



---

*Editorial*

**Effects of ionizing radiation in biomolecules, cells and tissue/organs:  
basic mechanisms and applications for cancer therapy, medical imaging  
and radiation protection**

**Francesca Ballarini<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Mario P. Carante<sup>1,2</sup>, Alessia Embriaco<sup>3</sup> and Ricardo L. Ramos<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics, University of Pavia, via Bassi 6, I-27100 Pavia, Italy

<sup>2</sup> INFN–Section of Pavia, via Bassi 6, I-27100 Pavia, Italy

<sup>3</sup> ENEA, Istituto Nazionale di Metrologia delle Radiazioni Ionizzanti, Roma, Italy

\* **Correspondence:** Email: [francesca.ballarini@unipv.it](mailto:francesca.ballarini@unipv.it); Tel: +390382987949.

---

**1. Basic mechanisms**

Soon after the discovery of X-rays in 1895, ionizing radiation started being used in medicine, both as a diagnostic tool and as a therapeutic agent. However, it was only after some decades that the mechanisms underlying the action of ionizing radiation in cells and tissues/organs started being investigated and, at least partially, understood. Ionizing radiation is also used in some industrial activities that, in addition to some environmental exposure scenarios (e.g., radon), raise radiation protection issues. It is therefore of crucial importance that the scientific community continuously updates and improves the knowledge about the action mechanisms of ionizing radiation and its effects, as well as its applications in different fields including medicine and industry.

It is well known that radiation damage to the DNA double helix plays a pivotal role in the subsequent production of damage at different levels, including chromosomes, cells, tissue/organs and even the whole organism [1]. The initial DNA damage, mainly consisting of single-strand breaks (SSBs), double-strand breaks (DSBs) and base damage, can be induced either by direct energy deposition in the DNA constituents or indirectly, by production of free radicals that diffuse and chemically interact with the double helix. While base damage and SSBs in general do not imply important consequences for the fate of the cell, DSBs, especially the complex ones (that is, associated to other damage types) can lead to the production of chromosome aberrations, consisting in large-scale genome

rearrangements mainly occurring following “Non-Homologous End Joining” (NHEJ) [e.g. 2]. The latter is a repair pathway that plays an important role in the G0/G1 phase of the cell cycle, and is known to be rapid but error-prone, leading to the rejoining of chromatin fragments belonging to different chromosomes, or different regions of a given chromosome. Some aberration types (typically, dicentric chromosomes) have a high probability of leading to cell death [e.g. 3]; on the contrary others, such as reciprocal translocations, do not prevent cell replication thus allowing the transmission of altered DNA sequences to the cell progeny, which in turn can lead to cell neoplastic transformation and, after several years of latency, even cancer. Indeed, several tumour types are associated to aberrations involving specific genes located in specific chromosomes; for instance, most Chronic Myeloid Leukemia cells carry a translocation involving the ABL1 gene in chromosome #9 and the BCR gene in chromosome #22, leading to the production of a fusion gene that encodes for an oncogene [e.g. 4,5].

Although the DNA double helix is widely recognized as the main radiation target, other targets do exist, which are involved e.g. in the so-called bystander effects, consisting of the induction of damage in cells that are not traversed by radiation, but are located close to traversed cells [e.g. 6]. The mechanisms underlying these effects, which may play a non-negligible role at low doses, have not been clarified yet; however, it is widely recognized that cellular communication via molecular signalling does play a role.

## 2. Medical applications and radiation protection

Concerning medical applications, ionizing radiation is widely used for imaging, including conventional radiography, computed tomography, PET (positron emission tomography) and SPECT (single-photon emission tomography). Furthermore, high-energy X-rays are routinely used for cancer treatment, either alone, or in association with surgery and/or chemotherapy.

More recently, also charged particles started being used for hadrontherapy cancer treatments. Currently, about 300,000 patients have been treated worldwide, and more than 100 hadrontherapy centres are operating [7]. Most treatments have been performed with protons, for which the dose falls to zero beyond the Bragg peak. This makes such particles particularly suitable for treating those tumours that are located just before organs at risk, or, more generally, for all those cases where particular attention must be devoted to spare the healthy tissues, as is the case of paediatric tumours.

A number of patients have been treated with Carbon ions, which are characterized by a higher Relative Biological Effectiveness (RBE) with respect to both photons and protons and thus represent a good strategy for the so-called radio-resistant tumours, which do not respond well to treatment with photons or even protons, for which a constant RBE of 1.1 is assumed in clinical practice. On this subject, it is worth mentioning that, when using heavy ions like Carbon, the RBE variation along the beam must be evaluated as accurately as possible, ideally at the single-voxel level, especially when active beam scanning is used. For this reason, *in vitro* and *in vivo* experiments must be integrated by biophysical models and simulation codes. At the moment, only two models are used in clinics, that is the Local Effect Model (LEM) [e.g. 8] in Europe and Shanghai, and the Microdosimetric Kinetic Model [e.g. 9] in Japan. However, other models are available including BIANCA [10], which, interfaced to the FLUKA radiation transport code [e.g. 11] has shown to be suitable for modelling cell death and chromosome aberrations along hadrontherapy beams of protons, C-ions and He-ions [12–17].

Hadrontherapy is evolving quite rapidly; the most recent applications imply the use of particle therapy together with immunotherapy [18], as well as its possible application according to the so-called FLASH modality, that is at ultra-high dose-rate [19].

Humans are exposed to ionizing radiation for different reasons, including medical exposure for diagnostics or therapy, occupational exposure and environmental exposure. Unless in case of accidents, the involved doses are generally very low: to get an idea, the annual effective dose limits are 1 mSv/year for the public, and 20 mSv/year for exposed workers. The radiation environment on Earth implies an average annual effective dose of about 3 mSv/year, also depending on the characteristics of the considered region. In space, astronauts are exposed to higher doses due to the lack of the protection provided by the atmosphere and the Geomagnetic field. For instance, the effective dose on the International Space Station is about 0.5 mSv/day, which becomes more than 1 mSv/day in case of a mission to the Moon or even to Mars [e.g. 20,21]. On this subject, it is worth mentioning that in these scenarios the physical dose is not sufficient to estimate the effects, since it is delivered by mixed radiation fields that can also contain high-LET components including heavy ions like Iron [22]. In these cases, it is useful that physical dosimetry is integrated by biological dosimetry; one of the most reliable techniques consists of counting dicentric chromosomes in peripheral blood lymphocytes, since lymphocyte dicentrics are considered as indicators of normal tissue damage [e.g. 23–25]. Lymphocyte dicentrics are also useful to estimate the dose in case of accidents or, more generally, when the physical dose is not known or is affected by large uncertainties. The frequency of CAs in peripheral blood lymphocytes was used to evaluate the radiation exposure in survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki A-bombs [26,27] and in victims of radiation accidents including Chernobyl [28], as well as for astronauts involved in space missions [e.g. 29] and cancer patients following radiotherapy [30].

## References

1. Hall E, Giaccia A (2018) Radiobiology for the Radiologist, 8 Eds., Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
2. Ottolenghi A, Ballarini F, Merzagora M (1999) Modelling radiation induced biological lesions: from initial energy depositions to chromosome aberrations. *Radiat Environ Bioph* 38: 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004110050132>
3. Cornforth MN, Bedford JS (1987) A quantitative comparison of potentially lethal damage repair and the rejoining of interphase chromosome breaks in low passage normal human fibroblasts. *Radiat Res* 111: 385–405. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3576926>
4. Cotran RS, Kumar V, Robbins SL (1989) Pathological basis of disease, Philadelphia: WB Saunders.
5. Ballarini F, Ottolenghi A (2004) A model of chromosome aberration induction and chronic myeloid leukaemia incidence at low doses. *Radiat Environ Bioph* 43: 165–171. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00411-004-0246-7>
6. Ballarini F, Alloni D, Facoetti A, et al. (2006) Modelling radiation-induced bystander effect and cellular communication. *Radiat Prot Dosim* 122: 244–251. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rpd/ncl446>
7. Particle Therapy Co-Operative Group. Available from: [http:// www.ptcog.ch](http://www.ptcog.ch).
8. Scholz M, Kellerer AM, Kraft-Weyrather W, et al. (1997) Computation of cell survival in heavy ion beams for therapy. *Radiat Environ Bioph* 36: 59–66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004110050055>
9. Inaniwa T, Kanematsu N, Matsufuji N, et al. (2015) Reformulation of a clinical-dose system for carbon-ion radiotherapy treatment planning at the National Institute of Radiological Sciences, Japan. *Phys Med Biol* 60: 3271. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-9155/60/8/3271>

10. Ballarini F, Carante MP (2016) Chromosome aberrations and cell death by ionizing radiation: Evolution of a biophysical model. *Radiat Phys Chem* 128: 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radphyschem.2016.06.009>
11. Ballarini F, Battistoni G, Campanella M, et al. (2006) The FLUKA code: an overview. *J Phys: Conf Series* 41: 151–160. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/41/1/014>
12. Carante MP, Ballarini F (2016) Calculating variations in biological effectiveness for a 62 MeV proton beam. *Front Oncol* 6: 76. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2016.00076>
13. Carante MP, Aimè C, Cajiao JJT, et al. (2018) BIANCA, a biophysical model of cell survival and chromosome damage by protons, C-ions and He-ions at energies and doses used in hadrontherapy. *Phys Med Biol* 63: 075007. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6629-3382>
14. Carante MP, Aricò G, Ferrari A, et al. (2019) First benchmarking of the BIANCA model for cell survival prediction in a clinical hadron therapy scenario. *Phys Med Biol* 64: 215008. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/ab490f>
15. Carante MP, Aricò G, Ferrari A, et al. (2020) In vivo validation of the BIANCA biophysical model: Benchmarking against rat spinal cord RBE data. *Int J Mol Sci* 21: 3973. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms21113973>
16. Carante MP, Embriaco A, Aricò G, et al. (2021) Biological effectiveness of He-3 and He-4 ion beams for cancer hadrontherapy: a study based on the BIANCA biophysical model. *Phys Med Biol* 66: 195009. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6560/ac25d4>
17. Kozłowska W, Carante M, Aricò G, et al. (2022) First application of the BIANCA model to carbon-ion patient cases. *Phys Med Biol* In press
18. Demaria S, Coleman CN, Formenti SC (2016) Radiotherapy: changing the game in immunotherapy. *Trends Cancer* 2: 286–294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trecan.2016.05.002>
19. Colangelo NW, Azzam EI (2020) The importance and clinical implications of FLASH ultra-high dose-rate studies for proton and heavy ion radiotherapy. *Radiat Res* 193: 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1667/RR15537.1>
20. Durante M, Cucinotta FA (2011) Physical basis of radiation protection in space travel. *Rev Mod Phys* 83: 1245. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.83.1245>
21. Ballarini F, Battistoni G, Cerutti F, et al. (2006) GCR and SPE organ doses in deep space with different shielding: Monte Carlo simulations based on the FLUKA code coupled to anthropomorphic phantoms. *Adv Space Res* 37: 1791–1797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2006.03.007>
22. Campa A, Alloni D, Antonelli F, et al. (2009) DNA fragmentation induced in human fibroblasts by 56Fe ions: experimental data and Monte Carlo simulations. *Radiat Res* 171: 438–445. <https://doi.org/10.1667/RR1442.1>
23. Ottolenghi A, Ballarini F, Biaggi M (2001) Modelling chromosomal aberration induction by ionising radiation: the influence of interphase chromosome architecture. *Adv Space Res* 27: 369–382. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1177\(01\)00004-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1177(01)00004-7)
24. Ballarini F, Ottolenghi A (2003) Chromosome aberrations as biomarkers of radiation exposure: modelling basic mechanisms. *Adv Space Res* 31: 1557–1568. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1177\(03\)00091-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1177(03)00091-7)
25. Embriaco A, Ramos R, Carante M, et al. (2021) Healthy tissue damage following cancer ion therapy: a radiobiological database predicting lymphocyte chromosome aberrations based on the BIANCA biophysical model. *Int J Mol Sci* 22: 10877. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms221910877>
26. Stram DO, Sposto R, Preston D, et al. (1993) Stable chromosome aberrations among A-bomb survivors: An update. *Radiat Res* 136: 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3578636>

27. Nakano M, Kodama Y, Ohtaki K, et al. (2001) Detection of stable chromosome aberrations by FISH in A-bomb survivors: comparison with previous solid Giemsa staining data on the same 230 individuals. *Int J Radiat Biol* 77: 971–977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09553000110050065>
28. Bauchinger M, Schmid E, Braselmann H (2001) Time-course of translocation and dicentric frequencies in a radiation accident case. *Int J Radiat Biol* 77: 553–557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09553000010022382>
29. George K, Willingham V, Wu H, et al. (2002) Chromosome aberrations in human lymphocytes induced by 250 MeV protons: Effects of dose, dose rate and shielding. *Adv Space Res* 30: 891–899. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1177\(02\)00406-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1177(02)00406-4)
30. Durante M, Yamada S, Ando K, et al. (2000) X-rays vs. carbon-ion tumor therapy: cytogenetic damage in lymphocytes. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 47: 793–798. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-3016\(00\)00455-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-3016(00)00455-7)



AIMS Press

© 2022 the Author(s), licensee AIMS Press. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)