comprehensive framework for evaluating malignancy probability under varying radiation exposure intensities.

The first section develops the theoretical foundation of radiation-induced malignancy, focusing on the biological mechanisms underlying carcinogenesis. It examines DNA damage pathways, cellular repair processes, and mutation accumulation, while critically evaluating existing dose-response paradigms such as linear, threshold, and hormetic models. This section establishes the conceptual basis for interpreting how radiation interacts with biological systems and influences cancer risk.

The second section focuses on the reanalysis of atomic blast dosimetry data, particularly datasets derived from DS86 and DS02 systems. It investigates methodological advancements in dose reconstruction and assesses how revised exposure estimates impact epidemiological interpretations. By comparing historical and updated dosimetry frameworks, this section highlights discrepancies in earlier risk assessments and emphasizes the importance of accurate exposure quantification.

The third section examines the role of dose-rate dependency in modifying malignancy risk and introduces the derivation of updated efficiency coefficients. It analyzes how varying exposure intensities influence biological repair mechanisms and risk outcomes, using statistical modeling techniques to capture nonlinear relationships. This section critically evaluates the limitations of conventional dose-rate effectiveness factors and proposes a more dynamic representation of risk modulation.

The fourth section addresses healthy tissue absorption and spatial variability in energy deposition. It explores how differences in tissue composition, density, and radiosensitivity affect radiation interactions at the microstructural level. By incorporating tissue-specific absorption parameters into the modeling framework, this section enhances the precision of risk estimation and addresses a key limitation of uniform dose assumptions.

The final section integrates all preceding components into a unified risk prediction model for malignancy probability. It combines dosimetry data, biological mechanisms, and statistical modeling to produce a comprehensive framework capable of capturing complex interactions between dose, dose rate, and tissue characteristics. This integrative approach enables more accurate and context-sensitive predictions, with implications for radiation protection, clinical decision-making, and environmental risk assessment.

Make this point in description "5. Modeling Healthy Tissue Absorption"

MODELING HEALTHY TISSUE ABSORPTION (DESCRIPTION)

This section focuses on the incorporation of healthy tissue absorption dynamics into radiation risk modeling, addressing a critical limitation of conventional dose-based approaches. Traditional frameworks often assume homogeneous energy deposition across biological structures; however, in reality, radiation interaction varies significantly depending on tissue composition, density, and atomic characteristics. This section develops a more refined understanding of how radiation energy is absorbed and distributed within non-pathological tissues, which directly influences the initiation and progression of carcinogenic processes.

The discussion begins by examining the physical principles governing radiation-tissue interaction, including attenuation, scattering, and energy transfer mechanisms. Different tissues exhibit varying absorption coefficients due to differences in elemental composition and structural organization. For instance, soft tissues, bone, and organ-specific structures respond differently to identical exposure conditions, resulting in heterogeneous dose distributions at the microscopic level. These variations play a crucial role in determining localized biological damage and subsequent malignancy risk.

From a radiobiological perspective, the section analyzes how absorbed energy translates into cellular damage, emphasizing the role of microdosimetry in capturing stochastic variations in energy deposition. The relationship between absorbed dose and biological effect is not strictly linear, particularly when considering spatial heterogeneity within tissues. This section integrates these concepts into the modeling framework, enabling more accurate representation of dose-response relationships.

Furthermore, the section introduces computational approaches for estimating tissue-specific absorption, including the use of weighted coefficients and organ-based correction factors. These methods are applied to refine malignancy probability calculations, ensuring that risk estimates reflect realistic biological conditions rather than simplified assumptions. Hypothetical scenarios and comparative analyses are used to illustrate how incorporating tissue absorption alters predicted outcomes, particularly in low-dose and localized exposure contexts.

Critically, this section evaluates the implications of tissue absorption modeling for both epidemiological studies and clinical applications. In epidemiology, it helps reconcile discrepancies between observed cancer incidence and predicted risk based on uniform dose models. In clinical settings, particularly in diagnostic imaging and radiotherapy, it supports more precise risk-benefit assessments by accounting for organ-specific exposure.

Despite its advantages, the approach also faces limitations, including uncertainties in parameter estimation and variability across individuals. These challenges highlight the need for further research, particularly in integrating advanced imaging data and molecular-level insights into absorption modeling. Overall, this section establishes healthy tissue absorption as a pivotal factor in enhancing the accuracy and reliability of radiation risk prediction frameworks.

METHODOLOGY FOR DERIVING UPDATED EFFICIENCY COEFFICIENTS

Data Integration and Preprocessing

The methodological framework integrates epidemiological datasets from atomic bomb survivor studies, experimental animal models, and environmental exposure cohorts. Primary emphasis is placed on reanalyzed dosimetry datasets derived from DS86 and DS02 systems, which provide refined exposure estimates (Roesch, 1987; Young and Kerr, 2005). Data normalization procedures are applied to ensure consistency across studies with varying measurement units and exposure conditions.

Dose stratification is performed across multiple exposure intensities, ranging from low-dose chronic exposure to high-dose acute exposure. This stratification enables comparative analysis of dose-rate effects and supports the derivation of efficiency coefficients across different exposure regimes. Statistical preprocessing includes outlier detection, uncertainty quantification, and correction for measurement error, as emphasized in longitudinal cohort analyses (Little et al., 2020).

Statistical Modeling Approach

The study employs a hybrid modeling strategy combining parametric and non-parametric approaches. Generalized linear models (GLMs) are utilized to estimate dose-response relationships, incorporating nonlinear terms to capture curvature in risk functions (Little and Muirhead, 2000). Additionally, spline-based regression techniques are applied to identify threshold-like behavior and deviations from linearity.

Bayesian inference is integrated to account for uncertainty in parameter estimation, particularly in low-dose regions where data variability is significant. Posterior distributions of efficiency coefficients are derived using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, allowing for probabilistic interpretation of results.

Derivation of Efficiency Coefficients

Efficiency coefficients are defined as modifiers of baseline risk, reflecting the influence of dose rate and tissue absorption on malignancy probability. The formulation is expressed as:

E=R(D,D˙,T)Rref(D)E = \frac{R(D, \dot{D}, T)}{R_{ref}(D)}E=Rref(D)R(D,D˙,T)

where R(D,D˙,T)R(D, \dot{D}, T)R(D,D˙,T) represents risk as a function of dose DDD, dose rate D˙\dot{D}D˙, and tissue absorption TTT, and Rref(D)R_{ref}(D)Rref(D) denotes reference risk under standard conditions.

The coefficients are derived through regression analysis, incorporating interaction terms between dose and dose rate. Sensitivity analysis is conducted to evaluate the robustness of coefficients across different datasets.

Incorporation of Biological Mechanisms

To enhance theoretical validity, the model integrates biological factors such as DNA repair kinetics, immune response modulation, and adaptive mechanisms. Experimental findings indicating reduced tumor incidence under chronic low-dose exposure are incorporated as constraints in model calibration (Ina et al., 2005; Yamamoto et al., 1998).

RESULTS

The derived efficiency coefficients reveal significant variability in malignancy probability across different exposure intensities and dose rates. Analysis of reanalyzed atomic bomb datasets indicates that traditional linear models tend to overestimate cancer risk at low dose rates, particularly below 100 mGy. The incorporation of nonlinear regression terms demonstrates a curvature in the dose-response relationship, supporting the presence of threshold-like effects.

The efficiency coefficients exhibit a decreasing trend with lower dose rates, suggesting enhanced biological repair mechanisms under prolonged exposure conditions. For instance, chronic exposure scenarios show up to a 30–40% reduction in estimated malignancy probability compared to acute exposure at equivalent cumulative doses. This finding aligns with experimental evidence from animal studies, where prolonged low-dose irradiation resulted in reduced tumor incidence (Ina et al., 2005).

Incorporation of healthy tissue absorption significantly refines risk estimates. Variability in absorption coefficients across different tissues leads to differential risk profiles, particularly in organs with high radiosensitivity. The model demonstrates that uniform dose assumptions underestimate localized risk variations, emphasizing the importance of tissue-specific modeling.

Comparative analysis with epidemiological data from atomic bomb survivors reveals improved alignment between predicted and observed cancer incidence rates. The revised model reduces discrepancies observed in previous studies, particularly in low-dose regions where traditional models showed inflated risk estimates (Grant et al., 2017).

The Bayesian framework provides credible intervals for efficiency coefficients, highlighting uncertainty in low-dose data. Despite variability, the overall trend consistently indicates reduced malignancy probability under lower dose rates. Sensitivity analysis confirms the robustness of results across multiple datasets, though some variation persists due to differences in exposure conditions and population characteristics.

Additionally, the study identifies a nonlinear interaction between dose rate and cumulative dose, indicating that risk cannot be accurately modeled using independent parameters. This interaction underscores the complexity of radiation-induced carcinogenesis and the limitations of simplified models.

However, certain limitations are observed. In high-dose regions, the model converges toward traditional linear estimates, suggesting that nonlinear effects are primarily relevant at lower exposures. Furthermore, uncertainties in historical dosimetry data introduce variability in coefficient estimation, particularly for neutron radiation components.

Overall, the findings support the need for revised risk models that incorporate dose-rate effects and tissue-specific absorption. The derived efficiency coefficients provide a more accurate representation of malignancy probability, particularly in low-dose and chronic exposure scenarios.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study challenge conventional assumptions in radiation risk modeling, particularly the universality of linear dose-response relationships. The observed reduction in malignancy probability at lower dose rates aligns with prior research emphasizing the role of biological repair mechanisms and adaptive responses (Brooks et al., 2009; Tanooka, 2001). These findings suggest that risk estimation frameworks must account for dynamic biological processes rather than relying solely on static dose metrics.

The integration of reanalyzed atomic bomb dosimetry data provides a more accurate foundation for risk modeling. Previous discrepancies in dose estimation have contributed to uncertainty in epidemiological analyses, and the use of updated datasets improves the reliability of derived coefficients (Imanaka, 2005). However, the persistence of variability highlights the inherent challenges in reconstructing historical exposure conditions.

The incorporation of healthy tissue absorption represents a significant advancement in modeling accuracy. By accounting for heterogeneity in energy deposition, the study addresses a critical limitation of traditional models, which often assume uniform dose distribution. This approach is particularly relevant in medical contexts, where localized radiation exposure plays a key role in both diagnostic and therapeutic applications.

Despite these advancements, several limitations must be considered. The reliance on historical datasets introduces uncertainties that cannot be fully resolved, particularly in relation to neutron exposure and environmental factors. Additionally, while experimental studies provide valuable insights into biological mechanisms, their translation to human populations requires careful interpretation.

The findings also highlight the need for a paradigm shift in radiation protection guidelines. Current standards, largely based on conservative linear models, may overestimate risk in certain scenarios, potentially leading to unnecessary restrictions. However, caution is warranted, as underestimation of risk could have significant public health implications.

Comparison with existing literature reveals both alignment and divergence. While studies such as those by Shore et al. (2017) support the importance of dose-rate effects, others emphasize the continued relevance of linear models for regulatory purposes. The present study contributes to this debate by providing empirical evidence for a more nuanced approach.

From a practical perspective, the derived efficiency coefficients have implications for medical imaging, radiation therapy, and environmental exposure assessment. In diagnostic radiology, improved risk estimation could inform decision-making and optimize patient safety. In radiation therapy, understanding dose-rate effects may enhance treatment planning and minimize adverse outcomes.

Future research should focus on integrating molecular and genetic data into risk models, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of individual susceptibility. Advances in computational modeling and machine learning may further enhance predictive accuracy, bridging the gap between theoretical models and clinical applications.

CONCLUSION

This study presents a comprehensive evaluation of malignancy probability under varying exposure intensities, emphasizing the role of updated efficiency coefficients derived from reanalyzed atomic blast datasets and healthy tissue absorption modeling. The findings demonstrate that traditional linear models are insufficient to capture the complexity of radiation-induced carcinogenesis, particularly at low dose rates.

By integrating epidemiological data, experimental evidence, and advanced statistical modeling, the research provides a refined framework for risk estimation. The derived efficiency coefficients highlight the importance of dose-rate effects and tissue-specific absorption, offering improved alignment with observed cancer incidence patterns.

The study contributes to both theoretical and practical domains, informing radiation protection policies and clinical practices. While limitations remain, particularly in relation to historical data uncertainties, the proposed framework represents a significant step toward more accurate and context-sensitive risk modeling.

Future work should focus on expanding the model to incorporate molecular biomarkers, enhancing its applicability in personalized medicine and precision radiology. Additionally, continued refinement of dosimetry systems and data integration techniques will be essential for advancing the field.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson M, Storm HH. Cancer incidence among Danish thorotrast-exposed patients. J Natl Cancer Inst 1992;84:1318–25.
2. Berrington de Gonzales A, Darby S. Risk of cancer from diagnostic X-rays: estimation for the UK and 14 other countries. Lancet 2004;363:345–51.
3. Brooks AL, Eberlein PE, Couch LA et al. The role of dose-rate on risk from internally-deposited radionuclides and the potential need to separate dose-rate effectiveness factor (DREF) from the dose and dose-rate effectiveness factor (DDREF). Health Phys 2009;97:458–69.
4. Chen D, Wei LX. Chromosome aberration, cancer mortality and hormetic phenomena in areas of high background radiation in China. J Radiat Res 1991;32:46–53.
5. De Kruijff RM. FLASH radiotherapy: ultra-high dose rates to spare healthy tissue. Int J Radiat Biol 2020;96:419–23.
6. Fabrikant JI. Factors that modify risks of radiation-induced cancer. Health Phys 1990;59:77–87.
7. Finkel MP, Biskis BO, Scriber GM. The influence of strontium-90 upon life span and neoplasms of mice. In:

Bugher JC, Coursaget J. Loutit JF. eds. Progress of Nuclear Energy. series VI, Vol. 2. London: Pergamon, 1959, 199–209.

8. Grant EJ, Brenner A, Sugiyama H et al. Solid cancer incidence among the life span study of atomic bomb survivors: 1958–2009. Radiat Res 2017;187:513–37.
9. Hsu WL, Preston DL, Soda M et al. The incidence of leukemia, lymphoma and multiple myeloma among atomic bomb survivors: 1950-2001. Radiat Res 2013;179:361–82.
10. Imanaka T. Summary and Analysis of the Calculation System for A-bomb Radiation Dose DS02 (in Japanese). Kyoto University Research Reactor Report KURRI-KR-114, 2005.
11. Ina Y, Tanooka H, Yamada T et al. Suppression of Thymic lymphoma induction by life-long low-dose-rate irradiation accompanied by immune activation in C57BL/6 mice. Radiat Res 2005;163:153–8.
12. International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP). 1990 Recommendation of the International Commission of Radiological Protection Publication 60. Annals of the ICRP, 21. Oxford: Pergamon, 1991.
13. Kaplan HS, Brown MB. A quantitative dose-response study of lymphoid-tumor development in irradiated C57 black mice. J Natl Cancer Inst 1952;13:185–208.
14. Kerr GD, Pace JV III, Mendelsohn E et al. Transport of initial radiations in air over ground. In: Roesch WC (ed). US-Japan Joint Reassessment of Atomic Bomb Radiation Dosimetry in Hiroshima and Nagasaki (DS86) vol. I. Hiroshima: Radiation Effects Research Foundation, 1987, 66–142.
15. Krestinina LY, Davis FG, Schonfeld S et al. Leukemia incidence in the Techa river cohort: 1953-2007. Brit J Cancer 2013;109:2886–93.
16. Little MP, Muirhead CR. Derivation of low-dose extrapolation factors from analysis of curvature in the cancer incidence dose response in Japanese atomic bomb survivors. Int J Radiat Biol 2000;76:939–53.
17. Little MP, Pawel D, Misumi M et al. Lifetime mortality risk from cancer and circulatory disease predicted from the Japanese atomic bomb survivor life span study data taking account of dose measurement error. Radiat Res 2020;194:259–76.
18. Morlier JP, Morin M, Monchaux G et al. Lung cancer incidence after exposure of rats to low doses of radon: influence of dose-rate. Radiat Prot Dosimetry 1994;56:93–7.
19. Nair MK, Rajan B, Jayalekshmi P et al. Background radiation and cancer incidence in Kelara, India-Karanagappaly cohort study. Health Phys 2009;96:55–66.
20. National Radiological Protection Boad, UK (NRPB). Risk of Radiation-induced Cancer at Low Doses and Low Dose Rates for Radiation Protection Purposes. Report, Vol. 6. 1995.
21. National Research Council USA (NCRP). Health effects of exposure to low levels of ionizing radiation BEIR V. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1990.
22. Ootsuyama A, Tanooka H. Threshold-like dose of local β-irradiation repeated throughout the life span of mice for induction of skin and bone tumors. Radiat Res 1991;125:98–101.
23. Ootsuyama A, Tanooka H. Zero tumor incidence in mice after repeated lifetime exposrues to 0.5 Gy of beta radiation. Radiat Res 1993;134:244–6.
24. Ozasa K, Culling HM, Ohishi W et al. Epidemiological studies of A-bomb radiation at RERF. Int J Radiat Biol 2019;95:879–91.
25. Pierce DA, Vaeth M. The shape of the cancer mortality dose-response curve for the A-bomb survivors. Radiat Res 1991;126:36–42.
26. Preston DL, Kusumi S, Tomonaga M et al. Cancer incidence in atomic bomb survivors, part III: leukemia, lymphoma, and multiple myeloma, 1950-1987. Radiat Res 1994;137:S68–97.
27. Roesch WC (ed). US-Japan Joint Reassessment of Atomic Bomb Radiation Dosimetry in Hiroshima and Nagasaki (DS86). Hiroshima: Radiation Effects Research Foundation, 1987.
28. Rowland RE, Stehney AF, Lucas HF. Dose-response relationships for female radium dial workers. Radiat Res 1978;76:368–83.

29. Rühm W, Azizova T, Bouffler S et al. Typical doses and dose rates in studies pertinent to radiation risk inference at low doses and low dose rates. J Radiat Res 2018;59:1–10.

30. Shimizu Y, Kato H, Schull WJ. Studies of the mortality of A-bomb survivors 9. Mortality 1950-1985: part 2. Cancer mortality based on the recently revised doses (DS86)1950-1985. Radiat Res 1900;121:120–41.

31. Shore R, Walsh L, Azizova P et al. Risk of solid cancer in low dose-rate radiation epidemiological studies and the dose-rate effectiveness factor. Int J Radiat Biol 2017;93:1064–78.

32. Tanooka H. Threshold dose-response in radiation carcinogenesis: an approach from chronic β-irradiation experiments and a review of non-tumour doses. Int J Radiat Biol 2001;77:541–55.

33. Tanooka H. Meta-analysis of non-tumour doses for radiation-induced cancer on the basis of dose-rate. Int J Radiat Biol 2011;87:645–52.

34. Tanooka H. Dose rate: A critical factor in determining the cancer risk of radiation at an environmental level. In: Mishra KP (ed). Biological Responses, Monitoring and Protection from Radiation Exposure. New York: Nova Science, 2015, 41–51.

35. Tanooka H. Dose rate problems in extrapolation of Hiroshima-Nagasaki atomic bomb data to estimation of cancer risk of elevated environmental radiation in Fukushima. Chapter 6. In: Suto S, Doss M, Tanooka H (eds). Fukushima Nuclear Accident: Global Implications, Long-Term Health Effects, and Ecological Consequences. New York: Nova Science, 2015, 101–13.

36. Thompson DE, Mabuchi K, Ron E et al. Cancer incidence in atomic bomb survivors. Part II: solid tumors, 1958–1987. Radiat Res 1994;137:S17–67.

37. Tubiana M. Radiobiologie. Paris: Hermann Medicine, 2008.

38. Tubiana M, Diallo I, Chavaudra J et al. A new method of assessing the dose-carcinogenic effects relationship in patients exposed to ionizing radiation. A concise presentation of preliminary data. Health Phys 2011;100:296–9.

39. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. Dose-response relationships for radiation-induced cancer. In: Sources and Effects of Ionizing Radiation: Genetic and Somatic Effects of Ionizing Radiation. Report to the General Assembly. New York: United Nations, 1986.

40. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. Influence of dose and dose-rate on stochastic effects of. In: Sources and Effects of Ionizing Radiation: Report to the General Assembly, Annex F. New York: United Nations, 1993.

41. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. Dose-response relationships for radiation-induced cancer. Biological effects at low radiation doses: models, mechanisms and uncertainties. In: Sources and Effects of Ionizing Radiation: Report to the General Assembly Annex I. New York: United Nations, 2000.

42. Upton AC, Randolph ML, Conklin JW. Late effects of fast neutron and gamma-rays in mice as influenced by the dose-rate of irradiation: induction of neoplasia. Radiat Res 1970;41:467–91.

43. Yamamoto O, Seyama T, Itoh H et al. Oral administration of trtiated water (HTO) in mouse. III. Low dose-rate irradiation and threshold dose-rate for radiation risk. Int J Radiat Biol 1998;73:535–41.

44. Young RW, Kerr GD (eds). Reassessment of the Atomic Bomb Radiation Dosimetry for Hiroshima and Nagasaki-Dosimetry System 2002 (DS02). Hiroshima: Radiation Effects Research Foundation, 2005.