

## Comparison of Two Leg Phantoms Containing <sup>241</sup>Am in Bone

Gary H. Kramer<sup>1</sup>, Barry Hauck<sup>1</sup>, Kevin Capello<sup>1</sup>, Werner Rühm<sup>2</sup>, Nabil El-Faramawy<sup>2,3</sup>, David Broggio<sup>4</sup>, Didier Franck<sup>4</sup>, Maria Antonia Lopez<sup>5</sup>, Teresa Navarro<sup>5</sup>, Juan Francisco Navarro<sup>5</sup>, Begoña Perez<sup>5</sup>, Sergei Tolmachev<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Human Monitoring Laboratory, Radiation Protection Bureau, 775 Brookfield Road, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 1C1 Canada; <sup>2</sup>Helmholtz Zentrum München - German Research Center for Environmental Health, GmbH, Institute of Radiation Protection, Ingolstädter Landstraße 1, D-85764 Neuherberg, Germany; <sup>3</sup>On leave from Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, 65511 Abbassia, Cairo, Egypt; <sup>4</sup>Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire, Internal Dose Assessment Laboratory, DRPH/SDI/LEDI, BP-17 F-92262 Fontenay-aux-Roses Cedex, France; <sup>5</sup>Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas, Avda. Complutense, 22, Madrid 28040, Spain; <sup>6</sup>U.S. Transuranium & Uranium Registries, Richland, WA, USA.

Three facilities (CIEMAT, HMGU, and HML) have used their *in vivo* counters to compare two leg phantoms. One was commercially produced with activity artificially added to the bone inserts. The other was manufactured from <sup>241</sup>Am contaminated bones resulting from an intake. The comparison of the two types of leg phantom showed that the two phantoms are not similar in their activity distributions. An error in the bone activity estimate can be quite large if the commercial leg phantom is used to estimate what is contained in the USTUR leg phantom and, consequently, a real person. As the latter phantom was created as a result of a real contamination it is deemed to be the more representative of what would actually happen if a person were internally contaminated with <sup>241</sup>Am.

USTUR-0301A-10