

**ECOLOGICAL SCIENCES SERIES**

**RADIOACTIVE RISK SET**



**Volume 7**

# **Radioactive Risk for Humans**

**Jean-Claude Amiard  
Jean-Claude Zerbib**

**ISTE**

**WILEY**

# Table of Contents

[Cover](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

[Title Page](#)

[Copyright Page](#)

[Preface](#)

[P.1. Our beliefs](#)

[P.2. Public opinion](#)

[P.3. The expert and the biases of scientific expertise](#)

[P.4. Project objectives](#)

[P.5. Drafting the manuscript](#)

[P.6. References](#)

[Acronyms and Abbreviations](#)

[Introduction Methodology in Radioactive Risk Assessment](#)

[I.1. Radioactive risk assessment method](#)

[I.2. International institutions responsible for nuclear safety](#)

[I.3. National nuclear safety institutions](#)

[I.4. References](#)

[1 Radioactive Danger](#)

[1.1. Introduction](#)

[1.2. Radionuclides and radioelements](#)

[1.3. Radionuclide-related dangers](#)

[1.4. Elements of nuclear physics](#)

[1.5. References](#)

[2 Radioactive Contamination of the Anthroposphere](#)

[2.1. Introduction](#)

[2.2. Sources of radioactive contamination of the anthroposphere](#)

[2.3. Natural radioactive contamination of the anthroposphere](#)

[2.4. Anthropogenic radioactive contamination](#)

[2.5. Conclusions](#)

[2.6. References](#)

### [3 Human Exposure to Radionuclides](#)

[3.1. Introduction](#)

[3.2. Types of exposure to ionizing radiation](#)

[3.3. External exposure pathways](#)

[3.4. Internal exposure pathways](#)

[3.5. Conclusions](#)

[3.6. References](#)

### [4 Radioactive Contamination of Food and Trophic Transfer](#)

[4.1. Introduction](#)

[4.2. Transfer of radionuclides from food to humans](#)

[4.3. Transfers from the environment to animal products consumed by humans](#)

[4.4. Transfers from the environment to plant products consumed by humans](#)

[4.5. Transfer from drinking water to humans](#)

[4.6. Environmental monitoring of products consumed by humans](#)

[4.7. References](#)

### [5 Human Bioaccumulation of Radionuclides](#)

[5.1. Human bioaccumulation of radionuclides](#)

[5.2. Protecting people from radionuclides](#)

[5.3. Therapeutic removal of radionuclides from humans](#)

[5.4. Conclusions](#)

[5.5. References](#)

## [6 Estimates of Human Radiation Doses](#)

[6.1. Introduction: from exposure to dose](#)

[6.2. Expressing exposure](#)

[6.3. Limits to the estimation of effective doses](#)

[6.4. Dose rates](#)

[6.5. Occupational doses](#)

[6.6. Collective doses](#)

[6.7. References](#)

## [7 Estimating Human Radiation Doses](#)

[7.1. Natural external radiation doses](#)

[7.2. Natural internal radiation doses](#)

[7.3. Estimates of artificial radiation doses to humans](#)

[7.4. Some cases of human exposure](#)

[7.5. References](#)

## [8 The Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation at the Molecular and Cellular Level](#)

[8.1. Physico-chemical processes responsible for biological effects](#)

[8.2. The effects of ionizing radiation at the molecular level](#)

[8.3. The effects of ionizing radiation at the sub-cellular level](#)

[8.4. The consequences of irradiation at cellular level](#)

8.5. Quantifying the effects of ionizing radiation using biomarkers

8.6. Conclusions

8.7. References

## 9 Health Effects of Ionizing Radiation at the Individual Level

9.1. Introduction

9.2. The adverse effects of ionizing radiation depend on the age at exposure

9.3. Radiation-induced cancers in adults

9.4. Adverse effects of ionizing radiation on different tissues and organs

9.5. The transgenerational effects of ionizing radiation

9.6. Individual variability in the adverse effects of ionizing radiation

9.7. Conclusions

9.8. References

## 10 Occupational Diseases Caused by Ionizing Radiation

10.1. History of the first radiation injuries caused by X-rays and radium

10.2. The creation and difficult development of the occupational disease recognition system

10.3. Radiation-induced occupational diseases recognized in France since 1948

10.4. Diseases recognized in Europe

10.5. Conclusions

10.6. References

## 11 The Dose-Response Relationship to the Effects of Ionizing Radiation

[11.1. Introduction: the dose-response relationship](#)

[11.2. Dose-response relationships for high doses](#)

[11.3. Dose-response relationships for low doses](#)

[11.4. Conclusions](#)

[11.5. References](#)

## [12 International and French Regulatory Values](#)

[12.1. Introduction](#)

[12.2. International expertise and organization](#)

[12.3. International and European recommendations and their evolution](#)

[12.4. Radiation protection standards and regulatory limits](#)

[12.5. Radionuclide toxicity and radiotoxicity](#)

[12.6. Food standards](#)

[12.7. References](#)

## [13 General Conclusions and Perspectives](#)

[13.1. Introduction](#)

[13.2. Knowledge of the effects of ionizing radiation on humans](#)

[13.3. Strengths and weaknesses of the radioactive risk assessment method](#)

[13.4. Towards a new approach to estimating radioactive risk](#)

[13.5. Conclusions](#)

[13.6. References](#)

[Glossary](#)

[Index](#)

[Other titles from iSTE in Ecological Science](#)

[End User License Agreement](#)

# List of Tables

## Introduction

[Table I.1. National authorities in charge of nuclear safety and radiation pr...](#)

## Chapter 1

[Table 1.1. Half-layer values \(HLV\) in biological tissue](#)

[Table 1.2. Energy of the Compton electron and the photon scattered at 90° \(a...](#)

[Table 1.3. Dose rate and photon attenuation of a gamma point source](#)

[Table 1.4. Penetration and ionization power of various types of radiation](#)

## Chapter 2

[Table 2.1. Origin of the main radionuclides](#)

[Table 2.2. Radioactivity of various natural environments \(modified from \[GAM...](#)

[Table 2.3. Radon-222 concentrations in groundwater as a function of aquifer ...](#)

[Table 2.4. Concentrations of naturally occurring radionuclides in various so...](#)

[Table 2.5. Concentrations of naturally occurring radionuclides in building m...](#)

[Table 2.6. Contribution of different radon sources in a building. Examples g...](#)

[Table 2.7. Latitudinal distribution of atmospheric fallout from atomic testi...](#)

[Table 2.8. Average concentrations of artificial radionuclides in Bikini Atol...](#)

[Table 2.9. Activities measured in water \(3H in Bq.L-1\) and settled suspended...](#)

[Table 2.10. Mass and volume activities of radionuclides in samples from Nord...](#)

### Chapter 3

[Table 3.1. Average radioactivity of the Earth's crust over time \(modified fr...](#)

### Chapter 4

[Table 4.1. Activities of uranium and thorium radionuclides in the diet \(modi...](#)

[Table 4.2. Maximum values for the absorbed fraction \(fA\) following ingestion...](#)

[Table 4.3. Food transfer coefficients from animal products \(j.kg<sup>-1</sup> or j.L<sup>-1</sup>\).](#)

[Table 4.4. Example values for absorbable fractions of various radionuclides ...](#)

[Table 4.5. Average, minimum and maximum values for the annual quantities of ...](#)

### Chapter 5

[Table 5.1. Reference values for uranium and thorium series radionuclide conc...](#)

### Chapter 6

[Table 6.1. Weighting factors \(W<sub>R</sub>\) \(according to \[ICR 91\]\)](#)

[Table 6.2. Tissue weighting factor \(WT\) from \[ICR 07\] \(ICRP Publication 60 v...](#)

### Chapter 7

[Table 7.1. Comparison of changes in the external dosimetry of all workers ex...](#)

## Chapter 8

[Table 8.1. Average number of lesions of various types, induced by a 1 Gy dos...](#)

## Chapter 9

[Table 9.1. Impact \(mortality-morbidity\) of exposure to ionizing radiation in...](#)

[Table 9.2. Members of the initial LSS cohort alive in October 1950, accordin...](#)

[Table 9.3. Members of the LSS cohort on January 1, 1958, by dosimetric statu...](#)

[Table 9.4. Doses received by women in the LSS cohort alive on January 1, 195...](#)

[Table 9.5. Acute dose thresholds recommended in 2012 by the ICRP \[ICR 12\]](#)

[Table 9.6. Incidence and mortality of radiation-induced cancers as a functio...](#)

## Chapter 10

[Table 10.1. Relative balances to recognized occupational diseases from 1968 ...](#)

[Table 10.2. Change in the number of recognized radiation-induced cancers fro...](#)

[Table 10.3. Comparison of risk rates for all occupational cancers, asbestos-...](#)

[Table 10.4. General data on occupational cancers in Europe in 2016 \(from \[EU...](#)

## Chapter 11

[Table 11.1. Weighted colon dose for subjects in the LSS \(Life Span Study\) co...](#)

[Table 11.2. Comparison of ex utero exposure levels from different sources in...](#)

[Table 11.3. Comparison of average risk estimates attributed to routine relea...](#)

## Chapter 12

[Table 12.1. Exemption value for various radionuclides \(activity below which ...](#)

[Table 12.2. Permissible limits for food activity in accidental situations \(F...](#)

[Table 12.3. Maximum permissible levels of radioactive contamination for food...](#)

[Table 12.4. Maximum permissible levels of radioactive contamination for read...](#)

## Chapter 13

[Table 13.1. Summary of immune effects described by radiation exposure \(accor...](#)

# List of Illustrations

## Introduction

[Figure I.1. The general principle of human radioactive risk estimation \(accord...](#)

[Figure I.2. Conceptual overview of an integrated risk assessment \(IRA\) \(accord...](#)

## Chapter 1

[Figure 1.1. Nuclear structure, symbolism and electrical charges of the three t...](#)

[Figure 1.2. Comparison of nuclide stability as a function of mass number and a...](#)

[Figure 1.3. Diagram of cobalt-60 decay](#)

[Figure 1.4. The three types of ionizing radiation produced by nuclear reaction...](#)

[Figure 1.5. Spectrum of electromagnetic waves.](#)

## Chapter 2

[Figure 2.1. The various stages of radiological risk assessment, the parameters...](#)

[Figure 2.2. The main transfers of radionuclides of natural and anthropogenic o...](#)

## Chapter 3

[Figure 3.1. Distinction between irradiation and external and internal contamin...](#)

[Figure 3.2. Schematic representation of human exposure to radionuclides from t...](#)

[Figure 3.3. The various exposure pathways for the population of the Beaumont-H...](#)

## Chapter 4

[Figure 4.1. The main digestive factors influencing radionuclide absorption](#)

[Figure 4.2. Potential bioavailability of metals and radionuclides in meat prod...](#)

[Figure 4.3. Bioaccessibility and bioavailability of metals and radionuclides d...](#)

## Chapter 5

[Figure 5.1. Radionuclide transmembrane pathways](#)

[Figure 5.2. Influence of molecule solubility on two cases of passive transport...](#)

[Figure 5.3. General diagram of radionuclide fate in humans](#)

[Figure 5.4. Radionuclide bioaccumulation in the human body](#)

## Chapter 6

[Figure 6.1. Steps in calculating effective dose](#)

[Figure 6.2. Estimating the risk of leukemia in young people according to the m...](#)

## Chapter 7

[Figure 7.1. Uranium-238 parentage chain. Physical half-lives taken from \[CEA 1...](#)

[Figure 7.2. Map of the distribution of uranium content in mg.kg<sup>-1</sup> of rock in t...](#)

## Chapter 8

[Figure 8.1. Cellular responses and consequences of exposure to ionizing radiat...](#)

[Figure 8.2. Cellular response to genotoxic stress \(according to Bertrand et al...](#)

[Figure 8.3. Epigenetics. Nature of the adaptive predictive response \(APR\) dete...](#)

[Figure 8.4. The various mechanisms of heritable alterations in gene expression](#)

## Chapter 11

[Figure 11.1. Diagram illustrating the principle of dose-response extrapolation...](#)

## Chapter 12

[Figure 12.1. Simplified, theoretical diagram of the international organization...](#)

## Chapter 13

[Figure 13.1. Schematic representation of the human immune system and its main ...](#)

[Figure 13.2. Schematic representation of the most important immune and inflamm...](#)

[Figure 13.3. Illustration of the stages of a complete mechanistic response mod...](#)

[Figure 13.4. Gaps in human radioactive risk estimation. The color of the stars...](#)

[Figure 13.5. Classification of ionizing radiation effects and radiation protec...](#)

**Radioactive Risk Set**

coordinated by  
Jean-Claude Amiard

Volume 7

**Radioactive Risk for  
Humans**

Jean-Claude Amiard  
Jean-Claude Zerbib

**ISTE**

**WILEY**

First published 2024 in Great Britain and the United States by ISTE Ltd and John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licenses issued by the CLA. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside these terms should be sent to the publishers at the undermentioned address:

ISTE Ltd  
27-37 St George's Road  
London SW19 4EU  
UK

[www.iste.co.uk](http://www.iste.co.uk)

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.  
111 River Street  
Hoboken, NJ 07030  
USA

[www.wiley.com](http://www.wiley.com)

© ISTE Ltd 2024

The rights of Jean-Claude Amiard and Jean-Claude Zerbib to be identified as the authors of this work have been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s), contributor(s) or editor(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of ISTE Group.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2024944826

---

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data  
A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library  
ISBN 978-1-78630-884-9

---

# Preface

## P.1. Our beliefs

When writing this book, we were guided by a certain number of convictions: independence, freedom of spirit, competence, transparency, scientific rigor, absence of conflict of interest and the right to err in all sincerity.

### P.1.1. *Independence*

Our book aims to be scientific and therefore neither pro- nor anti-nuclear, detailing our current scientific knowledge with its strengths and shortcomings. To be independent and responsible, it soon became clear that we needed a limited number of authors. They assume full responsibility for their texts.

### P.1.2. *Freedom of spirit*

There is a big difference between fundamental research organizations such as the CNRS, which until recently was one of our employers, and institutional organizations such as the CEA or IRSN, where the hierarchy is very strong. In the former case, researchers are totally free to publish under their own responsibility, whereas in the latter, the hierarchy controls the writings of its employees, resulting in the risk of censorship or self-censorship.

### P.1.3. *Competence*

Both authors can legitimately claim competence in this field. One of them has completed two theses (specialist doctorate and state doctorate) involving research in marine radioecology. He has produced some 50 scientific

publications in this field, most of them in international peer-reviewed journals. He did not abandon the field altogether, however, as he worked as an expert for CNRS Life Sciences division of the GRNC (*Groupe Radioécologie Nord Cotentin*) from 1997 to 2010. The GRNC has published numerous reports. Since then, he has joined the Scientific Committee, then the Expert Group of ANCCLI (*Association Nationale des Comités et Commissions Locales d'Information*). The Scientific Committee's missions include advising and assisting Local Information Commissions, Local Committees and the ANCCLI in their expert appraisals, acting as an advisory body for Local Information Commissions and ANCCLI actions and publications, and acting as a point of contact for expert committees set up by various French and foreign bodies.

The other author was an engineer at the *Commissariat à l'énergie atomique*

(CEA) at the Saclay center. He has devoted his career to protection against ionizing radiation (radioactive measurements, radiation protection of X-ray generators and particle gas accelerators, remediation of contaminated sites). He took part in teaching radiation protection at INSTN (1980-1998) and in the IAEA's international radiation protection courses (1994-1996). In 1996, he was appointed "Senior Expert" at the CEA on the advice of an external scientific commission.

He has taken part in a number of national commissions, including the Castaing commission on the reprocessing of irradiated fuels (1981-1984), the Jean Bernard commission on cancers at the Pasteur Institute (1986-1990), the Radioecology group of the North Cotentin region (GRNC) on the dosimetric impact of radioactive releases from plants (1997-2008), the pluralistic expert group (GEP) on uranium mines in the Limousin region (2006-2013), and

the Ministry of Labor commissions on occupational diseases and chemical, physical and biological hazards (1983-1998). He is the author of around 100 articles and co-author of several books on nuclear and occupational health issues.

#### **P.1.4. *Transparency***

Among the multitude of books, scientific publications and gray literature, a choice had to be made. This choice was dictated by scientific quality. Our choices were based on a hierarchy, with French-language publications being the most accessible to the majority. Secondly, work published in peer-reviewed scientific journals, i.e. where peers, other scientists, evaluate and criticize the work before deciding whether its quality justifies publication. As all experts are fallible, this does not certify an absolute value of veracity and quality, but it does contribute significantly to it. Next, all information from official national and international bodies directed our choice. Finally, when we feel that it reinforces information, we include so-called “gray literature”, i.e. documents that are much less easily accessible to the public, especially if this literature is old and in the form of printed reports. In this way, anyone can return to most of the sources used in this book.

#### **P.1.5. *Scientific rigor***

Scientific rigor obviously depends on the choice of information and the way in which it is presented. We read a large part of the literature published on this subject, both pro- and anti-nuclear, as well as literature considered to be scientific. We then formed our own opinion. This is what appears in this book.

#### **P.1.6. *Conflicts of interest***

The authors have no conflict of interest in the nuclear field, as they have not carried out any research in this area for many years, and have no shareholdings in companies operating in this niche.

### ***P.1.7. The right to err in all sincerity***

On such a vast subject, two authors cannot master everything, and they must necessarily trust their peers and the information published. They have not necessarily assimilated all the information correctly, and may therefore have made biased interpretations. All these deviations, if they exist, have been made in all sincerity and the authors apologize in advance to the reader. We undertake to correct them should a second version of this book be published.

## **P.2. Public opinion**

Public opinion on the nuclear phenomenon has evolved over time. Initially, the public's enthusiasm for radium was very strong, and the most far-fetched applications, even dangerous for consumers, were developed, such as the addition of radium-226 to toothpaste, beauty creams and chocolate, alongside more "useful" applications such as luminescent paints. The next applications were military, with the military bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This is associated with the use of "defense secrecy" for the majority of nuclear applications. The result is strong public distrust and even opposition. The various accidents that have occurred, particularly the most serious ones such as Three Mile Island in 1979, Chernobyl in 1986 and Fukushima in 2011, have accentuated the opposition that now arises whenever a new basic nuclear infrastructure (BNI) is created or modified.

### ***P.2.1. Public perception of radioactive risk***

The public generally fails to distinguish between danger and risk. Furthermore, risk is measured in terms of probability. As a result, the hazard-risk pair is perceived very differently from one individual to another. Some hazards with uncertain risk potential will be perceived as paramount by the public. Conversely, hazards associated with proven risks will be considered derisory by the public. In the first group we find GMOs, and in the second group alcohol, road accidents, tobacco, etc.

In 2021, the rising concern of the French population was the management of nuclear waste in France: 41% of French people believe that nuclear power plants are a source of high risk, and 48% have the same perception of nuclear waste. This is in line with the 31% of French people who believe that the leading cause of accidental risk is that of a major nuclear accident, such as those at Chernobyl and Fukushima, and that this is the main obstacle to the use of nuclear energy. The second most important potential risk is the storage of radioactive waste (21% of opinions) [[IRS 21](#)].

### ***P.2.2. People trust science, not researchers***

Do you trust scientists to tell the truth about the results and consequences of their work on nuclear energy? The image of scientific experts remains positive for 50% of French people surveyed. The main qualities sought are competence, honesty and independence. Five organizations – the CNRS, ASN, IRSN, HCTISN and CEA – working in the nuclear field had a public confidence rating of over 70% in November 2020 [[IRS 21](#)].

### ***P.2.3. The creation of independent official bodies***

In the past, the protection of humanity and the environment, as well as nuclear safety, were ensured by

various services that were too closely linked to industrial interests, such as the CEA. Others, such as OPRI, had had a critical attitude during the Chernobyl accident, and were therefore completely disqualified in the eyes of the public. To compensate for these serious drawbacks, the French government created a number of new bodies that were dependent on the state but independent of the nuclear lobby. These included the IRSN and ASN. The qualities expected of these organizations are competence, independence, rigor and transparency. The gamble has largely paid off.

Alongside institutional experts, there are independent experts who often work for various associations (ANCCLI, ACRO, Global Chance, etc.). Unfortunately, their perfectly independent work is largely neglected, even denigrated or scorned. This is probably due to the fact that independent experts are very often volunteers, and that unpaid work is undervalued.

## **P.3. The expert and the biases of scientific expertise**

### ***P.3.1. Choice of experts***

The selection of experts for scientific appraisals varies from one field to another. In some cases, experts are co-opted, as in the case of the ICRP, while in others, as in the case of UNSCEAR, the choice is made by political leaders. In all cases, however, scientific criteria are not the only ones involved, but political, industrial and other criteria may also be taken into account.

### ***P.3.2. The expert's competence***

The scientific subject under discussion in an expert group is generally very broad, and no individual expert can possibly have a complete scientific knowledge of the field. Expertise is therefore necessarily collective, and each expert must at one time or another have confidence in their colleagues.

### ***P.3.3. The expert's integrity***

Scientific experts are first and foremost people with their own limitations and weaknesses. Before being an expert, a scientific researcher's primary mission (in principle) is to carry out fundamental or applied research. To this end, they are paid employees of a public or private organization. In addition, either to finance their research or to enrich themselves personally, they may accept funding from various public or private organizations. It is therefore not uncommon for conflicts of interest to arise between these institutional or occasional funders and the expert's mission. In the latter case, their "good faith" and independence are far from total.

### ***P.3.4. Selecting scientific information***

For a long time, the only sources of scientific literature in the nuclear field were the organizations directly involved, which were therefore "biased". It was only after the Chernobyl accident in 1986 that university scientists began to invest in this field of research. The subjects addressed were much more diversified and the concepts renewed. In order to eliminate these independent sources of information, it became common practice in many fields of physical and chemical risk assessment to retain only publications based on "Good Laboratory Practice" (GLP). These standards had been imposed on laboratories dependent on industry to limit scientific drift. However, while academics respect GLP in spirit, they do not apply it

sensu stricto. As a result, not all their publications are taken into account. This is particularly true of the summaries produced by the European Food Security Authority (EFSA) [[AMI 17](#)].

### **P.3.5. *Censorship of scientific publications***

#### **P.3.5.1. *Control of nuclear organizations***

Most organizations working in the nuclear field have a pyramid-shaped management structure, and all publications are subject to authorization by the management. As a result, any “disturbing” information can be blocked. Few organizations allow their staff to publish without constraint.

#### **P.3.5.2. *“Defense secrets” and “industrial secrets”***

In the nuclear field, many organizations are military or industrial. They can therefore censor information that could embarrass them on the grounds of “defense secrecy” or “industrial secrecy”.

In France, the enactment of the “Transparency, Nuclear Safety” (*transparence et sécurité en matière nucléaire - TSN*) law has considerably changed attitudes (at least for the majority) and made it easier to obtain information about nuclear energy and, in particular, safety. However, there are still a number of gray areas, particularly where national defense is concerned, which are covered by “defense secrecy”. We can hope for a positive change in the future, as much of the information retained has no military value, and some of it is an open secret published in specialized journals, but of course cannot be verified.

### **P.3.6. *Scientific truth***

Scientific truth is by definition provisional, since new scientific advances can call into question our current certainties. In this book, the authors have taken into account the most recent findings.

In many areas, especially those where economic interests are at stake, we can observe divergent interpretations. This is particularly true of human health issues. For example, the toxicity of tobacco has long been denied by scientists, often linked to the tobacco industry. This is still the case in some countries for asbestos. How can this attitude be explained? Knowledge - and this is no different for toxicology - is gradually gaining ground. So, at the outset, there is a period of time that can unfortunately extend for years, when an isolated piece of information reveals a certain phenomenon, such as the toxicity of tobacco. But does this single result represent an exception or a general phenomenon? New results are often divided between confirming and refuting the first result. This is because, in order to occur, the phenomenon must meet certain conditions (e.g. inter-individual variations in susceptibility to carcinogens, dietary habits).

In science, contrary to popular belief, results are rarely perfectly clear-cut (black and white, yes and no), but are associated with uncertainties. These uncertainties are expressed by a range within which the true answer may lie, associated with a certain probability of being true (95%, 99%). This means that the answer is not absolute; there are 5% or 1% of cases where the answer may be different. Our certainties are therefore only probabilities.

As with any human activity, research involves a number of researchers who lack rigor, and are capable of biasing the interpretation of their observations, or even inventing their results, often in line with the interests of the funders of their work. Limited though it may be, this type of behavior

is enough to cause a significant proportion of the population to lose confidence in the profession as a whole. As is the case with the political class, the result for the public is “that we are being lied to”, “that serious things are being hidden from us”. Internet culture allows all kinds of rumors to be spread quickly and widely.

Biological responses are generally highly variable and often follow a normal (or Gaussian) distribution. The same applies to the responses of organisms to radionuclides, whether in terms of bioaccumulation, elimination or damage caused by ionizing radiation. This is true for all living beings, including humans. As a result, it is extremely difficult to identify the main laws and predict the real impact of this type of aggression.

### ***P.3.7. Our conception of the expert's role***

A researcher must make available to society, in an accessible form, scientific knowledge concerning the health and environmental benefits, dangers and risks associated with major societal choices, such as the use of nuclear energy.

Our view of the expert's role is that they are not a substitute for decision-makers or society as a whole, but have a duty to enable as many people as possible to make informed choices.

The expert must be able to keep their distance from the generally preconceived opinions of the protagonists, and must assess the case without preconceived ideas and with complete serenity.

## **P.4. Project objectives**

The aim of this book is to estimate the radioactive risk to humans. To do this, the authors will follow the steps of the

classic approach presented above. On the one hand, radioactive danger was recognized at the same time as the discovery of radioactivity. On the other hand, the estimation of the radioactive risk to humans is still the subject of lively debate. In this volume, the authors will summarize the scientific work, past and present, that has made it possible to estimate the radioactivity of the anthroposphere and the radioactive contamination of humans. They will list the various routes of exposure to ionizing radiation (external, internal, dietary) and estimate the radiation doses suffered by humans under various conditions (natural for the public and professionals, accidental). Also, the harmful effects of ionizing radiation at various biological levels (molecular, cellular, tissue) and the health effects at the individual level will be reported. The focus will be on occupational diseases caused by radiation. The relationship between doses and adverse effects of ionizing radiation will be discussed for high, medium and low doses. Controversies on this subject will be explained. International and French regulatory values will be provided. Finally, an estimate of the radioactive risk to humans will be proposed.

## **P.5. Drafting the manuscript**

The Preface, [Introduction](#) and [Chapters 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12](#) and [13](#) were written by Jean-Claude Amiard, and [Chapters 1, 3, 6, 7, 9](#) and [10](#) by Jean-Claude Zerbib. Each chapter has been reviewed, corrected, amended, completed and approved by the other co-author.

We wish to thank Professor Philip Rainbow (former Keeper of Zoology, Natural History Museum, London, UK) for reading the English version of the book. We warmly thank him for his time and efforts.

---

Other titles from



in

Ecological Science

---

## **2024**

AKBAR Saima, KUMAR SINGH Suraj, KANGA Shruti  
*Disaster Management: Preparedness and Mitigation*

FLEURENCE Joël  
*Aquatic Biotechnologies: From Genetic Engineering to Enzymatic or Fermentation Engineering*

MATAGNE Patrick  
*Birth of Scientific Ecology: Eugenius Warming (1841-1924)*

## **2023**

GAID Kader  
*Drinking Water Treatment 1: Water Quality and Clarification*

*Drinking Water Treatment 2: Chemical and Physical Elimination of Organic Substances and Particles*

*Drinking Water Treatment 3: Organic and Mineral Micropolluants*

*Drinking Water Treatment 4: Membranes Applied to Drinking Water and Desalination*

*Drinking Water Treatment 5: Calco-carbonic Equilibrium and Disinfection*

## **2022**

AMIARD Jean-Claude  
*Marine Radioecology*

*(Radioactive Risk Set - Volume 6)*

GODET Laurent, DUFOUR Simon, ROLLET Anne-Julia  
*The Baseline Concept in Biodiversity Conservation: Being Nostalgic or Not in the Anthropocene Era*

GRISON Claude, CASES Lucie, LE MOIGNE Mailys,  
HOSSAERT-MCKEY Martine  
*Photovoltaism, Agriculture and Ecology: From Agrivoltaism to Ecovoltaism*

LÉVÊQUE Christian  
*Biodiversity Erosion: Issues and Questions*

## **2021**

AMIARD Jean-Claude  
*Disarmament and Decommissioning in the Nuclear Domain  
(Radioactive Risk Set - Volume 4)  
Management of Radioactive Waste  
(Radioactive Risk Set - Volume 5)*

FLEURENCE Joël  
*Microalgae: From Future Food to Cellular Factory*

JOLY Fernand, BOURRIÉ Guilhem  
*Mankind and Deserts 1: Deserts, Aridity, Exploration and Conquests  
Mankind and Deserts 2: Water and Salts  
Mankind and Deserts 3: Wind in Deserts and Civilizations*

PIOCH Sylvain, SOUCHE Jean-Claude  
*Eco-design of Marine Infrastructures: Towards Ecologically-informed Coastal and Ocean Development*

## **2020**

BRUSLÉ Jacques, QUIGNARD Jean-Pierre  
*Fish Behavior 1: Eco-ethology  
Fish Behavior 2: Ethophysiology*

ROSSIGNOL Jean-Yves

*Climatic Impact of Activities: Methodological Guide for Analysis and Action*

**2019**

AMIARD Jean-Claude

*Industrial and Medical Nuclear Accidents: Environmental, Ecological, Health and Socio-economic Consequences*

*(Radioactive Risk Set - Volume 2)*

*Nuclear Accidents: Prevention and Management of an Accidental Crisis*

*(Radioactive Risk Set - Volume 3)*

BOULEAU Gabrielle

*Politicization of Ecological Issues: From Environmental Forms to Environmental Motives*

GIRAULT Yves

*UNESCO Global Geoparks: Tension Between Territorial Development and Heritage Enhancement*

KARA Mohamed Hichem, QUIGNARD Jean-Pierre

*Fishes in Lagoons and Estuaries in the Mediterranean 2: Sedentary Fish*

*Fishes in Lagoons and Estuaries in the Mediterranean 3A: Migratory Fish*

*Fishes in Lagoons and Estuaries in the Mediterranean 3B: Migratory Fish*

OUVRARD Benjamin, STENGER Anne

*Incentives and Environmental Policies: From Theory to Empirical Novelties*

**2018**

AMIARD Jean-Claude

*Military Nuclear Accidents: Environmental, Ecological, Health and Socio-economic Consequences*

*(Radioactive Risk Set - Volume 1)*

FLIPO Fabrice  
*The Coming Authoritarian Ecology*

GUILLOUX Bleuenn  
*Marine Genetic Resources, R&D and the Law 1: Complex Objects of Use*

KARA Mohamed Hichem, QUIGNARD Jean-Pierre  
*Fishes in Lagoons and Estuaries in the Mediterranean 1: Diversity, Bioecology and Exploitation*

**2016**

BAGNÈRES Anne-Geneviève, HOSSAERT-MCKEY Martine  
*Chemical Ecology*

**2014**

DE LARMINAT Philippe  
*Climate Change: Identification and Projections*