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The presentation discussed an alternative approach for establishing laser exposure limits for repetitively-pulsed lasers. The approach was dependent on the calculation of the additivity between pulses in a train for producing retinal injury.
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INTRODUCTION

The present method for evaluating repetitive pulsed lasers is based primarily on data taken for a fixed exposure time (0.5 s). The biological effect from these studies was interpreted to be a function of the pulse repetition frequency when in fact this same effect could just as well have been plotted against the total number of pulses in the pulse train. It is the opinion of this author that the reason several pulses cause retinal injury when a retinal lesion is not observed from a single pulse of the same energy is that microscopic cell changes partially combine together to cause visible injury.

ADDITIVITY METHOD

Since pulses only partially add to produce retinal injury, a quantitative definition had to be developed for additivity (A). The following definition was considered appropriate:

\[ A = \frac{(n - E_{DP}^{50}/E_{D_{50}}^{\text{single}})/(n - 1)} \]

Where \( E_{DP}^{50} \) and \( E_{D_{50}}^{\text{single}} \) represent the total interocular energy necessary to produce a retinal burn 50 percent of the time for \( n \) pulses or for 1 pulse respectively. If a particular experiment showed complete additivity between pulses, \( E_{DP}^{50} \) would equal \( E_{D_{50}}^{\text{single}} \) and \( A \) in the above equation would reduce to 1.0. On the other hand for an experiment which showed no additivity, the above expression would reduce to zero.

In evaluating currently available biologic data with pulse durations less than 10 μs, additivity values were generally found to lie between 90 and 98 percent when several pulses were included in the exposure. A functional relationship between additivity and pulse-repetition-rate (F) is not totally clear. A slight improvement over adopting one particular value for additivity for all conditions is to use the following function:

\[ A = \begin{cases} 
0.97 - 3.5 \times 10^{-2} \log F & 1 \leq F < 100 \\
0.83 + 3.5 \times 10^{-2} \log F & 100 \leq F < 10,000 
\end{cases} \]

The opinions or assertions herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the U.S. Department of the Army or the U.S. Department of Defense.
Maximum permissible exposure values (MPE), using the additivity method, may be found by substituting the MPE for n pulses (MPE\textsubscript{n}) for ED\textsubscript{50} and substituting the MPE for a single pulse (MPE\textsubscript{single}) for ED\textsubscript{50single} in equation 1. The MPE for n pulses is then given as a function of the single pulse MPE by the following equation:

\[
\text{MPE}_n = \text{MPE}\text{single} \left[ n - (n - 1)\alpha \right] \tag{3}
\]

The MPE for one pulse in a train of n pulses may be found by dividing the above equation by n; therefore:

\[
\text{MPE}\text{single in a train} = \frac{\text{MPE}\text{single} \left[ n - (n - 1)\alpha \right]}{n} \tag{4}
\]

An effective \(C_p\) value is then obtained as a correction to the single pulse MPE; thus:

\[
C_p = \frac{n - (n - 1)\alpha}{n} \tag{5}
\]

This function may be plotted as a function of the total number of pulses as shown in Figures 1, 2, and 3. Note the similarity between these plots and the \(C_p\) as defined in ANSI Z136.1.\textsuperscript{6} Data points were plotted on these curves for PRF values of 1, 10, 100, 1000, and 10,000 for exposures with the total number of pulses ranging from 2 pulses to 10,000 pulses. The biologic data used to make these plots are tabulated in the table and listed in the references.\textsuperscript{7 8 9 10} The \(C_p\) values were calculated for these data points by the following formula:

\[
C_p = \frac{\text{ED}_{50p}}{n \ \text{ED}_{50\text{single}}} \tag{6}
\]

Since the biologic data generally follow the calculated \(C_p\) values, the additivity method therefore maintains the same margin of safety for repetitive pulses as is available for a single pulse from the same laser.

LIMITATIONS

The additivity method does not work as well as the current method described in ANSI Z136.1 for pulse durations in excess of 10 \(\mu\)s because the additivity value drops below 90 percent for long pulses (>10 \(\mu\)s); therefore, the additivity method should not be used for long pulses.

For trains of short pulses (<10 \(\mu\)s) with a high repetition rate, a person may be expected to be exposed to a high number of pulses. For large \(n\), equation 5 reduces to:

\[
C_p = 1 - \alpha \tag{7}
\]
Figure 1. Repetitive-Pulse Data for 100 Hz with a C p Curve for an Additivity of 0.90.
Figure 2. Repetitive-Pulse Data for 10 Hz and 1000 Hz with a \( C_p \) Cure for an Additivity of 0.935.
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Number of Pulses (n) vs. Repetitive-Pulse Correction Factor \( (C_p) \)
Figure 3. Repetitive-Pulse Data for 1.0 Hz and 10,000 Hz with a $C_p$ Curve for an Additivity of 0.97
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$A = 0.97$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F (Hz)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>ED50 (μJ)</th>
<th>t (ns)</th>
<th>Additivity (%)</th>
<th>( \frac{[n - ED50_{\text{avg}}]}{(n-1)} )</th>
<th>( ED50_{\text{avg}} )</th>
<th>( CP )</th>
<th>( [n - (n-1)A]/n )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5940</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>5K</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>19700</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Continuous Wave Limit
The hazard analysis in this case is then fairly simple. For very high repetition rates, the continuous wave (CW) MPE values would be used when their use yields a more conservative MPE. However, for trains of short pulses having a low repetition rate, an accurate determination must be made of the number of pulses to which an individual would be exposed or alternatively adopt the "worst-case" analysis of equation 7. An alternate solution to assigning a number of pulses would be to assign an exposure time which would be either a reasonable expected exposure time or a limit to the additivity method itself. Based on the limited biologic data for long trains of low repetition rate pulses, 10 seconds would probably be as good of an approximation as any.

**EFFECT ON CURRENT STANDARDS**

For a 1000 Hz train of short pulses the current C_p value is 0.06. For the additivity method this value is 0.065. These values could be made to correspond without loss of accuracy to biologic thresholds.

For a 10 Hz train of short pulses lasting for 10 s, the C_p value would be 0.074. The present value is 0.32. These values could be made to correspond by limiting the additivity method to 0.4 s. The new C_p value would then be 0.30; however, biological data does not support this assumption. In fact, pulses have been shown to add for exposure durations of 2 minutes. Therefore, MPE values for low pulse rate lasers would be lowered if the additivity method were accepted. For an unlimited exposure duration, the C_p would be simply 1 - A. However, for low repetition-rate ND YAG lasers, the present MPE values are probably quite adequate since biologic data indicates that MPE values for single pulses from a Q-switched ND YAG laser are too conservative. This MPE could be raised by a factor of 10 without endangering exposed personnel. However, for repetitive-pulsed lasers, the C_p factor for 10 to 20 Hz should be approximately 0.07 for a few seconds exposure. Therefore, the net result is that the repetitive-pulsed MPE would be more liberal by a factor of 2. A relaxation in the MPE by a factor of 5 would provide a sufficient margin of safety (a factor of 12) between an ED50 threshold and MPE values. By using the additivity method, this margin of safety could be maintained for any pulse-repetition frequency. Also, a factor of five increase in the single-pulsed MPE for Q-switched, ND YAG lasers would essentially leave the MPE for 10 to 20 Hz lasers unchanged if the additivity method is adopted.

For laser devices which do not have a large safety margin between MPE values and actual biologic damage for single exposures, such as short pulsed ruby or GaAs lasers, the additivity method would insure that this same safety margin is maintained for repeated exposures even at low repetition rates. The present standards may not be adequate.

**SHORT EXPOSURE DURATIONS**

Much confusion has arisen when the presently used C_p must be used to evaluate an exposure of 2 or three pulses spaced a few microseconds apart. For those well versed in laser safety, the least conservative of two methods is used.
(1) The entire energy in the pulse train is added and compared to the MPE for 1 pulse.

(2) The $C_p$ correction factor is applied to the single pulse MPE and compared to the radiant exposure for 1 laser pulse.

To the uninitiated, this procedure appears complicated and possibly unreliable; however, the additivity method blends these two procedures smoothly together with one equation.

### CODED PULSES

Laser pulses which are coded in order to transmit information are impossible to evaluate by current standards. The repetitively-pulsed correction factor would be assigned based on the minimum interpulse spacing. For many laser systems, this method would be over restrictive. With the additivity method, however, an accurate $C_p$ may be determined. From equation 5, $n$ represents the total number of pulses and $n-1$ represents the number of interpulse spacings. The additivity for each interpulse spacing may be determined by equation 2. The additivity values for each pulse separation are added and substituted back into equation 5 in place of $(n-1)A$. The resulting equation may be expressed as follows:

$$C_p = \left( \frac{n-1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i} \right) / n$$

Therefore, no matter how involved the coding, a $C_p$ value may be assigned which will provide a uniform margin of safety from a biologic injury threshold.

### MECHANISM OF INJURY

The method used for determining whether retinal injury has occurred has been traditionally a human observer who searches for injury at a specific time interval after exposure. This method is probably as good as any. However, just because visible damage does not occur in an exposure does not mean that cell damage has not occurred. This result has been shown by electron microscope observations of exposed retinal tissue. Therefore, by no surprise, the additivity between short duration pulses is generally over 90 percent. The additivity generally tends to be better defined as the number of pulses increases.

### CONCLUSION

The additivity method offers a more logical approach for evaluating repeated exposures from short pulsed laser devices. A uniform safety margin may be maintained for multiple pulses and single pulses from the same laser device. Termmissible exposures to a very few pulses or to coded pulses may be easily calculated by this method. Most importantly, an adequate margin of safety may be maintained for all repetitively-pulsed lasers.
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