المجلد الخامس- العدد الثاني – فبراير 2026
Volume 5 (Issue 2) February 2026

مجلة قورينا العلمية QSJ
Qurina Scientific Journal
ISSN: 2959 - 746

Interpretation of Applied Radiation Biology

Muhammad Mahmoud Mohsen[1], Aisha Al-Saadawi[2], Mohamed Abdelsalam elanizy[3]

[1] College of Medical Technology, Benghazi- Libya. **Email: Muhammad.MahMoud@tu.edu.ly.**
[2] College of Medical Technology, Benghazi - Libya. **Email:Aisha.Saadawi@tu.edu.ly.**
[3]Academy of Postgraduate Studies, Benghazi- Libya.

الملخص: نشأ علم بيولوجيا الإشعاع في أعقاب اكتشاف الأشعة السينية والنشاط الإشعاعي أواخر القرن التاسع عشر، ليصبح أحد الركائز الأساسية في الطب الحديث (Becquerel, 1896; Curie & Becquerel, 1901). يستعرض هذا البحث التطور التاريخي لهذا المجال، بدءاً من أعمال كل من رونتجن وبيكريل وكوري، مروراً باكتشاف التأثيرات البيولوجية للإشعاع وتطور تقنيات العلاج الإشعاعي ومعايير السلامة (Patton, 1992). كما يناقش البحث قانون بيرجوني وتريبوندو المتعلق بالحساسية الإشعاعية، ومبدأ تجزئة الجرعات الإشعاعية، والنسبة العلاجية، ونموذج العلاقة الخطية غير العتبية (LNT) المستخدم في تقدير المخاطر الإشعاعية

(Bergonié & Tribondeau, 1906; Regaud, 1901; Holthusen, 1936; ICRP, 2007).

لقد أسهم التقدم التكنولوجي والتعمق في الفهم البيولوجي في تحسين نتائج علاج السرطان وتقليل المخاطر المصاحبة للعلاج. يختتم البحث بمناقشة التحديات الراهنة والاتجاهات المستقبلية في هذا المجال، مع التأكيد على ضرورة الموازنة بين الفوائد العلاجية والمخاطر المحتملة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: بيولوجيا الإشعاع، العلاج الإشعاعي، الحماية من الإشعاع، الإشعاع المؤين، التسرطن، تجزئة الجرعات، النسبة العلاجي.

Abstract: The field of radiation biology emerged following the discovery of X-rays and radioactivity in the late nineteenth century, becoming a cornerstone of modern medicine (Becquerel, 1896; Curie & Becquerel, 1901). This paper provides an overview of the historical development of this discipline, beginning with the work of Röntgen, Becquerel, and Curie, through the recognition of biological effects and the evolution of radiotherapy techniques and safety standards (Patton, 1992). We discuss Bergonié and Tribondeau's law regarding radiosensitivity, the principle of dose fractionation, the therapeutic ratio, and the linear non-threshold (LNT) model for risk assessment (Bergonié & Tribondeau, 1906; Regaud, 1901; Holthusen, 1936; ICRP, 2007). Advances in technology and biological understanding have improved cancer treatment outcomes while reducing associated risks. The paper concludes with current challenges and future directions, emphasizing the need to balance therapeutic benefits against potential risks.

Keywords: Radiation biology, radiotherapy, radiation protection, ionizing radiation, carcinogenesis, fractionation, therapeutic ratio.

I. INTRODUCTION

Röntgen's discovery of X-rays in 1895 and Becquerel's discovery of radioactivity the following year marked a turning point in medical science (Röntgen, 1895; Becquerel, 1896). Soon afterwards, Pierre and Marie Curie isolated radium and polonium, laying the foundations for what would become radiation biology (Curie, 1984). As ionising radiation began to be used in medical applications, its harmful biological effects were quickly observed, prompting the development of early radiation protection measures (Albers-Schönberg & Frieben, 1903). This paper aims to present a comprehensive overview of the historical evolution of radiation biology, with a focus on the fundamental concepts that have shaped modern clinical practice and the challenges that persist today.

II. DISCUSSIONS

2.1 Early Biological Discoveries and Effects of Radiation:

From its inception, radiation biology was closely linked to key discoveries at the end of the nineteenth century, and researchers soon

QSJ مجلة قورينا العلمية
Qurina Scientific Journal
ISSN: 2959 - 7463

documented the damaging biological effects of radiation shortly after its discovery (Mould, 1993). Cases of hair loss and skin damage were recorded among physicians and technicians working with X-rays (Anonymous, 1936), and more severe consequences such as anaemia and cancers appeared as a result of unprotected exposure (Finzi, 1933). These observations led to stricter controls and the establishment of regulatory standards for the use of radiation therapy (Clarke & Valentin, 2009).

Early therapeutic attempts used X-rays; for example, in 1896 Victor Despeignes tried to treat stomach cancer with this novel technique (Despeignes, 1896). As technology advanced, treatment moved from Coolidge tubes to teletherapy using cobalt-60 sources and later to linear accelerators (Bernier *et al*., 2004).

2.2 Bergonié and Tribondeau's Law and the Concept of Radiosensitivity:

In 1906, the French scientists Jean Bergonié and Louis Tribondeau proposed a principle linking the radiosensitivity of cells to their proliferative activity (Bergonié & Tribondeau, 1906). However, subsequent research has shown that radiosensitivity is influenced by more complex factors than the rate of division alone, such as the cell's capacity to repair DNA damage (Arlett *et al*., 1988). For instance, cells from patients with ataxia telangiectasia exhibit extreme radiosensitivity despite their slow division rate (Begg, 1995). Nevertheless, this early principle stimulated much of the initial thinking in radiation biology.

2.3 Development of Radiotherapy and the Principle of Fractionation:

The shift toward fractionated therapy represented a crucial advance in improving both the safety and effectiveness of radiation treatment. Pioneers such as Claudius Regaud and Henri Coutard demonstrated that dividing the total dose into smaller portions delivered over several weeks improves the therapeutic ratio (Regaud, 1901; Foray, 2012). Fractionation allows time for healthy tissues to repair between sessions, thereby increasing their tolerance to radiation.

Mathematical models were later developed to guide clinical practice, including the nominal standard dose (NSD) model (Ellis, 1939) and the linear-quadratic (LQ) model, which is the most widely used today (Dixon, 1972). Modern high-precision techniques such as stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) and CyberKnife enable the delivery of very high doses (hypofractionation) with extreme accuracy (Kilby *et al*., 2010).

2.4 The Therapeutic Ratio and Strategies to Improve Treatment Outcomes:

The primary goal of radiation therapy is to maximise the probability of tumour control (TCP) while minimising the probability of normal tissue complications (NTCP) – a balance known as the therapeutic window (Holthusen, 1936). Several strategies have been pursued to achieve this balance:

- Technological improvements: Techniques such as intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) enhance the precision of dose delivery (Chargari *et al*., 2016).
- Combined treatments: Combining radiation with chemotherapy or molecularly targeted agents can improve outcomes (Hanahan & Weinberg, 2011).
- Radiosensitisers and protectors: Research continues into agents that increase tumour sensitivity or protect healthy tissues (Bernier *et al*., 2004).
- Systemic effects: There is growing interest in the potential beneficial immune responses triggered by local radiation, such as the abscopal effect (Chargari *et al.*, 2016).

2.5 Radiation Epidemiology and the Linear Non-Threshold (LNT) Model:

Large epidemiological studies, notably those of atomic bomb survivors in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, have demonstrated that exposure to high doses of radiation increases cancer risk (Ozasa, 2016). Based on these findings, regulatory bodies adopted the linear non-threshold (LNT) model for radiation protection purposes. This model assumes that any dose, no matter how small, carries a risk proportional to its magnitude (ICRP, 2007).

مجلة قورينا العلمية QSJ
Qurina Scientific Journal
ISSN: 2959 - 7463

However, the validity of the LNT model at very low doses remains controversial because some studies suggest adaptive responses and possible beneficial effects (hormesis) at low dose levels (Feinendegen, 2005; Calabrese, 2009).

Despite the debate, the LNT model remains practical for risk management. The risk of secondary cancers after radiotherapy is a genuine concern; estimates indicate that radiation may be responsible for approximately 8% of such tumours (Berrington de Gonzalez et al., 2011). It is essential to weigh this relatively low risk against the life-saving benefits of the initial treatment (Suit et al., 2007).

III. CONCLUSIONS

The century-long journey of radiation biology reflects a complex interplay between scientific discovery, clinical innovation, and safety awareness. This history highlights the need to balance substantial therapeutic benefits against potential risks through appropriate dose fractionation, technological precision, and consideration of individual variations in radiosensitivity. The ongoing debate over the LNT model underscores the complexity of assessing risks from low-dose exposure. Emerging directions – such as FLASH radiotherapy, proton therapy, and combination with immunotherapy – hold promise for further expanding the therapeutic ratio. History reminds us that the responsible application of this powerful tool depends on a deep understanding of its biological interactions.

REFERENCES

Albers-Schönberg, H., & Frieben, A. (1903). Albers-Schönberg, H., & Frieben, A. (1903). Hodenveränderungen bei Tieren nach Röntgenbestrahlungen. *Münchener Medizinische Wochenschrift*, 50, 2295.

Anonymous. (1936). Memorial to X-ray martyrs. *British Journal of Radiology*, 9(102), 351–353.

Arlett, C. F., Green, M. H., Priestley, A., Harcourt, S. A., & Mayne, L. V. (1988). Comparative human cellular radiosensitivity: I. The effect of SV40 transformation and immortalisation on gamma-irradiation survival. *International Journal of Radiation Biology*, 54(6), 911–928.

Becquerel, H. (1896). Sur les radiations émises par phosphorescence. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, 122, 420–421.

Begg, A. C. (1995). The clinical status of Tpot as a predictor? *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics*, 32, 1539–1541.

Bergonié, J., & Tribondeau, L. (1906). Interprétation de quelques résultats de la radiothérapie. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, 143, 983–984.

Bernier, J., Hall, E. J., & Giaccia, A. (2004). Radiation oncology: A century of achievements. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 4(9), 737–747.

Berrington de Gonzalez, A., Curtis, R. E., Kry, S. F., et al. (2011). Proportion of second cancers attributable to radiotherapy treatment in adults. *The Lancet Oncology*, 12(4), 353–360.

Calabrese, E. J. (2009). The road to linearity: Why linearity at low doses became the basis for carcinogen risk assessment. *Archives of Toxicology*, 83, 203–225.

Chargari, C., Magne, N., Guy, J. B., et al. (2016). Optimize and refine therapeutic index in radiation therapy: An overview. *Cancer Treatment Reviews*, 45, 58–67.

Clarke, R. H., & Valentin, J. (2009). The history of ICRP and the evolution of its policies. *Annals of the ICRP*, 39(1), 75–110.

Curie, P. (1984). *Oeuvres de Pierre Curie*. Éditions des Archives Contemporaines.

Curie, P., & Becquerel, H. (1901). Action physiologique des rayons du radium. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, 82, 1289.

Despeignes, V. (1896). Observation concernant un cas de cancer de l'estomac traité par les rayons Roentgen. *Lyon Médical*, 82, 428–430.

QSJ مجلة قورينا العلمية
Qurina Scientific Journal
ISSN: 2959 - 7463

Dixon, R. L. (1972). General equation for the calculation of nominal standard dose. *Acta Radiologica: Therapy, Physics, Biology*, 11, 305–311.

Ellis, F. (1939). The radiosensitivity of malignant melanoma. *British Journal of Radiology*, 12(138), 327–352.

Feinendegen, L. E. (2005). Evidence for beneficial low level radiation effects and radiation hormesis. *British Journal of Radiology*, 78(925), 3–7.

Finzi, N. S. (1933). Late X-ray and radium effects. *British Journal of Radiology*, 6(63), 148–161.

Foray, N. (2012). Claudius Regaud: A pioneer of radiobiology and radiotherapy. *Cancer/Radiothérapie*, 16(4), 315–321.

Hanahan, D., & Weinberg, R. A. (2011). Hallmarks of cancer: The next generation. *Cell*, 144(5), 646–674.

Holthusen, H. (1936). Erfahrungen über die Verträglichkeitsgrenze für Röntgenstrahlen. *Strahlentherapie*, 57, 254–268.

ICRP. (2007). The 2007 recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection. *ICRP Publication 103. Annals of the ICRP*, 37(2–4).

Kilby, W., Dooley, J. R., Kuduvalli, G., Sayeh, S., & Maurer, C. R., Jr. (2010). The CyberKnife robotic radiosurgery system in 2010. *Technology in Cancer Research & Treatment*, 9(5), 433–452.

Mould, R. F. (1993). *A century of X-rays and radioactivity in medicine: With emphasis on photographic records of the early years*. CRC Press.

Ozasa, K. (2016). Epidemiological research on radiation-induced cancer in atomic bomb survivors. *Journal of Radiation Research*, 57(Suppl 1), i112–i117.

Patton, D. D. (1992). Roentgen and the "new light": The discovery of X-rays. *Investigative Radiology*, 27(6), 408–414.

Regaud, C. (1901). Études sur la structure des tubes séminifères et sur la spermatogenèse chez les mammifères. *Archives d'Anatomie Microscopique*, 4, 101–155.

Röntgen, W. C. (1895). Über eine neue Art von Strahlen. *Sitzungsberichte der Physikalisch-Medizinischen Gesellschaft zu Würzburg*, 9, 132–141.

Suit, H., Goldberg, S., Niemierko, A., et al. (2007). Secondary carcinogenesis in patients treated with radiation: A review of data on radiation-induced cancers in human, non-human primate, canine and rodent subjects. *Radiation Research*, 167(1), 12–42.