



Public Health
England

Protecting and improving the nation's health

PHE Intercomparison of Passive Radon Detectors

2015 results

About Public Health England

Public Health England exists to protect and improve the nation's health and wellbeing, and reduce health inequalities. We do this through world-class science, knowledge and intelligence, advocacy, partnerships and the delivery of specialist public health services. We are an executive agency of the Department of Health, and are a distinct delivery organisation with operational autonomy to advise and support government, local authorities and the NHS in a professionally independent manner.

Public Health England
133–155 Waterloo Road
Wellington House
London SE1 8UG
T: 020 7654 8000

www.gov.uk/phe

Twitter: [@PHE_uk](https://twitter.com/PHE_uk)

Facebook: www.facebook.com/PublicHealthEngland

© Crown copyright 2017

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0. To view this licence, visit OGL or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to:

Press and Information
Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards
Public Health England
Chilton, Didcot, Oxfordshire OX11 0RQ
E: ChiltonInformationOffice@phe.gov.uk

Published April 2017

PHE publications

gateway number: 2017012

PHE supports the UN

Sustainable Development Goals



Results of the 2015 PHE Intercomparison of Passive Radon Detectors

C B Howarth

ABSTRACT

Intercomparison exercises for passive radon detectors have been held regularly by PHE and its predecessor organisations over many years. In 2015, 28 laboratories from 13 countries, took part in the exercise. Some laboratories submitted more than one set of detectors. A total of 34 sets of detectors were exposed in the PHE radon chamber.

The detectors were exposed to five different radon concentrations ranging from 50 to 3000 kBq m⁻³ h. After exposure, the detectors were returned to the originating laboratories for processing. Each participant was asked to return results for each detector in terms of exposure to radon. A parameter referred to as measurement error, was used to evaluate the performance for each exposure separately and to classify results. Results have been reported to individual participants and are presented here.

Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental
Hazards
Public Health England
Chilton, Didcot
Oxfordshire OX11 0RQ

Approval : April 2017

This report from the PHE Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards reflects understanding and evaluation of the current scientific evidence as presented and referenced in this document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Radon is the largest and most variable contributor of radiation dose to the general population. For more than 20 years, countries in Europe and elsewhere have carried out surveys in order to determine both individual and average exposures and identify where excessive exposures might occur. Most of these measurements have been carried out using passive etched track radon detectors exposed for periods of months. Activated charcoal and electret radon detectors have also been used, mainly for shorter term measurements. In addition, all three types of detector are used for experimental and research work.

Intercomparisons provide information about the accuracy of measurements. By allowing different detectors to be compared side by side, an objective assessment of the accuracy of measurements can be made. The results of intercomparisons have been used by individual laboratories to identify and rectify problems, as well as providing calibrations for their detectors traceable to international standards.

The Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards of Public Health England (CRCE) carries out international intercomparisons of passive radon detectors each year. For this intercomparison laboratories were invited to submit sets of detectors that were randomised into six groups at CRCE. Five of these groups were exposed in the CRCE radon chamber to five different radon concentrations ranging from 50 to 3000 kBq m⁻³ h and the sixth group was used to determine transit exposures. The detectors were then returned to the laboratories who were asked to report the integrated exposure result for each detector. The laboratories were not informed of the details of the exposures or which detectors were in which group until all the results had been submitted.

This report considers the results for the intercomparison carried out in 2015, for which a total of 28 laboratories from 13 countries submitted 34 sets of detectors. Analysis of the results allows each exposure group in each set to be classified from A (best) to F (worst). All types of detector, whether etched track or electret, can be found in each class, demonstrating the point that, in measuring radon, stringent quality assurance is vital irrespective of the measured technique.

CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Executive summary	iii
1 Introduction	1
2 Laboratory exposure and measurement facilities	2
3 Logistical arrangements	2
4 Radon exposures	2
5 Performance classification scheme	3
6 Results and discussion	4
7 Conclusion	5
8 Acknowledgements	5
9 References	5
10 List of participants submitting results	6
11 Tables and figures	7

1 INTRODUCTION

Passive detectors, of varying designs have been used for many years to make measurements of integrated radon exposures. The three most common methods are outlined below.

Etched track detectors are referred to as such because alpha particles from the decay products of radon damage the surface of the plastic detection medium producing microscopic tracks. These tracks are subsequently made visible by chemical or electrochemical etching. The most popular etched track materials are cellulose nitrate (LR-115), polycarbonate (Makrofol) and polyallyl diglycol carbonate (CR-39). In the open type of etched track detector the plastic material is exposed to the ambient atmosphere. Open etched track detectors record alpha particles originating from radon decay products and from radon isotopes. For these detectors, the radioactive decay equilibrium factor, F , for Rn-222 has to be taken into account to estimate the proportion of alpha particles that arise from radon-222 decay. In the closed type, the detection material is enclosed in a chamber that excludes entry of ambient radon decay products and only allows entry of radon gas by diffusion.

Activated charcoal detectors work by retaining adsorbed radon in a charcoal volume. The radon is subsequently measured in the originating laboratory.

Electret detectors consist of an air chamber above an electret. Ionisation of air in the chamber by radon gradually discharges the electret. Measurement of the charge on the electret by the laboratory before and after radon exposure allows the average radon concentration during exposure to be calculated.

Passive radon detectors are quite simple to produce and process but each is subject to sources of error. It is therefore appropriate for laboratories that use these detectors to undertake regular checks against reference exposures carried out in relevant radon exposure facilities. The present laboratory intercomparison programme, which was developed with broad international participation, following standard and agreed test and interpretation protocols, has been designed to provide participants with a routine benchmark performance standard. The intercomparison programme was established by the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB)*, now the PHE Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards (CRCE), and has operated regularly since 1982.

Operational procedures and equipment have been described previously (Howarth, 2015).

* The NRPB was subsequently incorporated into the Health Protection Agency (HPA). On 1 April 2013 the HPA was abolished and its functions transferred to Public Health England.

2 LABORATORY EXPOSURE AND MEASUREMENT FACILITIES

The exposures in this intercomparison were carried out in the CRCE radon chamber. This 43 m³ walk-in chamber is of the static type, in which radon is continuously released from dry radium-226 radon sources. There is no air flow through the chamber during operation.

The radon atmosphere in the chamber can be varied from around 200 to 8000 Bq m⁻³. Table 1 shows the parameters measured and controlled in the chamber

The radon concentration in the chamber was continuously monitored using an ATMOS 12 DPX ionisation chamber and with an Alphaguard ionisation chamber as a second primary transfer standard. A daily cross-calibration between the Atmos12 DPX and Alphaguard was carried out throughout the intercomparison exercise. Both instruments are calibrated regularly using a radon gas source supplied by Physikalisch Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB), Germany.

During exposures, radon decay products were sampled approximately four times per day onto a Millipore AA filter and their concentrations determined using an alpha spectrometry system. All chamber-monitored data was automatically transferred to a database. Radon and radon decay product exposures were calculated subsequently.

3 LOGISTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

In total, 28 laboratories from 13 countries, took part in the 2015 PHE intercomparison. Some laboratories submitted more than one set of detectors, so 34 sets of detectors were exposed in the radon chamber. Following exposure, the detectors were returned to the originating laboratories for processing. Each participant was asked to return results for each detector in terms of exposure to radon. Participants are not told any details of the exposures delivered in the exercise. Results were not reported for some sets, so the results for 31 sets of detectors from 26 laboratories are presented in this report

4 RADON EXPOSURES

Appropriate conditions were established in the chamber before introducing the detectors. An equilibrium factor, F , of about 0.40 between radon and its decay products was maintained in the chamber for the five intercomparison exposures. The chamber exposures were calculated after the deadline for return of results by participants and are shown with exposure durations in Table 1. Radon and EER (equilibrium equivalent of radon) concentrations during the exposures are shown in Figures 1–5.

The radon concentration in the laboratory outside the exposure chamber was monitored during the exposures using an Alphaguard ionisation chamber. The daily average concentrations ranged from 6 to 39 Bq m⁻³, with an overall average of 28 Bq m⁻³. The estimated additional exposure of the detectors caused by leaving them exposed in the laboratory for three days to allow radon to diffuse out of them was less than 1% of the exposure in the chamber in all cases and the values were neglected for the purpose of

calculating the reference exposures. Transit detectors were used to monitor radon exposure received in transit.

5 PERFORMANCE CLASSIFICATION SCHEME

A performance classification scheme was introduced in 2011 based on the following parameters:

- percentage biased error, which measures the bias of the measurement
- percentage precision error, which measures the precision of the measurement
- percentage measurement error, which takes into account their combined effect

The measured mean is obtained by subtracting the mean transit exposure from the mean reported exposure. The parameters are given below:

$$\% \text{ biased error} = \frac{\text{Measured mean} - \text{Reference value}}{\text{Reference value}} \times 100$$

Where the reference value is the reference radon exposure,

$$\% \text{ precision error} = \frac{\text{Standard deviation}}{\text{Measured mean}} \times 100$$

$$\% \text{ measurement error} = \sqrt{\% \text{ biased error}^2 + \% \text{ precision error}^2}$$

Since the percentage measurement error combines the biased error and precision error, a result can have low measurement error only if both bias and precision errors are low. Measurement errors are reflected as a performance classification from A (best) to F (worst) for each exposure separately. Each participating laboratory is assigned a classification, between A and F, for each exposure. The criteria for each of the classification groups are given below.

Range of measurement error (%)	Performance classification
< 10%	A
≥ 10% and < 20%	B
≥ 20% and < 30%	C
≥ 30% and < 40%	D
≥ 40% and < 50%	E
≥ 50%	F

6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results reported by the laboratories are given in Table 2. In these tables, the ‘mean’ is the mean result of ten exposed detectors (five for electrets) after subtracting the mean transit exposure. The standard deviation, ‘1 SD’, is for ten reported results (five for electrets). Results for % biased error, % precision error and % measurement error are provided as well.

The mean results and their standard deviations, as reported by participants, are depicted in Figures 6–10. The mean of all transit exposures is shown in Figure 11.

The mean, μ , and standard deviation, σ , of all reported results, calculated for each exposure, are given in Table 3. The distributions of the mean exposure results given in Table 3 are depicted in Figure 12.

The characteristics of the detectors such as material, detector holder design, detector type and material supplier are provided in Table 4.

The mean of all transit exposures is 33 kBq m⁻³ h (Figure 11). Most of the reported transit exposures were below 50 kBq m⁻³ h, one laboratory reported a value between 50 and 100 kBq m⁻³ h, while two laboratories reported values above 100 kBq m⁻³ h.

Results, using the performance classification scheme, are given in Table 4. This table is sorted according to performance classification with the first order of sort being the lowest exposure. The position of a laboratory in the table reflects the performance classification of the different exposures and should not be interpreted as a criterion of their total performance. The results in the table are informative and can be used by laboratories to review their procedures and to identify problems at different exposure levels.

Eight laboratories participating with nine sets of detectors (29%) achieved five class A results, meaning that they have a measurement error of under 10% for all five exposures. This is an improvement on previous years. Moreover about 55% of all sets of detectors achieved class A for at least three exposures - a figure similar to that seen in previous intercomparisons. There was also similar performance to 2014 at measuring the lowest exposure (145 kBq m⁻³ h): 32% of laboratories achieved class A.

It should be noted that the laboratories participating with the same type of detectors and detector material can achieve quite different performance classifications, possibly reflecting each laboratory’s own quality assurance (QA) protocols and staff experience.

In order to identify sources of errors, the laboratories should take into account changes in various parameters such as: calibration factor, sensitivity and background. Reviews of sources of errors for etched track detectors are given in Ibrahim et al (2009), Hanley et al (2008) and Hardcastle and Miles (1996). Constant monitoring of detector performance and strict QA protocols should be established and maintained to identify and manage the above sources of errors.

The proportion of sets achieving each performance classification (A-F) is given in Figure 13.

7 CONCLUSION

In total, 28 laboratories from 13 countries participated in the 2015 PHE intercomparison of passive radon detectors. A six-band (A-F) classification scheme was used to evaluate the performance of the detectors across a range of exposures.

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank PHE Radon Group colleagues who provided valuable assistance in the radon exposure of the detectors.

9 REFERENCES

Howarth CB (2015). Results of the 2014 HPA Intercomparison of Passive Radon Detectors. Chilton, HPA-CRCE-022.

Hanley O, Gutierrez-Villanueva JL, Currivan L and Pollard D (2008). Assessment of the uncertainties in the Radiological Protection Institute of Ireland (RPII) radon measurements service. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity*, **99**, 1578–82.

Hardcastle GD and Miles JCH (1996). Ageing and fading of alpha particle tracks in CR-39 exposed to air. *Radiation Protection Dosimetry*, **67**(4), 295–8.

Howarth CB (2009). Results of the 2007 HPA Intercomparison of Passive Radon Detectors. Chilton, HPA-RPD-060.

Ibrahimi Z-F, Howarth CB, Miles JCH (2009). Sources of error in etched-track radon measurements and a review of passive detectors using results from a series of radon intercomparisons. *Radiation Measurements*, **44**, 750–54.

10 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS SUBMITTING RESULTS

Contact person	Organisation	Country
Nivaldo Carlos da Silva	Brazilian Commission for Nuclear Energy - CNEN	Brazil
Kremena Ivanova	NCRRP	Bulgaria
Renato Falcomer	Health Canada National Radon Laboratory	Canada
Nicolas Tharaud	Dosirad	France
Vincent Delpech	Pôle d' Expertise et d' Analyse Radioactivité Limousin	France
Pierre Filleuil	ALGADE	France
Maria Kolovou	Greek Atomic Energy Commission	Greece
Tamas Pazmandi	Hungarian Academy of Sciences	Hungary
David Doyle	Alpharadon Ltd	Ireland
Silvia Arrigoni	ARPA Lombardia	Italy
Claudio Cazzato	Esp. Qualificato di III Grado	Italy
Anna Maria Sotgiu	ISPRA	Italy
Silvia Penzo	ENEA BAS-ION-IRP	Italy
Francesco Bochicchio	Istituto Superiore di Sanita	Italy
Paola Gozzelino	Tointech srl	Italy
Marta Rossetti	U-Series Srl	Italy
Daniele Bonamini	Tecnorad S.r.l.	Italy
Marielle Lecomte	Division de la Radioprotection	Luxembourg
Trine Kolstad	NRPA	Norway
Tryggve Ronnqvist	Gammadata Landauer	Sweden
Gilbert Jonsson	RADONANALYS GJAB	Sweden
Maria Häggmark	MRM Konsult AB	Sweden
Sean Baker	PHE Personal Dosimetry Service	UK
Darren Langridge	DRPS	UK
Simon Crust	Kingston University	UK
Jaroslawn Wasikiewicz	PHE	UK

11 TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1: Exposure parameters

Exposure	1	2	3	4	5
Duration (h)	217.7	365.6	23.2	54.2	119.3
Radon exposure (kBq m ⁻³ h)	1353	2259	145	330	719
Uncertainty (%) at 68% CL	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
EER exposure (kBq m ⁻³ h)	541	904	57	129	273
Uncertainty (%) at 68% CL	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
F, equilibrium factor	0.40	0.40	0.39	0.39	0.38

Notes

EER is equilibrium equivalent of radon.
CL is the confidence level.

Notes to Table 2 and 4

For set 119-3 the two lowest reference exposures, 3 and 4, are outside the normal dynamic range of the particular detector configuration.

The results for two detectors in set 168-1 were incorrectly assigned by the reporting laboratory. When the corrected results were supplied the result for the mean of exposure 2 was 2137.2 kBq m⁻³ h with a measurement error of 5.4%. The corrected rank for exposure 2 was A.

The results for the detectors in set 181-1 were incorrectly assigned by the reporting laboratory. When the corrected results were supplied the results for the mean of exposures 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were 1160.8, 1847.0, 132.0, 295.5 and 620.8 kBq m⁻³ h, respectively. The measurement errors for exposures 1 - 5 when corrected were 14.5%, 18.6%, 11.0%, 12.5% and 13.9% respectively. The ranks for exposures 1 - 5 when corrected were B, B, B, B and B respectively.

TABLE 2: Analysis of all reported results**Exposure 1 1353 kBq m⁻³ h**

Set ID	Mean (kBq m ⁻³ h)	1 SD (kBq m ⁻³ h)	% biased error	% precision error	% measurement error
1-1	1358.6	22.4	0.4	1.6	1.7
1-2	1362.9	29.5	0.7	2.2	2.3
7-1	1293.1	82.4	-4.4	6.4	7.8
12-1	1464.3	16.2	8.2	1.1	8.3
13-1	1304.6	36.9	-3.6	2.8	4.6
14-1	1150.6	46.0	-15.0	4.0	15.5
25-1	1415.9	54.3	4.6	3.8	6.0
25-2	1490.1	58.3	10.1	3.9	10.9
32-1	1315.8	35.3	-2.7	2.7	3.8
40-1	1117.6	145.3	-17.4	13.0	21.7
45-1	1290.5	196.7	-4.6	15.2	15.9
70-1	1231.3	48.3	-9.0	3.9	9.8
119-1	1382.5	82.5	2.2	6.0	6.4
119-2	1490.1	27.7	10.1	1.9	10.3
119-3	1481.4	41.5	9.5	2.8	9.9
129-1	1259.3	45.5	-6.9	3.6	7.8
136-1	1336.6	31.2	-1.2	2.3	2.6
141-1	1277.8	42.4	-5.6	3.3	6.5
144-1	1341.2	19.1	-0.9	1.4	1.7
156-1	1047.2	485.8	-22.6	46.4	51.6
160-1	1280.1	35.6	-5.4	2.8	6.1
160-2	1212.2	36.7	-10.4	3.0	10.8
161-1	1375.7	37.5	1.7	2.7	3.2
168-1	1369.5	35.5	1.2	2.6	2.9
171-1	1218.4	143.7	-9.9	11.8	15.4
174-1	1338.2	88.6	-1.1	6.6	6.7
177-1	1296.0	76.9	-4.2	5.9	7.3
178-1	1391.3	15.0	2.8	1.1	3.0
179-1	1279.1	40.1	-5.5	3.1	6.3
181-1	-29.4	626.8	-102.2	-2134.3	2136.7
182-1	1673.8	167.6	23.7	10.0	25.7

TABLE 2: Analysis of all reported results (continued)

Exposure 2 2259 kBq m⁻³ h

Set ID	Mean (kBq m ⁻³ h)	1 SD (kBq m ⁻³ h)	% biased error	% precision error	% measurement error
1-1	2279.1	55.9	0.9	2.5	2.6
1-2	2350.3	35.9	4.0	1.5	4.3
7-1	2154.7	55.6	-4.6	2.6	5.3
12-1	2496.9	15.9	10.5	0.6	10.6
13-1	2083.6	55.9	-7.8	2.7	8.2
14-1	1830.9	93.3	-18.9	5.1	19.6
25-1	2471.1	73.6	9.4	3.0	9.8
25-2	2392.2	142.4	5.9	6.0	8.4
32-1	2225.4	77.4	-1.5	3.5	3.8
40-1	1784.3	158.8	-21.0	8.9	22.8
45-1	2281.4	138.0	1.0	6.0	6.1
70-1	1995.7	34.0	-11.7	1.7	11.8
119-1	2219.2	84.9	-1.8	3.8	4.2
119-2	2400.1	74.7	6.2	3.1	7.0
119-3	2470.7	175.9	9.4	7.1	11.8
129-1	2136.7	39.9	-5.4	1.9	5.7
136-1	2110.8	55.9	-6.6	2.6	7.1
141-1	2156.8	42.1	-4.5	2.0	4.9
144-1	2266.2	66.9	0.3	3.0	3.0
156-1	1092.6	681.7	-51.6	62.4	81.0
160-1	2129.5	68.1	-5.7	3.2	6.6
160-2	2047.7	39.3	-9.4	1.9	9.5
161-1	2243.7	73.6	-0.7	3.3	3.4
168-1	1869.2	642.1	-17.3	34.3	38.4
171-1	1776.3	244.8	-21.4	13.8	25.4
174-1	2234.0	138.4	-1.1	6.2	6.3
177-1	2173.1	128.0	-3.8	5.9	7.0
178-1	2380.1	28.1	5.4	1.2	5.5
179-1	2197.1	45.6	-2.7	2.1	3.4
181-1	-469.4	354.4	-120.8	-75.5	142.4
182-1	2523.4	254.5	11.7	10.1	15.4

TABLE 2 Analysis of all reported results (*continued*)Exposure 3 145 kBq m⁻³ h

Set ID	Mean (kBq m ⁻³ h)	1 SD (kBq m ⁻³ h)	% biased error	% precision error	% measurement error
1-1	142.5	6.1	-1.7	4.3	4.6
1-2	142.6	3.9	-1.7	2.7	3.2
7-1	131.1	25.3	-9.6	19.3	21.6
12-1	165.7	6.3	14.3	3.8	14.8
13-1	143.6	10.0	-1.0	7.0	7.0
14-1	136.1	13.6	-6.1	10.0	11.7
25-2	159.2	20.0	9.8	12.6	15.9
32-1	149.2	9.4	2.9	6.3	6.9
40-1	158.7	20.0	9.5	12.6	15.8
45-1	139.2	13.8	-4.0	9.9	10.7
70-1	141.5	12.6	-2.4	8.9	9.2
119-1	146.4	10.2	1.0	7.0	7.0
119-2	240.8	87.3	66.0	36.3	75.3
119-3	181.4	137.3	25.1	75.7	79.7
129-1	132.7	11.6	-8.5	8.8	12.2
136-1	153.9	9.5	6.1	6.2	8.7
141-1	132.0	4.5	-9.0	3.4	9.6
144-1	141.8	12.9	-2.2	9.1	9.4
156-1	110.7	65.5	-23.7	59.2	63.7
160-1	159.0	12.7	9.7	8.0	12.5
160-2	143.4	5.3	-1.1	3.7	3.8
161-1	160.1	22.5	10.4	14.0	17.5
168-1	163.3	12.8	12.6	7.9	14.9
171-1	136.7	27.4	-5.7	20.1	20.9
174-1	136.2	23.7	-6.1	17.4	18.4
177-1	137.4	40.6	-5.2	29.5	30.0
178-1	149.4	3.2	3.0	2.2	3.7
179-1	131.3	4.6	-9.4	3.5	10.1
181-1	-56.9	636.1	-139.2	-1118.8	1127.4
182-1	267.7	308.4	84.6	115.2	142.9
178-1	2425.4	48.1	1.8	2.0	2.7

TABLE 2: Analysis of all reported results (continued)

Exposure 4 330 kBq m⁻³ h

Set ID	Mean (kBq m ⁻³ h)	1 SD (kBq m ⁻³ h)	% biased error	% precision error	% measurement error
1-1	322.6	9.4	-2.2	2.9	3.7
1-2	314.0	7.5	-4.8	2.4	5.4
7-1	308.4	49.9	-6.5	16.2	17.5
12-1	350.4	9.1	6.2	2.6	6.7
13-1	318.6	9.0	-3.5	2.8	4.5
14-1	283.8	17.5	-14.0	6.2	15.3
25-2	363.6	27.7	10.2	7.6	12.7
32-1	326.9	19.7	-0.9	6.0	6.1
40-1	323.9	36.3	-1.8	11.2	11.4
45-1	332.7	48.6	0.8	14.6	14.6
70-1	318.3	17.8	-3.5	5.6	6.6
119-1	330.2	22.5	0.0	6.8	6.8
119-2	473.5	143.0	43.5	30.2	52.9
119-3	385.3	136.4	16.7	35.4	39.2
129-1	306.0	22.0	-7.3	7.2	10.2
136-1	304.7	14.4	-7.7	4.7	9.0
141-1	321.0	10.9	-2.7	3.4	4.4
144-1	332.4	19.6	0.7	5.9	5.9
156-1	202.2	146.8	-38.7	72.6	82.3
160-1	335.3	21.0	1.6	6.3	6.5
160-2	313.7	15.0	-4.9	4.8	6.9
161-1	370.7	43.0	12.3	11.6	16.9
168-1	359.4	20.1	8.9	5.6	10.5
171-1	340.1	33.3	3.0	9.8	10.3
174-1	324.2	25.9	-1.8	8.0	8.2
177-1	294.0	27.8	-10.9	9.5	14.4
178-1	332.6	6.4	0.8	1.9	2.1
179-1	329.9	13.6	0.0	4.1	4.1
181-1	-139.4	678.2	-142.3	-486.4	506.8
182-1	295.9	109.4	-10.3	37.0	38.4

TABLE 2 Analysis of all reported results (continued)

Exposure 5 719 kBq m⁻³ h

Set ID	Mean (kBq m ⁻³ h)	1 SD (kBq m ⁻³ h)	% biased error	% precision error	% measurement error
1-1	679.0	20.4	-5.6	3.0	6.3
1-2	675.2	10.5	-6.1	1.6	6.3
7-1	687.5	35.1	-4.4	5.1	6.7
12-1	734.7	9.3	2.2	1.3	2.5
13-1	687.2	26.2	-4.4	3.8	5.8
14-1	594.6	28.1	-17.3	4.7	17.9
25-1	678.7	26.9	-5.6	4.0	6.9
25-2	694.0	60.0	-3.5	8.7	9.3
32-1	694.4	31.4	-3.4	4.5	5.7
40-1	624.7	62.5	-13.1	10.0	16.5
45-1	695.9	64.5	-3.2	9.3	9.8
70-1	632.3	32.8	-12.1	5.2	13.1
119-1	709.6	52.8	-1.3	7.4	7.6
119-2	839.0	118.1	16.7	14.1	21.8
119-3	752.7	48.4	4.7	6.4	8.0
129-1	672.9	71.9	-6.4	10.7	12.5
136-1	653.1	19.8	-9.2	3.0	9.7
141-1	670.7	11.0	-6.7	1.6	6.9
144-1	712.5	34.5	-0.9	4.8	4.9
156-1	365.4	244.1	-49.2	66.8	83.0
160-1	702.0	32.0	-2.4	4.6	5.1
160-2	647.0	25.8	-10.0	4.0	10.8
161-1	724.2	58.0	0.7	8.0	8.0
168-1	716.2	37.1	-0.4	5.2	5.2
171-1	650.2	41.7	-9.6	6.4	11.5
174-1	688.4	28.2	-4.3	4.1	5.9
177-1	650.7	50.5	-9.5	7.8	12.3
178-1	702.3	9.0	-2.3	1.3	2.7
179-1	679.5	19.7	-5.5	2.9	6.2
181-1	42.3	791.8	-94.1	1871.4	1873.8
182-1	816.6	173.8	13.6	21.3	25.2

TABLE 2 Analysis of all reported results (continued)**Transit controls**

Set ID	Mean (kBq m ⁻³ h)	1 SD (kBq m ⁻³ h)	Set ID	Mean (kBq m ⁻³ h)	1 SD (kBq m ⁻³ h)
1-1	7.8	4.5	129-1	20.0	3.8
1-2	2.5	2.1	136-1	29.0	4.2
7-1	58.1	11.4	141-1	0.0	0.0
12-1	12.8	2.9	144-1	17.8	6.5
13-1	4.0	2.2	156-1	16.7	6.5
14-1	30.1	6.2	160-1	38.9	5.3
19-1	20.7	8.3	160-2	35.7	4.9
25-1	9.1	1.7	161-1	39.1	5.4
25-2	15.4	3.7	168-1	34.0	4.9
32-1	6.6	1.3	171-1	10.4	3.4
40-1	13.7	2.0	174-1	20.2	13.7
45-1	24.0	6.0	177-1	56.8	16.8
70-1	27.0	7.8	178-1	6.1	2.0
119-1	21.3	12.2	179-1	0.0	0.0
119-2	49.1	27.9	181-1	821.3	766.7
119-3	115.4	55.1	182-1	269.5	152.1

TABLE 3: Statistical analysis of all reported results given in Table 2

Exposure	Mean (μ) of all reported results (kBq m ⁻³ h)	Standard deviation (σ) of all reported results (kBq m ⁻³ h)
1 (1353 kBq m ⁻³ h)	1284	272
2 (2259 kBq m ⁻³ h)	2074	549
3 (145 kBq m ⁻³ h)	146	49
4 (330 kBq m ⁻³ h)	313	95
5 (719 kBq m ⁻³ h)	660	138

TABLE 4: Performance classification scheme based on measurement error

	Performance classification in each exposure					Detector type	Filter	Holder	Detector material	Detector material supplier
	3	4	5	1	2					
	145 kBq m ⁻³ h	330 kBq m ⁻³ h	719 kBq m ⁻³ h	1353 kBq m ⁻³	2259 kBq m ⁻³ h					
1-1	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		NRPB/SSI	CR39	Mi-Net
1-2	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		NRPB/SSI	CR39	TASL
13-1	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		NRPB/SSI	CR39	Intercast
32-1	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		NRPB/SSI	CR39	TASL
119-1	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		Radosys	CR39	Radosys
136-1	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL
141-1	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL
144-1	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		Radosys	CR39	Radosys
178-1	A	A	A	A	A	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL
70-1	A	A	B	A	B	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL
160-2	A	A	B	B	A	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL
25-1			A	A	A	Open		Own	LR115	Dosirad
160-1	B	A	A	A	A	Closed		NRPB/SSI	CR39	TASL
174-1	B	A	A	A	A	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL

179-1	B	A	A	A	A	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL
12-1	B	A	A	A	B	Closed		NRPb/SSI	CR39	_
161-1	B	B	A	A	A	Closed	Yes	Radosys	CR-39	Radosys
25-2	B	B	A	B	A	Closed		Own	LR115	Dosirad
45-1	B	B	A	B	A	Closed	Yes	Own	LR115	Dosirad
129-1	B	B	B	A	A	Closed		Own	CR39	Intercast
14-1	B	B	B	B	B	Closed		NRPB/SSI	CR39	TASL
40-1	B	B	B	C	C	Closed		NRPB	CR39	MiNet
168-1	B	B	A	A	D	Closed		NRPB	CR39	TASL
7-1	C	B	A	A	A	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL
177-1	C	B	B	A	A	Closed		TASL	CR39	TASL
171-1	C	B	B	B	C	Closed		Own	LR115	Dosirad
119-3	F	D	A	A	B	Closed		E-Perm L	Electret	E-Perm
119-2	F	F	C	B	A	Closed		E-Perm S	Electret	E=Perm
182-1	F	D	C	C	B	Closed		NRPB/SSI	CR39	TASL
156-1	F	F	F	F	F	Closed		Radosys	CR39	Radosys
181-1	F	F	F	F	F	Closed		Radosys	CR39	Radosys




FIGURE 1: Radon and EER concentrations for Exposure 1




FIGURE 2: Radon and EER concentrations for Exposure 2




FIGURE 3: Radon and EER concentrations for Exposure 3




FIGURE 4: Radon and EER concentrations for Exposure 4




FIGURE 5: Radon and EER concentrations for Exposure 5




FIGURE 6: Results as reported by participants for Exposure 1




FIGURE 7: Results as reported by participants for Exposure 2




FIGURE 8: Results as reported by participants for Exposure 3




FIGURE 9: Results as reported by participants for Exposure 4




FIGURE 10: Results as reported by participants for Exposure 5









FIGURE 11: Results as reported by participants for transit exposure

FIGURE 12: Distribution of mean exposure results given in Table 3










FIGURE 13: Proportions of sets achieving different performance classes for each exposure