



CHAIRMAN

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 12, 2004

Henry D. Royal, M.D.
President
Society of Nuclear Medicine
1850 Samuel Morse Drive
Reston, Virginia 20190-5316

Dear Dr. Royal:

On behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), I am responding to your letter dated December 2, 2003, in reference to a dose reconstruction case for a family member of a hospitalized, terminally ill patient. The results of that dose reconstruction, performed by the staff of the NRC, were reported in an NRC inspection report dated December 10, 2002.

Your letter also transmitted an alternate dose reconstruction for this case, performed by Drs. Carol Marcus and Jeffrey Siegel, in which they concluded that NRC may have over-estimated the dose by a factor of between 1.6 and 17. Although the Commission believes that a difference of a factor of 1.6 between two independent dose reconstructions cannot be viewed as a significant difference, considering the uncertainty of the data and the nature of the assumptions that were necessary for completing the assessment, we regard a factor of 17 difference as significant and meriting attention. The NRC will therefore carefully review this alternate dose reconstruction and provide the results of its assessment. The Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes has been tasked to provide an independent analysis and recommendations, if appropriate, as part of this assessment process.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Nils J. Diaz

cc: Simin Dadparvar, M.D.
President, ANCP



CHAIRMAN

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 12, 2004

Simin Dadparvar, M.D.
President
American College of Nuclear Physicians
1850 Samuel Morse Drive
Reston, Virginia 20190-5316

Dear Dr. Dadparvar:

On behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), I am responding to your letter dated December 2, 2003, in reference to a dose reconstruction case for a family member of a hospitalized, terminally ill patient. The results of that dose reconstruction, performed by the staff of the NRC, were reported in an NRC inspection report dated December 10, 2002.

Your letter also transmitted an alternate dose reconstruction for this case, performed by Drs. Carol Marcus and Jeffrey Siegel, in which they concluded that NRC may have over-estimated the dose by a factor of between 1.6 and 17. Although the Commission believes that a difference of a factor of 1.6 between two independent dose reconstructions cannot be viewed as a significant difference, considering the uncertainty of the data and the nature of the assumptions that were necessary for completing the assessment, we regard a factor of 17 difference as significant and meriting attention. The NRC will therefore carefully review this alternate dose reconstruction and provide the results of its assessment. The Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes has been tasked to provide an independent analysis and recommendations, if appropriate, as part of this assessment process.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Nils J. Diaz

cc: Henry D. Royal, M.D.
President, SNM

Identical letter sent to:

Henry D. Royal, M.D.
President
Society of Nuclear Medicine
1850 Samuel Morse Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5316

Simin Dadparvar, M.D.
President
American College of Nuclear Physicians
1850 Samuel Morse Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5316

