SAS Journal of Medicine

OPEN ACCESS

Abbreviated Key Title: SAS J Med
ISSN 2454-5112
Journal homepage: https://saspublishers.com

Radiology

Standard Radiography in Pilot Screening: A Key Tool for Enhancing Flight Safety and Aeromedical Fitness

Safaa Maktit[1*], Meryem Zerrik[1], Zakaria Iloughmane[1], Mouna El Ghazi[1], Fahd Bennani Smires[1], Fatima Zohra Tlemcani[1], Mounya Jaouher[1], Mehdi El Azouzi[2], Rachid Zerrouk[1], Houda Echchachoui[1], Mohamed Chemsi[1]

[1]Aeromedical Expertise Center, Military Hospital Mohammed V, Rabat, Morocco
[2]Radiology Department, Military Hospital Mohammed V, Rabat, Morocco

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36347/sasjm.2026.v12i03.015 | **Received:** 08.02.2026 | **Accepted:** 16.03.2026 | **Published:** 26.03.2026

***Corresponding author:** Safaa Maktit
Aeromedical Expertise Center, Military Hospital Mohammed V, Rabat, Morocco

Abstract **Review Article**

The aeronautical environment imposes multiple physiological, biomechanical, and psychological constraints on aircrew, particularly pilots, including high accelerations, pressure variations, vibrations, hypoxia, operational stress, and prolonged postures. These factors can precipitate or exacerbate conditions that may compromise flight safety. Aerospace medicine aims to maintain the highest level of safety by ensuring the physical and psychological fitness of aircrew through systematic medical evaluations at initial selection and periodic follow-up, with frequency adapted to the aeronautical specialty. The fundamental principle is that every aircrew member must be free from conditions that could be aggravated by flight or lead to sudden in-flight incapacitation, with an acceptable risk threshold classically set at less than 1%. To achieve this, a range of complementary investigations is integrated into initial assessments and follow-up protocols, with conventional radiography playing a central role. Radiography allows the detection of pulmonary diseases, including structural, infectious, or functional abnormalities; identification of musculoskeletal disorders, particularly of the spine; and the recognition of vesicorenal lithiasis on abdominal plain films. These conditions, often asymptomatic in their early stages, can nevertheless impair in-flight performance and pose a significant threat to aviation safety. In this context, conventional radiography serves as a strategic tool for triage, diagnostic orientation, and longitudinal surveillance in assessing aeromedical fitness, supporting targeted interventions to preserve operational readiness and safety. This ongoing practice raises an important question in contemporary aviation medicine: Does standard radiology truly help prevent in-flight incapacitation, or is it maintained more as a matter of regulatory tradition than as an evidence-based measure?

Keywords: Aeromedical fitness, Radiography screening, Aviation medicine, Spine imaging, Chest X-ray, Flight safety.

INTRODUCTION

Aircrew members undergo periodic medical evaluations throughout their careers. Before beginning flight training, a comprehensive initial assessment is conducted, followed by regular follow-up examinations, typically annually. This initial evaluation usually includes a detailed medical history, a thorough physical examination, urinalysis, an electrocardiogram (ECG), an electroencephalogram (EEG), audiometric testing, blood analyses, and a standard chest radiograph.[1]

These assessments were originally intended to minimize medical attrition during flight training by detecting, at an early stage, conditions that could potentially lead to incapacity. The core objective of occupational fitness evaluations is to ensure that individuals can perform their duties safely and effectively, without endangering themselves or others. In aviation, this requirement is particularly critical given the unique physiological stresses of the aerospace environment. However, the likelihood that a single episode of acute pilot incapacitation will result in an accident is estimated to be less than 1 in 1,000 events. Such probabilities should be carefully considered when establishing or updating aeromedical standards.[2]

Regarding radiology, the World Health Organization (WHO) has stated that routine X-ray screening is not justified in the general population, except for individuals exposed to specific occupational pulmonary hazards. This recommendation is primarily based on the low diagnostic yield of standard radiographs

in detecting clinically significant disease in asymptomatic individuals. Nevertheless, standard radiography remains a component of the initial medical examination for professional pilots in several regulatory frameworks. [3]

DISCUSSION

Standard radiography is a medical imaging technique that uses X-rays. An X-ray beam passes through the patient's body and is variably absorbed depending on tissue density: dense structures such as bone strongly absorb X-rays and appear white, whereas soft tissues appear in shades of gray, and air appears black. The resulting image is a two-dimensional projection that is quick to perform, inexpensive, and widely available.[4]

In the aeronautical context, conventional radiology is of particular interest in pilots. It enables the screening and follow-up of musculoskeletal (spine, limbs), thoracic (lungs, chest wall), or sinus pathologies that may impair tolerance to pressure changes, acceleration forces (+Gz), and vibratory constraints. Spinal radiography, for example, can identify degenerative or structural abnormalities that may compromise in-flight performance or increase the risk of pain under high biomechanical stress.[5]

However, in aerospace medicine, standard radiography represents a first-line tool for medical fitness assessment, the detection of potential contraindications to flying duties, and the longitudinal monitoring of pilots exposed to specific physical stresses.[6]

Chest X-ray:

Chest radiography is the most frequently used standard imaging examination during initial medical evaluations of pilots, providing a rapid, accessible, and cost-effective method for detecting pulmonary, mediastinal, and cardiac abnormalities that could compromise tolerance to hypoxia, barometric pressure changes, or the physiological stresses associated with flight.[3]In aerospace medicine, chest X-rays are particularly valuable for identifying residual lesions from prior tuberculosis or other chronic infections, detecting emphysematous bullae or other cystic lung diseases that may predispose to spontaneous pneumothorax an important consideration in unpressurized or military aviation and revealing cardiomegaly or mediastinal abnormalities that could indicate underlying cardiovascular pathology. Pilots, especially those operating high-performance military aircraft, are exposed to unique respiratory demands, including hypobaric and hypoxic environments that necessitate the use of onboard oxygen systems, sometimes in combination with masks and regulators to increase inspired oxygen pressure, which can alter minute ventilation and compensatory respiratory responses. Additional stressors such as repeated exposure to high G-forces, tightly secured seating in ejection seats, and restrictive flight equipment can further impact pulmonary mechanics, potentially causing atelectasis or restrictive ventilatory patterns.[7]Unexplained physiological events in aircrew, often described as "hypoxia-like events," have occasionally led to temporary grounding of aircraft fleets, underscoring impaired pulmonary function as a possible contributing factor. Despite these considerations, evidence indicates that in young, asymptomatic, and medically selected pilots, the diagnostic yield of routine chest radiography is relatively low, with most detected anomalies being benign, old, or clinically insignificant.[8]

Chest radiography also has limited sensitivity for early cardiac disease, does not serve as an effective screening tool for coronary artery disease, the leading cause of cardiovascular incapacitation in pilots, and involves exposure to a small but real amount of ionizing radiation. Consequently, chest radiography is most appropriately used as a targeted screening tool for individuals with specific risk factors or relevant medical histories rather than as part of routine, universal screening.[9]

Spinal radiography:

Spinal radiography remains a cornerstone imaging modality for evaluating the vertebral column in pilots, particularly those subject to extreme biomechanical stresses, such as repeated +Gz forces in military aviation or high-performance aerobatic maneuvers. Its principal clinical value lies in detecting structural abnormalities that could compromise a pilot's ability to tolerate acceleration forces, maintain prolonged seated postures in confined cockpits, and perform complex operational tasks under sustained physical and cognitive demands. Radiographs can identify significant scoliosis, congenital vertebral malformations, early degenerative disc disease, vertebral instabilities, osteophytes, or traumatic sequelae, many of which might be missed on routine clinical assessment or physical examination.[10]

In high-performance military aviation, where spinal discomfort or injury can directly affect flight safety, early detection is crucial, as back pain remains one of the leading causes of temporary flight restrictions or grounding, and progressive spinal pathology can impair tolerance to prolonged G-forces, repetitive vibration exposure, and the static postures required during flight. The evaluation of scoliosis is performed using the Cobb angle measured on standing spinal radiographs. Aeromedical fitness decisions are based on the degree of spinal curvature. Candidates presenting with a Cobb angle of 15° or less are generally considered fit for all pilot specialties, including fighter, transport, and helicopter aviation (general standard A1). When the Cobb angle ranges between 16° and 24°, the candidate is typically considered unfit for fighter aviation but may remain eligible for transport or helicopter operations

(general standard B1). A curvature of 25° or greater is usually considered incompatible with military pilot duties due to the potential biomechanical impact of high-performance flight conditions.[11] Thoracic kyphosis is also evaluated radiographically. When the kyphotic angle exceeds 50°, candidates are usually considered unfit for military pilot duties. When the angle is below 50°, aeromedical decision-making may require an individualized assessment, taking into account potential sequelae of Scheuermann disease and the presence of symptoms or functional impairment. Another condition of interest is spondylolysis (isthmic lysis). In the absence of spondylolisthesis, isolated isthmic defects are generally considered compatible with military aviation duties. However, when spondylolisthesis is present, aeromedical decisions depend on the degree of vertebral displacement. A vertebral slip of less than 1 cm may still allow fitness for certain pilot roles, although restrictions may apply depending on the operational demands. In contrast, a displacement greater than 1 cm is usually considered incompatible with pilot duties due to the increased risk of spinal instability under repeated acceleration forces.[12]

Beyond acute detection, spinal radiography provides a practical, rapid, and cost-effective method for longitudinal monitoring of spinal integrity over a pilot's career, enabling early recognition of potentially limiting conditions before they manifest clinically, which can inform preventative measures, modifications of flight duties, or rehabilitation planning. Despite these advantages, the diagnostic and predictive utility of spinal radiography is inherently limited. The correlation between radiographic abnormalities and actual clinical symptoms is often weak; many degenerative changes, particularly in the cervical and lumbar regions, are observed in asymptomatic pilots without any functional deficit.[13]

Standard X-rays also have intrinsic technical limitations: they offer poor visualization of intervertebral discs, ligamentous structures, facet joints, and neural elements, for which magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or computed tomography (CT) provides far superior diagnostic accuracy. Additionally, repeated exposure to ionizing radiation, although generally low per study, may accumulate over time in pilots subjected to serial imaging, raising considerations for long-term safety and risk–benefit balance. Furthermore, radiographs are limited in detecting early inflammatory, metabolic, or subtle traumatic changes, which may still affect operational performance.[14] Consequently, spinal radiography is most appropriately indicated for pilots presenting with clinical symptoms, known risk factors (such as prior spinal injury), or those operating in environments of extreme mechanical stress, such as fighter or aerobatic aviation, rather than as a routine or universal screening tool across all flight personnel. When integrated with clinical assessment, occupational history, and advanced imaging as indicated, spinal radiography serves as a valuable component of a comprehensive aeromedical evaluation strategy, balancing accessibility, cost, and diagnostic yield.[5]

Plain abdominal radiography (without contrast or preparation):

Plain abdominal radiography (without contrast or preparation) is a conventional imaging modality used to evaluate the abdominal organs, gastrointestinal tract, and osseous structures in a rapid and accessible manner.[15]Although it is less commonly employed in routine aeromedical assessments than thoracic or spinal radiography, its use may be indicated in pilots with a history of abdominal trauma, gastrointestinal disorders, or unexplained abdominal pain. The examination can detect structural abnormalities such as renal or ureteral calculi, intestinal obstruction, fecal impaction, or abnormal gas patterns, which could potentially affect in-flight performance or exacerbate symptoms under conditions of hypobaric pressure or prolonged immobility. In military or high-performance aviation, where pilots may experience rapid altitude changes and limited ability to address acute abdominal discomfort during flight, early identification of such conditions is important to prevent in-flight incapacitation.[5]

However, the diagnostic utility of plain abdominal radiography is limited. Many soft tissue and early gastrointestinal pathologies, including inflammatory or ischemic conditions, are not reliably detected with this technique. It provides minimal information regarding organ parenchyma or vascular structures, for which ultrasound, CT, or MRI are superior. [15] Moreover, as with other X-ray modalities, exposure to ionizing radiation, although low, must be considered, especially for pilots undergoing serial imaging. Consequently, plain abdominal radiography is most appropriately used in a targeted, symptom-driven manner rather than as a routine screening tool in asymptomatic flight personnel, complementing clinical evaluation and more advanced imaging when indicated.

Global benefit–risk analysis:

The fundamental goal of aerospace medicine is to minimize the risk of in-flight incapacitation, a critical component of flight safety. This approach focuses on preventing acute medical events that could compromise a pilot's performance or ability to safely operate an aircraft. Traditionally, comprehensive medical examinations, including standard radiography, have been employed as part of a broad screening strategy. However, current evidence indicates that the actual benefit of routine standard radiography is limited when applied indiscriminately.[6] The added value of routine, symptom-free radiographic screening for reducing this already low risk is difficult to demonstrate. In young, asymptomatic populations, the diagnostic yield of standard radiography is very low, with most detected abnormalities being clinically insignificant.[5]

The International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) emphasizes that any exposure to ionizing radiation must be justified by a demonstrable medical benefit rather than by tradition. Modern recommendations advocate for targeted examinations based on clinical history, age, cardiovascular risk factors, and symptoms, rather than systematic radiography. For instance, a chest radiograph may be indicated for a candidate presenting with respiratory symptoms or a history of pulmonary disease, but it is not recommended for asymptomatic, low-risk individuals.[16]

Future perspectives:

A more rational approach to radiological examinations in pilots involves targeting investigations based on individual risk factors and symptoms rather than maintaining routine, systematic screening. Chest radiography should be reserved for candidates with a history of respiratory disease or pulmonary symptoms, while spinal radiography could be limited to pilots exposed to high biomechanical stresses or presenting with back pain. Plain abdominal radiography (without preparation) has no proven value as a routine screening tool and should be discontinued, as alternative diagnostic modalities are more sensitive when clinically indicated. At the same time, cardiovascular screening the main contributor to acute in-flight incapacitation should be reinforced through the assessment of individual risk factors, ECG, exercise testing, and, if necessary, targeted functional imaging. This individualized strategy maximizes flight safety while reducing unnecessary radiation exposure and aligns practice with evidence-based medicine principles.[1]

CONCLUSION

Standard radiography whether thoracic, spinal, or abdominal has long been included in pilot medical examinations as part of a comprehensive and precautionary screening strategy. However, epidemiological data and evidence-based medicine principles indicate that its diagnostic yield is low in young, asymptomatic populations and that it does not effectively detect the primary causes of acute in-flight incapacitation, particularly cardiovascular disorders.[2] A more rational strategy consists of prioritizing targeted examinations—based on clinical history, individual risk factors, and symptomatology—while simultaneously strengthening cardiovascular screening, a key determinant of the risk of in-flight incapacitation. This approach optimizes aviation safety, limits unnecessary radiation exposure, and rationalizes medical resources, all while adhering to modern standards of aviation medicine and radiation protection.[6]

Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

All authors confirm that they have obtained written consent from the patient for publication of the article.

Author Contributions: All authors contributed equally to this work.

Funding: The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Ethical Approval: No ethical approval is required for de-identified single case reports based on our institutional policies.

REFERENCES

1. Mcloughlin, D. C. Aircrew Periodic Medical Examinations. Occup. Med. 2003, 53 (1), 11–14. https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqg022.
2. Mitchell, S. J. The Value of Screening Tests in Applicants for Professional Pilot Medical Certification. Occup. Med. 2003, 53 (1), 15–18. https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqg020.
3. Keesling, C. A.; Johnson, C. E.; Grayson, D. E.; Morrison, W. B. The Utility of Screening Chest Radiographs for Flight Physicals. Mil. Med. 2000, 165 (9), 667–669. https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/165.9.667.
4. la_radiologie_cours_RAYONNEMENTS.
5. Chadha, W. C. D.; Capt, G.; Sabikhi, G.; Handa, W. C. A.; Vasdev, W. C. V. Validity of Radiological Screening as Part of Initial Medical Examination of Aircrew.
6. Manuel de Médecine Aéronautique Civil.
7. Bang, S.; Yang, S.; Cho, S. W.; Kim, D. H.; Kang, H. Follow-Up of Blebs and Bullae in Pilots 40 Years and Older Using CT. Aerosp. Med. Hum. Perform. 2019, 90 (10), 867–871. https://doi.org/10.3357/AMHP.5340.2019.
8. Frijters, E.; Lindgaard, K.; Regn, D.; Gray, G.; Naylor, J.; Bushby, A.; Guettler, N.; Leino, T. Policies on Pulmonary Screening and Management of Respiratory Conditions in Military Pilots. Aerosp. Med. Hum. Perform. 2024, 95 (12), 908–912. https://doi.org/10.3357/AMHP.6471.2024.
9. Riches, A.; Spratford, W.; Witchalls, J.; Newman, P. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis About the Prevalence of Neck Pain in Fast Jet Pilots. Aerosp. Med. Hum. Perform. 2019, 90 (10), 882–890. https://doi.org/10.3357/AMHP.5360.2019.
10. Hämäläinen, O. Thoracolumbar Pain among Fighter Pilots. Mil. Med. 1999, 164 (8), 595–596. https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/164.8.595.
11. Al Rumaithi, M.; Al Qubaisi, M.; Al Suwaidi, M.; Al Zaabi, F.; Campos, L. A.; Baltatu, O. C.; Al Tunaiji, H. Determinants of Cervical Spine Disorders in Military Pilots: A Systematic Review. Occup. Med. 2023, 73 (5), 236–242. https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqad067.
12. Keskimölö, T.; Oura, P.; Honkanen, T.; Niinimäki, J.; Sovelius, R.; Leino, T.; Karppinen, J. Association Between Cumulative G-Force Exposure and Cervical Spine Degenerative Changes. Mil. Med.

2025, 190 (5–6), e930–e937. https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/usae452.
13. Shiri, R.; Frilander, H.; Sainio, M.; Karvala, K.; Sovelius, R.; Vehmas, T.; Viikari-Juntura, E. Cervical and Lumbar Pain and Radiological Degeneration among Fighter Pilots: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Occup. Environ. Med. 2015, 72 (2), 145–150. https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2014-102268.
14. Sovelius, R.; Salonen, O.; Lamminen, A.; Huhtala, H.; Hämäläinen, O. Spinal MRI in Fighter Pilots and Controls: A 13-Year Longitudinal Study. Aviat. Space Environ. Med. 2008, 79 (7), 685–688. https://doi.org/10.3357/ASEM.2249.2008.
15. Sreedharan, S.; Fiorentino, M.; Sinha, S. Plain Abdominal Radiography in Acute Abdominal Pain Is It Really Necessary? Emerg. Radiol. 2014, 21 (6), 597–603. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10140-014-1244-y.
16. ICRP Radio.