success is about whether all affected persons have been alerted. A useful checklist is provided for conducting evaluations.

Part V deals with communication related to emergencies, such as terrorism. Emergencies are defined as sudden, unforeseen situations that require immediate action in contrast to a crisis that may be anticipated in advance. Fears may be the biggest factor affecting emergency communications. The answer is to plan for the unexpected and to delineate your role in an emergency. Communication among responders and teaming with other organizations are important. This section has a long and very useful list of questions that the media may raise during an emergency.

In conclusion, I would recommend this book as a useful addition to your risk communication library. While I have identified limitations in some areas, such as understanding the language preferences of the spokesperson and the audience and elements of credibility as a risk communicator, overall the positives far outweigh the negatives. Besides representing a very helpful compendium of information on risk communication, the authors have also provided exhaustive lists of references for those who wish to become more knowledgeable in risk communications. The checklists near the end of many sections make this a very practical reference.

RAYMOND JOHNSON

Radiation Safety Academy
481 N. Frederick Ave., Suite 302
Gaithersburg, MD 20877


REPORT No. 145 is the replacement for the previous publication Dental X-ray Protection, NCRP Report No. 35, which was published in 1970. There are a great many differences between the two publications, including a 4-fold increase in pages for the new report. Much of the length difference can be found in the extensive appendices of Report No. 145. The body of the text contains chapters on introduction, general considerations, radiation protection in dental facilities, role of equipment design, role of the qualified expert, and conclusions. The appendices cover radiography-related biohazards, including infection control; risk assessment; evaluation of radiation safety performance and equipment performance; selection criteria; image receptors; shielding design for dental facilities (the largest appendix); and radiation quantities and units.

The report is very prescriptive, with over 100 shall or shall not statements, covering everything from the type of image receptor (image receptors of speeds slower than ANSI speed Group E films shall not be used for intraoral radiography) to beam collimation (rectangular collimation of the x-ray beam shall be routinely used for periapical radiography) to design of the radiography facilities (shielding design by a qualified expert shall be provided for all new or remodeled dental facilities). Many of the recommendations in the report are contrary to current common radiography practices in dentistry, particularly with respect to receptor speed (ANSI Group D film is still more commonly used than faster films) and collimation (rectangular collimation is used by only a small percentage of dentists even though it has been recommended for many years). If the states adopt the NCRP recommendations, as is commonly done, most dental offices will not be in compliance.

In several places throughout the report it is mentioned that doses from dental radiography are very low, with effective doses numerically equal to the unavoidable natural background radiation received in a few hours to a few days by the average American. For that reason there has been some criticism that the report is overly prescriptive and that the costs to bring all the dental offices into compliance may be higher than can be justified by the amount of dose reduction afforded by the recommendations. Obviously, this is not the opinion of the NCRP, which proposes a very conservative approach to the use of ionizing radiation.

One feature of the report that will be appreciated by health physicists is the extensive appendices. In the introduction it is stated that the report is intended to be a stand-alone document since the target audience may not have ready access to related documents. Since one of the recommendations is shielding design by a qualified expert, which has not generally been the rule for standard dental offices, health physicists will find the appendix on this topic to be of great help as their workload increases because of this.

In summary, NCRP Report No. 145 is intended to provide the guidance to reduce the radiation dose from dental radiography to the absolute minimum, to patients, operators, and the general public. While there can be some debate about whether some of the recommendations are more extreme than is necessary, the publication appears to serve its purpose and should be a useful document for many years. It belongs on the shelf of everyone concerned with radiation protection.

SHARON L. BROOKS

University of Michigan School of Dentistry
Department of Oral Medicine/Pathology/Oncology
1011 N. University Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-0178


THE AMBITIOUS title of this book promises rather more than it can deliver, but then the question posed is not simple either. The authors, husband and wife, set out to explain in simple, non-medical terms the nature of some of the more common types of cancer. Their principal thesis is that many types of cancer can be