Saudi Journal of Medicine and Public Health

https://saudijmph.com/index.php/pub

https://doi.org/10.64483/202522704

Occupational Exposure to Bloodborne Pathogens Among Nurses, Dental Staff, and Health Security Workers-An Updated Review

Ahmed Jardi Ali Majmi[(1)] , Khalil Mohammed Khalil Aldhuwaymir[(2)] , Abdullah Ali Nasser Alshehri[(3)] , Monirah Salem Alharbi[(4)] , Hanan Faris Ahmed Muswadi[(5)] , Basmah Abdulelah Abdullah Madkhali[(6)] , Yara Abduh Ali Sultan[(7)] , Nemat Nour Allah Qari[(8)] , Abdulaziz Salman Almukhalfa[(9)] , Jawaher Mohammed Abkar Zailai[(10)] , Fatimah Ibrahim Ali Sharwani[(11)] , Wejdan Abdullah Ahmed Ali[(12)] , Afnan Obeid Saeed Alanzi[(13)]

(1) Basamta Primary Health Care Center, ministry of health, Saudi Arabia
(2) Al-Aradh Primary Health Care Center, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(3) Alqabel Primary Health Care Center, Aseer Health Cluster, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(4) Ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(5) Al-Aridah General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia
(6) Prince Mohammed bin Nasser Hospital, Jazan, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(7) PMBNH, Jazan Health Cluster, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(8) Aliah PHC, Madinah, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia
(9) Cardiac Center, Arar, Northern Borders, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(10) Al-Shati Health Center, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(11) Abu Arish General Hospital, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(12) Urgent Care Center, Sabya, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia
(13) *Primary Health Care, Al-Murooj, Tabuk, ministry of health , Saudi Arabia*

Abstract

Background: Occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens remains a significant hazard for healthcare workers despite the implementation of global safety standards such as the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard. Nurses, dental staff, and health security workers are particularly vulnerable due to frequent contact with blood and body fluids, increasing the risk of transmission of HIV, HBV, and HCV.

Aim: This review aims to synthesize updated evidence on occupational exposure risks, regulatory frameworks, preventive strategies, and ongoing challenges among nurses, dental personnel, and health security workers.

Methods: A narrative updated review approach was used, analyzing regulatory guidelines, epidemiological data, and recent literature on occupational exposure, infection control practices, and preventive interventions in healthcare settings.

Results: Findings indicate that needlestick injuries and sharps-related incidents remain the primary route of exposure. HBV, HCV, and HIV continue to represent the most clinically significant pathogens. Despite vaccination programs, engineering controls, and training initiatives, compliance gaps, underreporting, inconsistent PPE use, and suboptimal adherence to standard precautions persist. Economic burden and psychological distress among exposed workers remain substantial.

Conclusion: Occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens continues to pose a multidimensional challenge requiring strengthened compliance, improved training, and system-wide safety culture. Interprofessional collaboration and strict adherence to OSHA standards are essential for reducing risk.

Keywords: Bloodborne pathogens, occupational exposure, healthcare workers, OSHA, needlestick injuries, infection control, HBV, HCV, HIV.

Introduction

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Bloodborne Pathogens Standard (29 CFR 1910.1030) represents a foundational regulatory framework established at the federal level to safeguard healthcare personnel from occupational exposure to infectious bloodborne agents, notably including Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), Hepatitis B Virus (HBV), and Hepatitis C Virus (HCV) [1]. Originally promulgated in 1991, the standard underwent significant revision in 2001 in response to the Needlestick Safety and Prevention Act (HR 5178), which strengthened employer obligations and reinforced the implementation of safer clinical practices within healthcare environments. This regulatory evolution reflects an ongoing commitment to reducing preventable occupational hazards and enhancing workplace safety through enforceable standards and structured preventive measures. Bloodborne pathogens are defined as pathogenic microorganisms present in human blood and other potentially infectious body fluids that are capable of

*Corresponding author e-mail: umturkey7@gmail.com (Ahmed Jardi Ali Majmi).
Receive Date: 07 December 2025, Revise Date: 29 December 2025, Accept Date: 31 December 2025

inducing severe, often life-threatening diseases in exposed individuals. Within clinical and occupational settings, transmission risk extends beyond blood to include exposure to a range of bodily fluids such as semen, vaginal secretions, saliva, and various serous fluids including pleural, pericardial, peritoneal, and amniotic fluids. Healthcare workers are particularly vulnerable due to the nature of clinical care, which frequently involves direct contact with blood and invasive procedures. Among the various routes of occupational exposure, needlestick injuries and other sharps-related incidents remain the predominant mechanism of transmission in healthcare environments [2]. These injuries often occur during routine procedures such as venipuncture, surgical interventions, and waste disposal practices, underscoring the persistent risk associated with sharp medical instruments even in controlled settings.

In addition to percutaneous injuries caused by contaminated needles or sharp devices, occupational exposure may also occur through alternative pathways, including cuts, abrasions, and breaches in the integrity of the skin. Accidental puncture wounds, human bites, and mucocutaneous exposures involving contact with infectious fluids through the eyes, nose, or oral mucosa further contribute to the spectrum of transmission risks. These varied exposure routes highlight the multifactorial nature of occupational hazards in healthcare environments and emphasize the importance of comprehensive preventive strategies, including adherence to standard precautions and the use of personal protective equipment. On a global scale, bloodborne pathogen exposure continues to constitute a substantial occupational health burden. It is estimated that approximately three million occupational exposures occur annually worldwide, reflecting the widespread nature of this issue across healthcare systems. Within the United States alone, hospitals report an estimated 400,000 needlestick and sharps injuries each year, demonstrating that despite advancements in safety protocols and engineering controls, the incidence of occupational exposure remains significant. These figures underscore the necessity for continuous surveillance, education, and the reinforcement of safety-oriented clinical practices to mitigate risk and protect healthcare workers from preventable infections [1][2].

Certain occupational groups are disproportionately affected due to the inherent nature of their clinical responsibilities. Healthcare professionals engaged in invasive procedures or those with frequent exposure to blood and bodily fluids are considered at highest risk. This includes personnel working in surgical departments, emergency medicine, critical care units, labor and delivery wards, and dialysis centers, where the likelihood of direct exposure to infectious materials is elevated due to the intensity and urgency of care provided. In addition, non-clinical occupational groups such as mortuary workers, waste management personnel, and maintenance staff who handle contaminated medical materials are also recognized as vulnerable populations [3]. These individuals may encounter indirect exposure through improper disposal of sharps, contaminated waste handling, or environmental contact with infectious residues, further broadening the scope of occupational risk beyond traditional clinical roles. Collectively, the persistent incidence of occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens highlights the critical importance of regulatory compliance, institutional accountability, and ongoing workforce education. The OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard serves as a vital protective mechanism designed to reduce exposure risks through mandated safety practices, engineering controls, and training requirements. Its continued relevance underscores the dynamic intersection between occupational health policy and clinical practice, where sustained vigilance is required to protect healthcare workers from preventable infectious disease transmission [1][2][3].

Major Pathogens

Among the more than twenty recognized bloodborne pathogens, a relatively small subset accounts for the majority of occupationally acquired infections in healthcare environments. Hepatitis B virus (HBV), Hepatitis C virus (HCV), and Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) remain the most clinically significant due to their prevalence, transmissibility, and potential to cause chronic, life-limiting disease. Collectively, these pathogens contribute substantially to global morbidity and mortality among healthcare workers and continue to represent a central focus of occupational infection control strategies [4][5]. The probability of transmission following occupational exposure is not uniform and is influenced by multiple interrelated factors. These include the type of exposure event, the volume of infectious material involved, the duration of contact, the viral load present in the source patient, and the overall prevalence of infection within the population from which the exposure originates [2]. These variables collectively determine the actual risk level associated with a given incident and guide post-exposure management protocols. Hepatitis B virus remains one of the most important occupational hazards in healthcare settings due to its high infectivity and ability to survive outside the human body for extended periods. Infection with HBV can result in a wide spectrum of clinical outcomes, ranging from acute self-limiting illness to chronic infection, which may progress to cirrhosis or hepatocellular carcinoma over time [6]. Transmission occurs primarily through direct contact with infected blood and a broad range of bodily fluids, including semen, vaginal secretions,

bile, and serous fluids such as amniotic, cerebrospinal, synovial, pleural, peritoneal, and pericardial fluids. Although saliva, tears, and wound exudates may also contain HBV, these fluids generally exhibit lower viral concentrations and therefore present comparatively reduced transmission risk [7][8]. Despite this, occupational exposure to even small quantities of infectious material remains clinically relevant due to the virus's high environmental stability.

The introduction and widespread implementation of HBV vaccination programs have significantly reduced the incidence of occupational infection among healthcare workers. Vaccination remains the most effective preventive measure and is considered a cornerstone of occupational health policy in healthcare institutions. The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices recommends universal HBV vaccination for all adults aged 19 to 59 years, as well as for adults aged 60 years and older who present identifiable risk factors, including those employed in healthcare settings. In addition, post-vaccination serologic testing is advised in selected populations to confirm adequate immune response and ensure protective antibody levels [6][9]. The persistence of HBV on environmental surfaces for prolonged periods further reinforces the importance of vaccination as part of a broader infection prevention strategy that also includes engineering controls, safe handling procedures, and adherence to standard precautions. When combined, these measures form a comprehensive framework designed to minimize occupational transmission risk and enhance workplace safety. Hepatitis C virus represents another major bloodborne pathogen of occupational relevance, particularly due to its high burden of chronic infection and its status as a leading cause of chronic liver disease in the United States. Transmission of HCV occurs predominantly through percutaneous exposure to infected blood, with needlestick injuries being the most common route in healthcare settings. Unlike HBV, no vaccine is currently available for HCV, and no effective post-exposure prophylaxis exists, which significantly complicates prevention efforts. As a result, primary prevention strategies are centered on strict adherence to infection control practices, minimization of exposure risk, and prompt reporting and evaluation of occupational incidents. Early identification and monitoring following exposure are essential to reduce the likelihood of undetected seroconversion and delayed treatment [6][8][9].

Despite the absence of preventive immunization, therapeutic advances have transformed the prognosis of HCV infection. The introduction of direct-acting antiviral agents has resulted in cure rates exceeding 95%, representing a major advancement in the management of chronic hepatitis C [10][11]. These highly effective treatment regimens have shifted clinical focus toward early detection and universal screening strategies. Current recommendations from the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases and the Infectious Diseases Society of America advocate for one-time universal screening of all adults aged 18 to 79 years. Additional recommendations include screening during each pregnancy, periodic testing for individuals with ongoing risk factors, and early initiation of treatment to reduce disease burden and prevent long-term complications [12][13]. These strategies aim not only to improve individual patient outcomes but also to reduce overall disease prevalence within the population, thereby indirectly decreasing occupational exposure risk. Human Immunodeficiency Virus remains a significant occupational concern due to its potential for severe long-term immunosuppression and progression to acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). Occupational transmission of HIV most commonly occurs through percutaneous exposure to infected blood, particularly in the context of needlestick injuries or sharp instrument accidents. Although the overall risk of transmission following a single exposure is relatively low compared to HBV, the clinical implications of infection necessitate immediate and structured post-exposure management. Post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) is the standard intervention and should be initiated as rapidly as possible, ideally within a 72-hour window following exposure. The recommended regimen typically involves a 28-day course of combination antiretroviral therapy, as outlined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the United States Public Health Service [14].

Management of potential occupational HIV exposure requires a systematic approach that includes immediate wound care, risk assessment of the exposure event, evaluation of the source patient's serostatus when available, and prompt initiation of PEP when indicated. Consultation with infectious disease or occupational health specialists is recommended, particularly in cases where drug resistance is suspected or where the exposure is classified as high risk. Ongoing monitoring and follow-up testing are essential components of post-exposure care to ensure early detection of seroconversion and appropriate clinical intervention. In addition, individuals with sustained occupational risk may benefit from pre-exposure prophylaxis counseling, which provides an additional preventive strategy for those frequently exposed to potential infectious materials [14]. In summary, HBV, HCV, and HIV remain the principal bloodborne pathogens of concern in occupational healthcare settings due to their epidemiological prevalence, modes of transmission, and potential for severe clinical outcomes. While significant progress has been made in prevention through vaccination, antiviral therapy, and post-exposure management protocols, occupational risk persists and requires continuous vigilance. Effective control depends on a multifaceted approach that integrates immunization, engineering controls, administrative policies, timely reporting systems, and

evidence-based clinical interventions to protect healthcare personnel and reduce transmission risk.

Regulatory Framework

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Bloodborne Pathogens Standard establishes a structured and enforceable regulatory framework designed to reduce occupational exposure to infectious bloodborne agents in healthcare environments. This framework is built on a series of interrelated requirements that collectively aim to prevent transmission, ensure safe clinical practice, and promote continuous improvement in occupational health systems. Employers in healthcare settings are legally obligated to implement and maintain these requirements as part of a comprehensive exposure prevention strategy that integrates administrative policies, engineering solutions, behavioral practices, and post-exposure management systems. A central component of the standard is the requirement for an exposure control plan. This plan must be a formally written document that identifies all job classifications and specific tasks in which occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens may reasonably occur. It must clearly define the risk levels associated with different clinical activities and outline specific strategies for reducing or eliminating exposure risk. The exposure control plan functions as a dynamic operational framework that guides institutional practice and ensures standardized safety procedures across departments. Importantly, the plan is not static; employers are required to review, evaluate, and update it at least annually to reflect changes in clinical practices, emerging technologies, and newly identified risks. This continuous revision process ensures that the plan remains aligned with current evidence-based infection control standards and workplace realities. Another foundational principle within the regulatory framework is the adoption of universal standard precautions. This principle requires that all human blood and certain body fluids be treated as potentially infectious, regardless of the known or presumed serological status of the source patient. This approach eliminates reliance on patient diagnosis as a determinant of protective behavior and ensures consistent application of infection control practices across all clinical encounters. By standardizing precautionary measures, this principle significantly reduces the risk of underestimation of exposure hazards and reinforces a culture of safety in healthcare environments [13][14].

Training represents a critical regulatory requirement and a key mechanism for ensuring compliance with the standard. OSHA mandates that all employees with occupational exposure risk receive comprehensive, employer-funded training on an annual basis. Training materials must be accessible, and employees must be provided with both the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard and the institution's exposure control plan. Instruction must be delivered at an appropriate educational level, ensuring that content is understandable and applicable to the specific roles of healthcare personnel. Additionally, training sessions must allow sufficient time for interactive engagement, discussion, and clarification of questions to promote effective knowledge retention. Core training content includes the epidemiology and clinical manifestations of bloodborne pathogens, modes of transmission, and associated occupational risks. It also includes detailed information regarding hepatitis B vaccination, post-vaccination testing when applicable, and the operational components of the exposure control plan, particularly tasks associated with elevated risk. Training must further address the correct use and limitations of engineering controls, work practices, and personal protective equipment (PPE), ensuring that healthcare personnel understand both the protective function and limitations of each measure. Proper handling, decontamination, and disposal procedures for contaminated materials and PPE are also essential components. In addition, employees must be instructed on incident reporting mechanisms and post-exposure protocols to ensure rapid and appropriate response in the event of occupational exposure. The effectiveness of training is closely linked to its clarity, accessibility, and relevance to real-world clinical scenarios. The provision and use of personal protective equipment constitute another critical regulatory requirement. Employers are obligated to supply appropriate PPE at no cost to employees and ensure its availability in all clinical settings where exposure risk is anticipated. PPE serves as a physical barrier between healthcare workers and infectious materials, thereby reducing the likelihood of direct contact with bloodborne pathogens. Employers must conduct risk assessments to determine the type and level of PPE required for specific tasks and must ensure proper sizing and fit for all users. Standard PPE includes gloves, surgical masks, and gowns, while higher-risk procedures may necessitate additional protection such as face shields or respiratory protection. Employers are also responsible for the cleaning, maintenance, replacement, and proper disposal of PPE. It is essential to recognize that PPE does not eliminate hazard exposure; rather, it functions as a last line of defense within a broader hierarchy of controls. Proper fit is particularly important, as ill-fitting PPE may compromise tactile sensitivity, reduce procedural accuracy, and increase occupational risk. Conversely, appropriately fitted PPE enhances usability and compliance, thereby improving overall safety outcomes [15].

Engineering and work practice controls represent the most effective strategies for reducing occupational exposure risk at the system level. Engineering controls are designed to physically isolate

or remove hazards from the workplace, while work practice controls focus on modifying the way tasks are performed to minimize exposure likelihood. Common engineering controls include sharps disposal containers, self-sheathing needles, needleless systems, and hand hygiene stations. Work practice controls include safe handling techniques for sharps, proper disposal procedures, and protocols that reduce unnecessary manipulation of contaminated materials. Employers are required to actively identify, evaluate, and implement these controls, with a strong emphasis on the adoption of safer medical devices, such as needles with engineered sharps injury protection mechanisms. Together, these controls significantly reduce the incidence of occupational injuries and form a core component of preventive occupational health practice. Hand hygiene is universally recognized as one of the most effective infection control measures within healthcare systems. The standard requires that healthcare personnel perform hand hygiene before and after patient contact, after contact with potentially contaminated surfaces, and immediately before donning and after removing PPE. Handwashing with soap and water should be performed for a minimum of 20 seconds, while alcohol-based hand sanitizers containing at least 60% alcohol may be used in appropriate situations [16][17][18]. Consistent adherence to hand hygiene protocols is essential in interrupting the chain of infection and reducing cross-contamination within clinical environments. The regulatory framework also mandates hazard communication strategies to ensure that employees are aware of potential risks in the workplace. Healthcare facilities must utilize standardized labeling systems, warning signs, and color-coding to identify regulated medical waste, contaminated equipment, and other hazardous materials. These visual communication tools are essential for reinforcing awareness and ensuring that hazardous materials are handled appropriately at all stages of clinical workflow [16][17][18].

Post-exposure evaluation and follow-up procedures constitute a critical component of the regulatory framework. Immediate response following occupational exposure is essential to minimize infection risk and ensure timely intervention. First aid measures vary depending on the type and location of exposure but generally include washing needlestick or cut injuries with soap and water, and flushing mucous membranes or ocular exposures with water, saline, or sterile solutions. Prompt reporting of the incident to the designated occupational health authority is mandatory, followed by a comprehensive evaluation of both the exposure event and the source patient when available. Medical assessment should occur without delay, as post-exposure prophylaxis decisions may need to be initiated within a narrow time window, often within two hours of exposure. Follow-up evaluations are conducted at specified intervals, commonly at baseline, 4 to 6 weeks, and 16 to 24 weeks, depending on the nature of the exposure and associated risk factors. Additional monitoring may be required based on clinical judgment and evolving public health guidance. All exposure-related documentation, including testing results and treatment interventions, must be securely maintained within confidential medical records, separate from personnel files [19]. Recordkeeping requirements further support regulatory compliance and institutional accountability. Employers must maintain detailed medical records for employees with occupational exposure, training documentation, and a sharps injury log. The sharps injury log must include the type and brand of device involved, the department where the incident occurred, and a clear description of how the exposure took place. This systematic documentation supports surveillance, risk analysis, and prevention planning. Finally, the standard requires annual review and employee participation in the continuous improvement of safety practices. Employers must update the exposure control plan annually and actively seek input from non-managerial employees involved in direct patient care. This participatory approach ensures that frontline workers contribute to the identification, evaluation, and selection of engineering controls and safer medical devices [20]. Increasingly, healthcare institutions are adopting digital systems for recordkeeping and exposure control documentation, which enhance accessibility, accuracy, and compliance monitoring [21][22].

Function

In healthcare environments, occupational exposure to infectious blood and body fluids represents one of the most persistent and clinically significant risks faced by healthcare professionals. The function of bloodborne pathogen prevention frameworks is to reduce the likelihood of transmission of infectious agents during routine clinical care, emergency interventions, and invasive procedures. Healthcare personnel who are directly involved in patient care activities that include exposure to blood, sharp instruments, or other potentially infectious materials are at increased risk of infection. This risk is especially pronounced in settings where invasive procedures are frequently performed, such as operating rooms, emergency departments, intensive care units, and procedural clinics [23]. The occupational hazard is not limited to physicians and nurses but extends to laboratory staff, surgical technicians, and any personnel whose duties involve contact with contaminated materials or clinical waste. The primary functional objective of occupational safety regulations in this context is prevention. Prevention is achieved through a structured system that integrates policy, education, engineering design, and behavioral compliance. Within this system, the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard serves as the central regulatory mechanism that defines how healthcare institutions should manage and mitigate exposure risks [1]. Its function is not merely advisory

but operational, establishing enforceable requirements that guide institutional practices and individual behaviors. By standardizing safety expectations across healthcare settings, the regulation ensures that exposure prevention is consistently applied regardless of department, institution size, or clinical specialty.

A critical function of this standard is the delineation of employer responsibilities in managing occupational exposure. Employers are required to implement structured post-exposure evaluation and follow-up systems that activate immediately after an incident occurs. This includes ensuring that exposed personnel receive prompt medical assessment, appropriate diagnostic testing, and timely initiation of prophylactic treatment when indicated. The system is designed to minimize delays in clinical decision-making, as rapid intervention is often essential in reducing the risk of infection following exposure. In addition, employers must ensure that all exposure incidents are properly documented and reviewed to identify preventable causes and implement corrective actions. Another essential function of the standard is the implementation of engineering and work practice controls. These controls are designed to reduce or eliminate exposure risk at the source rather than relying solely on individual behavior. Engineering controls include the use of safety-engineered medical devices, sharps disposal systems, and physical barriers that prevent direct contact with contaminated materials. Work practice controls involve modifications in clinical procedures, such as minimizing hand-to-hand passing of sharp instruments, proper disposal of contaminated materials immediately after use, and adherence to safe handling protocols. The combined function of these controls is to systematically reduce opportunities for accidental exposure during routine healthcare activities. Immunization programs also serve a preventive function within the regulatory framework. Vaccination, particularly against Hepatitis B virus, is a key protective measure that reduces susceptibility to infection among healthcare workers. By requiring employers to offer vaccination and ensure appropriate follow-up, the standard strengthens biological protection at the individual level. This function is particularly important because it provides long-term immunity and significantly reduces the occupational burden of preventable infections [23].

Communication and training represent another core functional component of the OSHA standard. Training ensures that healthcare personnel understand the nature of bloodborne pathogens, the mechanisms of transmission, and the specific risks associated with their clinical duties. It also reinforces correct use of personal protective equipment, safe handling of sharps, and appropriate response to exposure incidents. The function of training is not limited to knowledge transfer but extends to behavioral reinforcement, ensuring that safe practices are consistently applied in clinical settings. Regular training updates are necessary to maintain competency and adapt to evolving clinical technologies and infection control practices. Documentation and recordkeeping functions provide a systematic method for monitoring compliance and evaluating the effectiveness of exposure prevention strategies. Employers are required to maintain detailed records of exposure incidents, training activities, and preventive measures. This documentation supports ongoing risk assessment and facilitates institutional accountability. It also allows for trend analysis, which can identify recurring hazards and inform targeted interventions to improve workplace safety. Overall, the function of OSHA's Bloodborne Pathogens Standard is to establish a comprehensive, multi-layered system of occupational protection that integrates prevention, response, education, and continuous improvement. It functions as both a regulatory requirement and a practical framework that guides healthcare institutions in minimizing exposure risks. Its effectiveness depends on consistent implementation, active participation from both employers and healthcare workers, and a sustained commitment to safety culture within healthcare systems.

Issues of Concern

Since the introduction of the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogens Standard, there has been a measurable reduction in occupational exposure incidents within healthcare environments, reflecting improved regulatory compliance and heightened awareness of infection control practices. Despite this progress, bloodborne infections continue to represent a persistent and globally relevant occupational health concern for healthcare workers. The burden of noncompliance with established safety regulations remains significant. Between 1991 and 2015, more than 77,000 citations were issued by OSHA for violations of the standard, with the most frequent deficiencies identified in exposure control planning and recordkeeping practices [24]. These findings indicate that although regulatory frameworks are well established, implementation gaps continue to exist at institutional and operational levels. A major concern associated with occupational exposure is the discrepancy between the frequency of exposure events and the actual rate of subsequent infection. While the majority of exposures do not result in seroconversion or clinical disease, the potential consequences of infection are severe. Bloodborne pathogens such as HBV, HCV, and HIV are associated with chronic illness, long-term disability, and in some cases, premature mortality. Beyond the physical health consequences, occupational exposure often generates substantial psychological distress among healthcare workers. Individuals who experience needlestick injuries or similar incidents frequently report

heightened levels of anxiety, fear of infection, depressive symptoms, and prolonged emotional uncertainty while awaiting diagnostic results [2][24][25]. This psychological burden can negatively affect professional performance, job satisfaction, and overall mental well-being, contributing to occupational stress and burnout within healthcare systems.

In addition to the human impact, occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens imposes a considerable economic burden on healthcare systems worldwide. In the United States, the annual cost associated with needlestick injuries alone is estimated to range between approximately 100 million and 405 million dollars. These costs are primarily attributed to diagnostic testing, post-exposure prophylaxis, follow-up evaluations, and the management of potential or confirmed infections, as well as indirect costs such as lost productivity and absenteeism [26][27]. Similar financial burdens are observed in other countries. In Japan, the estimated national cost associated with in-hospital needlestick injuries reaches approximately 33.4 billion yen annually, equivalent to roughly 302 million US dollars. This estimate is based on an average cost of 63,711 yen per injury and an annual occurrence of approximately 525,000 injuries, with laboratory testing accounting for approximately 70 percent of total costs and productivity losses contributing an additional 20 percent [28]. In South Korea, the annual cost of managing sharps injuries among healthcare workers has been estimated at 844 million won, or approximately 884,385 US dollars [29]. These figures collectively highlight the substantial economic implications of occupational exposure and reinforce the importance of preventive strategies as a cost-effective approach to healthcare system sustainability. Another significant issue of concern is the continued vulnerability of healthcare workers at all levels of training and experience. Despite the presence of regulatory standards and institutional policies, variability persists in the level of knowledge, training quality, and adherence to infection prevention practices. This inconsistency contributes to a persistent perception of occupational insecurity among healthcare professionals and may negatively influence confidence in workplace safety measures [30]. Such perceptions can affect both compliance behavior and overall morale, particularly in high-risk clinical environments where exposure potential is frequent and unpredictable.

Compliance with standard precautions remains a particularly challenging area. Although these precautions are considered the foundation of infection prevention, adherence rates remain inconsistent and, in many settings, suboptimal. Hand hygiene, which represents one of the most basic and effective preventive measures, demonstrates wide variability in compliance rates across healthcare institutions. Reported adherence levels range from as low as 7 percent in some clinical environments to over 80 percent in others, although most facilities report average compliance rates between 50 and 70 percent [31][32][33]. This variability suggests that knowledge alone is insufficient to ensure behavioral compliance and that systemic, cultural, and organizational factors play a significant role in shaping adherence to infection control practices. The use of personal protective equipment (PPE) is another area of concern, particularly regarding proper selection, fitting, and utilization. While appropriately fitted PPE significantly reduces exposure risk, there remains a lack of universally standardized guidelines addressing PPE selection criteria, donning and doffing procedures, and training methodologies. This absence of comprehensive standardization creates variability in practice and may compromise the effectiveness of protective measures in real-world settings [15]. Furthermore, although innovative educational strategies such as active learning and multimodal training approaches have demonstrated potential benefits in improving compliance and knowledge retention, their comparative effectiveness has not been definitively established [34][35][36]. This highlights the need for further research to identify the most effective training methodologies for sustaining long-term behavioral change among healthcare workers. Vaccination against hepatitis B virus represents a critical preventive measure mandated under occupational safety regulations; however, vaccination coverage among healthcare workers remains suboptimal in many regions. Despite employer obligations to offer vaccination to all at-risk personnel, uptake rates are not universally consistent [37][38]. Barriers to vaccination may include lack of awareness, vaccine hesitancy, logistical challenges, or inadequate enforcement of institutional policies. This gap in preventive coverage continues to expose healthcare workers to avoidable risk and undermines the overall effectiveness of occupational health programs.

Underreporting of occupational exposures is another persistent and underrecognized issue. Although healthcare workers are generally aware of the risks associated with bloodborne pathogens, a significant proportion of exposure incidents are not formally reported or evaluated [39]. This underreporting is influenced by multiple factors, including unclear reporting procedures, perceived low risk of transmission, time constraints, and uncertainty regarding the infectious status of the source patient [40]. In some regions, reported exposure rates remain unexpectedly low despite high-risk working conditions, suggesting that actual exposure incidence may be substantially underestimated [40][41]. The true extent of underreporting remains difficult to quantify, but its impact is significant, as it limits the effectiveness of surveillance systems, delays post-exposure interventions, and impairs institutional learning from preventable incidents. Finally, the evolving nature of infectious diseases presents an

ongoing challenge for occupational health systems. The COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated that the epidemiology of infectious agents can change rapidly, requiring continuous adaptation of infection control policies and clinical guidelines. As new pathogens emerge and transmission dynamics shift, healthcare institutions must regularly update exposure control plans to reflect current scientific evidence and public health recommendations. This requires coordinated efforts between regulatory authorities, occupational health teams, and healthcare administrators to ensure that policies remain responsive and contextually appropriate. Regional variation in guideline implementation further complicates this process, creating disparities in occupational safety standards across different healthcare systems. Collectively, these issues underscore that despite significant advancements in regulatory frameworks and infection prevention strategies, occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens remains a complex and multifactorial problem. Addressing these challenges requires sustained investment in training, improved compliance monitoring, stronger institutional enforcement, standardized PPE protocols, enhanced vaccination coverage, and more effective reporting systems, alongside continuous adaptation to emerging infectious threats [40][41].

Clinical Significance

The transmission of infectious diseases within healthcare environments, particularly health care–associated infections, continues to represent a major and persistent public health challenge. Clinical settings that involve frequent exposure to blood and other potentially infectious body fluids inherently carry a well-documented risk for occupational transmission of key bloodborne pathogens, including Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), Hepatitis B Virus (HBV), and Hepatitis C Virus (HCV). These pathogens are associated with substantial clinical consequences, ranging from acute illness to chronic, life-threatening disease states that contribute significantly to long-term morbidity and mortality among affected individuals. As a result, occupational exposure in healthcare is not only an individual health concern but also a broader systemic issue that impacts workforce stability, healthcare delivery, and public health outcomes. The clinical importance of rapid response following occupational exposure cannot be overstated. Immediate reporting and structured evaluation of exposure incidents are essential components of effective infection prevention and control strategies. Delays in reporting may compromise the ability to initiate time-sensitive interventions, particularly post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), which has demonstrated optimal effectiveness when administered as early as possible following exposure. In the case of HIV, for example, PEP is most effective when initiated within hours and ideally within a 72-hour window, significantly reducing the risk of seroconversion when administered appropriately. Similarly, early evaluation and monitoring following HBV and HCV exposure are critical to ensure timely clinical management and reduce the likelihood of long-term complications [39].

Prompt medical assessment following exposure also facilitates accurate risk stratification, allowing healthcare providers to determine the likelihood of transmission based on factors such as the type of exposure, the volume of infectious material involved, and the infection status of the source patient when available. This structured assessment guides clinical decision-making regarding prophylaxis, laboratory testing, and follow-up care. Without timely evaluation, opportunities for early intervention may be missed, increasing both clinical and psychological burden on exposed healthcare workers. Occupational health clinicians play a central and coordinating role in the management of exposure incidents within healthcare systems. Their responsibilities include overseeing the reporting process, conducting detailed risk assessments, initiating appropriate post-exposure interventions, and organizing follow-up testing schedules to monitor for potential seroconversion. These clinicians also ensure adherence to established protocols and maintain continuity of care throughout the post-exposure period. In addition, they serve as a critical link between clinical departments, infection control teams, and administrative structures, thereby ensuring a coordinated institutional response to occupational exposure events. Beyond individual case management, occupational health services contribute to broader public health objectives by maintaining surveillance systems, identifying patterns of exposure, and implementing preventive strategies to reduce future incidents. This includes reinforcing compliance with standard precautions, improving training programs, and supporting the integration of safety-engineered devices into clinical practice. Through these functions, occupational health clinicians help sustain a safe working environment, reduce transmission risks, and uphold regulatory standards designed to protect healthcare personnel. Ultimately, the clinical significance of bloodborne pathogen exposure extends beyond immediate infection risk. It encompasses the psychological impact on healthcare workers, the economic burden on healthcare systems, and the operational challenges associated with workforce safety. Effective management of exposure incidents through timely reporting, rapid medical intervention, and coordinated occupational health oversight is therefore essential not only for individual protection but also for maintaining the integrity and resilience of healthcare systems as a whole [40].

Other Issues

The global COVID-19 pandemic, caused by the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2, revealed critical

vulnerabilities in healthcare systems and highlighted the substantial occupational risks faced by healthcare professionals under conditions of high transmissibility and systemic strain. During the pandemic, healthcare workers were exposed to elevated levels of infection risk while simultaneously operating in environments characterized by resource scarcity, high patient volumes, and rapidly evolving clinical protocols. One of the most significant challenges encountered during this period was the widespread shortage of personal protective equipment, including masks, gloves, gowns, and respiratory protection devices. These shortages directly impacted the ability of healthcare personnel to adhere consistently to established infection prevention and control standards, thereby increasing occupational risk and contributing to heightened psychological distress and occupational uncertainty. The pandemic also exposed significant variability in international guidance regarding the appropriate use of PPE, with different health authorities issuing divergent recommendations based on evolving scientific evidence and resource availability. This inconsistency underscored the importance of stable, evidence-based, and universally applicable occupational safety frameworks to guide healthcare practice during infectious disease outbreaks. In this context, established regulatory systems such as OSHA's Bloodborne Pathogens Standard provide an important foundation for consistent infection control practices across healthcare settings. Although originally designed for bloodborne pathogen exposure, the principles of structured risk assessment, engineering controls, and standardized protective measures remain highly relevant for broader infectious disease control scenarios, including airborne and droplet-transmitted infections [30].

In resource-limited settings, occupational exposure to blood and body fluids remains a persistent and underaddressed global health concern. The burden of risk in these environments is significantly amplified by multiple intersecting factors, including higher baseline prevalence of bloodborne infections within the community, limited access to vaccination programs, and deficiencies in infection control infrastructure. Despite clear recommendations from international health organizations such as the World Health Organization, unsafe clinical practices continue to be reported in many regions. One of the most concerning practices is the reuse of needles and syringes, which directly increases the risk of transmission of bloodborne pathogens among both patients and healthcare workers. These unsafe practices are often driven by systemic challenges, including inadequate financial resources, disrupted or insufficient supply chains for medical equipment, and broader sociopolitical instability that affects healthcare delivery systems. The true global burden of occupational exposure and its downstream health consequences remains significantly underreported and insufficiently quantified. Many incidents are not captured within formal surveillance systems, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where reporting infrastructure may be limited or inconsistent. This underrecognition contributes to an incomplete understanding of the magnitude of the problem and hinders the development of targeted, evidence-based interventions. As a result, there is an urgent need for sustainable, scalable, and context-appropriate prevention strategies that address both structural and behavioral determinants of occupational risk. These strategies must integrate improvements in supply chain management, expansion of vaccination coverage, enhancement of training programs, and enforcement of safe clinical practices to effectively reduce exposure risks [30].

Enhancing healthcare team outcomes in the context of bloodborne pathogen exposure requires a comprehensive and coordinated approach that integrates clinical, administrative, and behavioral interventions. The OSHA Bloodborne Pathogen Standard provides a structured regulatory framework designed to protect healthcare workers from occupational exposure to infectious materials, including blood and other potentially infectious body fluids. The standard mandates the implementation of exposure control plans, engineering and work practice controls, provision and proper use of personal protective equipment, hepatitis B vaccination programs, and structured post-exposure evaluation and follow-up procedures. Effective implementation of these requirements depends not only on institutional policy but also on sustained organizational commitment and interprofessional collaboration. Responsibility for minimizing occupational exposure is shared between employers and healthcare personnel. Employers are required to establish safe working environments, ensure availability of protective resources, and provide ongoing education and training. Healthcare workers, in turn, are responsible for adhering to established protocols, utilizing protective equipment correctly, and reporting exposure incidents promptly. Occupational health and safety professionals, alongside physicians, nurses, pharmacists, allied health practitioners, safety officers, and occupational health psychologists, play an essential role in operationalizing these standards. Their collective contribution ensures that administrative controls, engineering solutions, and behavioral practices are effectively integrated into daily clinical workflows. Regular interdisciplinary training is a critical component of maintaining competency and ensuring adherence to infection control practices. Training programs must be designed to address both clinical and non-clinical personnel, emphasizing safe handling of sharps, appropriate use of PPE, and immediate response protocols following exposure incidents. Despite the implementation of comprehensive preventive measures, occupational exposures may still occur, reinforcing the necessity for healthcare workers to be fully familiar with post-

exposure management procedures. Rapid and appropriate response is essential to reduce the risk of infection and mitigate associated psychological and clinical consequences. Ultimately, effective prevention of bloodborne pathogen transmission in healthcare settings requires a multifactorial and system-based approach. This includes structured communication channels, strong interprofessional teamwork, continuous education, and strict adherence to established occupational safety standards. By integrating these elements into routine clinical practice, healthcare systems can reduce occupational risks, enhance patient and worker safety, and foster a culture of shared responsibility that prioritizes both individual protection and collective healthcare system resilience [1].

Conclusion:

Occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens remains a persistent threat in healthcare environments despite regulatory advances and improved preventive strategies. Nurses, dental staff, and health security workers continue to face significant risks due to direct and indirect contact with infectious blood and body fluids. Although OSHA standards have contributed to measurable reductions in exposure incidents, gaps in compliance, underreporting, inconsistent use of personal protective equipment, and variability in training continue to limit overall effectiveness. HBV, HCV, and HIV remain the primary pathogens of concern, with needlestick injuries representing the most common transmission route. The consequences extend beyond infection risk to include psychological distress, financial burden, and workforce instability. Effective prevention requires strict adherence to exposure control plans, consistent application of standard precautions, and continuous education. Strengthening interprofessional collaboration, improving vaccination coverage, and reinforcing safety culture are essential to reducing occupational risk and ensuring sustainable protection for healthcare personnel across all clinical settings.

References:

1. Occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens--OSHA. Final rule. Fed Regist. 1991 Dec 06;56(235):64004-182.
2. Wicker S, Stirn AV, Rabenau HF, von Gierke L, Wutzler S, Stephan C. Needlestick injuries: causes, preventability and psychological impact. Infection. 2014 Jun;42(3):549-52.
3. Abdo Almoliky M, Elzilal HA, Alzahrani E, Abo-Dief HM, Saleh KA, Alkubati SA, Saad MS, Sultan MA. Prevalence and associated factors of needle stick and sharp injuries among nurses: A cross-sectional study. SAGE Open Med. 2024;12:20503121231221445.
4. Collins CH, Kennedy DA. Microbiological hazards of occupational needlestick and 'sharps' injuries. J Appl Bacteriol. 1987 May;62(5):385-402.
5. Guilbert JJ. The world health report 2002 - reducing risks, promoting healthy life. Educ Health (Abingdon). 2003 Jul;16(2):230.
6. Mironova M, Ghany MG. Hepatitis B Vaccine: Four Decades on. Vaccines (Basel). 2024 Apr 18;12(4)
7. Schillie S, Vellozzi C, Reingold A, Harris A, Haber P, Ward JW, Nelson NP. Prevention of Hepatitis B Virus Infection in the United States: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2018 Jan 12;67(1):1-31.
8. Workowski KA, Bachmann LH, Chan PA, Johnston CM, Muzny CA, Park I, Reno H, Zenilman JM, Bolan GA. Sexually Transmitted Infections Treatment Guidelines, 2021. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2021 Jul 23;70(4):1-187.
9. Lin CL, Kao JH. Global strategies and actions to eliminate hepatitis B virus infection. Clin Mol Hepatol. 2025 Oct;31(4):1197-1212.
10. Karimi SM, Poursafargholi S, Bayan Mohamed Y, Zarei H, Moghadami M, Rose M, Goldsby M, Fu W, Little BB. The association of direct-acting antiviral therapy with health care utilization and costs in patients with chronic hepatitis C virus infection: A systematic review of real-world studies in the United States. J Manag Care Spec Pharm. 2025 Nov;31(11):1189-1200.
11. Premkumar M, Dhiman RK. Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents for HCV Infection. J Clin Exp Hepatol. 2018 Mar;8(1):1-2.
12. Kerkar N, Hartjes K. Hepatitis C Virus-Pediatric and Adult Perspectives in the Current Decade. Pathogens. 2024 Dec 29;14(1)
13. Bhattacharya D, Aronsohn A, Price J, Lo Re V., AASLD-IDSA HCV Guidance Panel. Hepatitis C Guidance 2023 Update: AASLD-IDSA Recommendations for Testing, Managing, and Treating Hepatitis C Virus Infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2023 May 25;
14. Peters RPH, Grinsztejn B, Celum C, Mayer KH, Molina JM, Delany-Moretlwe S, Ngure K, Torres-Rueda S, Guy RJ, Reiss P, Ferrand RA, Kittiyaowamarn R, Bekker LG. Innovations in the biomedical prevention, diagnosis, and service delivery of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections. Lancet. 2025 Nov 01;406(10515):2133-2151.
15. Verbeek JH, Rajamaki B, Ijaz S, Sauni R, Toomey E, Blackwood B, Tikka C, Ruotsalainen JH, Kilinc Balci FS. Personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases due to exposure to contaminated body fluids in healthcare staff. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020 Apr 15;4(4):CD011621.

16. Boyce JM, Pittet D., Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee. HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. Guideline for Hand Hygiene in Health-Care Settings. Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America/Association for Professionals in Infection Control/Infectious Diseases Society of America. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2002 Oct 25;51(RR-16):1-45, quiz CE1-4.
17. Boyce JM. Update on hand hygiene. Am J Infect Control. 2013 May;41(5 Suppl):S94-6.
18. Lotfinejad N, Peters A, Tartari E, Fankhauser-Rodriguez C, Pires D, Pittet D. Hand hygiene in health care: 20 years of ongoing advances and perspectives. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021 Aug;21(8):e209-e221.
19. Kuhar DT, Henderson DK, Struble KA, Heneine W, Thomas V, Cheever LW, Gomaa A, Panlilio AL., US Public Health Service Working Group. Updated US Public Health Service guidelines for the management of occupational exposures to human immunodeficiency virus and recommendations for postexposure prophylaxis. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2013 Sep;34(9):875-92.
20. Tatelbaum MF. Needlestick safety and prevention act. Pain Physician. 2001 Apr;4(2):193-5.
21. Tuma S, Sepkowitz KA. Efficacy of safety-engineered device implementation in the prevention of percutaneous injuries: a review of published studies. Clin Infect Dis. 2006 Apr 15;42(8):1159-70.
22. Phillips EK, Conaway MR, Jagger JC. Percutaneous injuries before and after the Needlestick Safety and Prevention Act. N Engl J Med. 2012 Feb 16;366(7):670-1.
23. Beekmann SE, Henderson DK. Protection of healthcare workers from bloodborne pathogens. Curr Opin Infect Dis. 2005 Aug;18(4):331-6.
24. Kilinc Balci FS. Isolation gowns in health care settings: Laboratory studies, regulations and standards, and potential barriers of gown selection and use. Am J Infect Control. 2016 Jan 01;44(1):104-11.
25. Howsepian AA. Post-traumatic stress disorder following needle-stick contaminated with suspected HIV-positive blood. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 1998 Mar;20(2):123-4.
26. Mannocci A, De Carli G, Di Bari V, Saulle R, Unim B, Nicolotti N, Carbonari L, Puro V, La Torre G. How Much do Needlestick Injuries Cost? A Systematic Review of the Economic Evaluations of Needlestick and Sharps Injuries Among Healthcare Personnel. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2016 Jun;37(6):635-46.
27. Cooke CE, Stephens JM. Clinical, economic, and humanistic burden of needlestick injuries in healthcare workers. Med Devices (Auckl). 2017;10:225-235.
28. Kunishima H, Yoshida E, Caputo J, Mikamo H. Estimating the national cost burden of in-hospital needlestick injuries among healthcare workers in Japan. PLoS One. 2019;14(11):e0224142.
29. Oh HS, Yoon Chang SW, Choi JS, Park ES, Jin HY. Costs of postexposure management of occupational sharps injuries in health care workers in the Republic of Korea. Am J Infect Control. 2013 Jan;41(1):61-5.
30. Tabah A, Ramanan M, Laupland KB, Buetti N, Cortegiani A, Mellinghoff J, Conway Morris A, Camporota L, Zappella N, Elhadi M, Povoa P, Amrein K, Vidal G, Derde L, Bassetti M, Francois G, Ssi Yan Kai N, De Waele JJ., PPE-SAFE contributors. Personal protective equipment and intensive care unit healthcare worker safety in the COVID-19 era (PPE-SAFE): An international survey. J Crit Care. 2020 Oct;59:70-75.
31. Hessels AJ, Genovese-Schek V, Agarwal M, Wurmser T, Larson EL. Relationship between patient safety climate and adherence to standard precautions. Am J Infect Control. 2016 Oct 01;44(10):1128-1132.
32. Erasmus V, Daha TJ, Brug H, Richardus JH, Behrendt MD, Vos MC, van Beeck EF. Systematic review of studies on compliance with hand hygiene guidelines in hospital care. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2010 Mar;31(3):283-94.
33. Glowicz JB, Landon E, Sickbert-Bennett EE, Aiello AE, deKay K, Hoffmann KK, Maragakis L, Olmsted RN, Polgreen PM, Trexler PA, VanAmringe MA, Wood AR, Yokoe D, Ellingson KD. SHEA/IDSA/APIC Practice Recommendation: Strategies to prevent healthcare-associated infections through hand hygiene: 2022 Update. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2023 Mar;44(3):355-376.
34. Weaver MG. Using active learning strategies to present bloodborne pathogen programs. J Sch Nurs. 2003 Jun;19(3):181-4.
35. Zhang Z, Yamamoto T, Wu XN, Moji K, Cai GX, Kuroiwa C. Educational intervention for preventing bloodborne infection among medical students in China. J Hosp Infect. 2010 May;75(1):47-51.
36. Dogra S, Mahajan R, Jad B, Mahajan B. Educational interventions to improve knowledge and skills of interns towards prevention and control of hospital-associated infections. Int J Appl Basic Med Res. 2015 Aug;5(Suppl 1):S54-7.
37. Agerton TB, Mahoney FJ, Polish LB, Shapiro CN. Impact of the bloodborne pathogens standard on vaccination of healthcare workers with hepatitis B vaccine. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1995 May;16(5):287-91.

38. Strelow B, Roxas EG, Perkins KM, Frick SJ, Wagner EL, Petersen EE, Alimire M, Olson R, Wingo M, O'Laughlin D. Boosting Hepatitis B Vaccination Rates Among Healthcare Workers in the State of Minnesota. J Community Health. 2025 Dec;50(6):1144-1149.
39. Vaid N, Langan KM, Maude RJ. Post-exposure prophylaxis in resource-poor settings: review and recommendations for pre-departure risk assessment and planning for expatriate healthcare workers. Trop Med Int Health. 2013 May;18(5):588-95.
40. Bekele T, Gebremariam A, Kaso M, Ahmed K. Attitude, reporting behavour and management practice of occupational needle stick and sharps injuries among hospital healthcare workers in Bale zone, Southeast Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. J Occup Med Toxicol. 2015;10:42.

Bush C, Schmid K, Rupp ME, Watanabe-Galloway S, Wolford B, Sandkovsky U. Bloodborne pathogen exposures: Difference in reporting rates and individual predictors among health care personnel. Am J Infect Control. 2017 Apr 01;45(4):372-376.