

1 **Systematic review and meta-analysis of veterinary-related occupational exposures to hazards**

2 *Adebowale OO<sup>1\*</sup>, Fasanmi OG<sup>2</sup>, Awosile, B.B<sup>3</sup>, Afolabi, MO<sup>1</sup> and Fasina FO<sup>4,5</sup>*

3 <sup>1</sup>*Department of Veterinary Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Federal University of*  
4 *Agriculture, Alabata, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.*

5 <sup>2</sup> *Department of Veterinary Laboratory Technology, Federal College of Animal Health and*  
6 *Production Technology, Oyo State, Nigeria.*

7 <sup>3</sup> *Department of Health Information and Performances, Health PEI Charlottetown, PE Canada*

8 <sup>4</sup>*ECTAD, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*

9 <sup>5</sup>*Department of Veterinary Tropical Diseases, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa*

10

11

12

13

---

\* Corresponding Author: Adebowale Olusawo, Department of Veterinary Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Federal University of Agriculture, Alabata, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4207-7423>, Email address: [adebowaleoluawemimol@gmail.com](mailto:adebowaleoluawemimol@gmail.com). Telephone number: +2349085608043

14 **ABSTRACT**

15 **Objective:** Understanding hazards within the veterinary profession is critical for developing  
16 strategies to ensure health and safety in the work environment. This study was conducted to  
17 systematically review and synthesize data on reported risks within veterinary workplaces.

18 **Methods:** A systematic review of published data reporting occupational hazards and associated risk  
19 factors were searched within three database platforms namely PubMed, Ebscohost, and Google  
20 scholar. To determine the proportion estimates of hazards and pooled odds ratio, two random-effects  
21 meta-analysis were performed.

22 **Results:** Data showed veterinarians and students were at high risk of exposure to diverse physical,  
23 chemical, and biological hazards. For the biological, chemical and physical hazards, the pooled  
24 proportion estimates were 17% (95% CI: 15.0-19.0,  $p < 0.001$ ), 7.0% (95% CI: 6.0-9.0%,  $p < 0.001$ )  
25 and 65.0% (95% CI: 39.0-91.0%,  $p < 0.001$ ) respectively. A pooled odds ratio indicated the odds of  
26 physical (OR=1.012, 95% CI: 1.008-1.017,  $p < 0.001$ ) and biological exposures (OR=2.07, 95% CI:  
27 1.70-2.52,  $p < 0.001$ ) increased more when working with or in contact with animals than non-contact.

28 **Conclusions:** This review has provided a better understanding of occupational health and safety  
29 status of veterinarians and gaps within the developing countries. Veterinarians including students are  
30 at considerable risk of occupational-related hazards. The need to improve government and  
31 organisation policies and measures on occupational health and safety is therefore crucial, most  
32 importantly in Africa.

33  
34 **Keywords:** *Occupational hazards; risk factors; zoonoses; veterinary students and veterinary*  
35 *professionals*

36

## 37 **1. Introduction**

38 Occupational hazards are work-related injuries or illnesses people are exposed to at the workplaces,  
39 and these hazards contribute immensely to the global burden of diseases [1]. Globally, approximately  
40 2.3 – 2.7 million workers die from work-related injuries or illnesses annually [2,3], and total loss due  
41 to this worldwide, has been estimated to be about \$2.99 trillion annually [1,3].

42 The veterinary profession is comprised of a diverse group of individuals who interact with a wide  
43 variability of animal species under a working environment that creates exposure to injuries [4]. In  
44 the United States (US), the profession has been ranked as the fifth-highest industry for the incidence  
45 of non-fatal work related injuries. This is not far behind police and fire protection services, while  
46 public health hospitals were not in the top 20 [5]. Although, some reports showed exposure to work-  
47 related hazards are more common in the developed than developing countries [6], whether this is a  
48 true assessment is doubtful and indeterminate because most African countries lack occupational  
49 health and safety standards, implementations, risks assessment and adequate reporting protocols.

50 The reported processes of injuries in the profession included physical hazards such as needlestick  
51 injuries (NSI), animal bites, kicks, scratches and crushing by equipment used for animal restraint,  
52 which imposed physical harm or hurt to individuals [5,7]. Other occupational threats include  
53 exposure to biological (especially zoonoses), and chemical hazards (high doses of radiation and  
54 pesticides) which increase the risk of birth defects in offspring of female veterinarians [8]. Scientific  
55 data have also disclosed seroprevalence against different zoonoses is greater among veterinarians  
56 than in the general population, suggesting that veterinarians could act as sentinels to detect emergent  
57 diseases and propagators of infections [6]. Common zoonoses found primarily associated with health  
58 risks or illnesses among veterinary students and professionals were caused primarily by bacteria,  
59 parasites, viruses and fungi [6].

60 Therefore, this work aims to assess available pieces of evidence regarding exposures to zoonoses,  
61 physical and chemical threats among professionals and students in the veterinary discipline, and  
62 synthesize the associated risk factors.

## 63 **2. Methodology**

### 64 **2.1 Study Type and Search approach**

65 A systematic literature review and meta-analysis was conducted to identify scientific articles  
66 documenting hazards, investigate risk factors or practices and association with exposures. Preferred  
67 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Statement (PRISMA) was used to  
68 summarize the article selection process. To select important papers systematic search within  
69 PubMed, Ebscohost and Google scholar database was conducted. The search strategy included the  
70 key terms “occupational hazards”, “zoonoses”, “veterinary students”, “veterinarians”, “risk factors”,  
71 which were combined with the Boolean operator “AND” “OR”. Paper selections were based on  
72 information provided in the titles and/or abstracts.

### 73 **2.2 Eligibility criteria for the selection of relevant materials**

74 Only papers published in English were eligible, and no restrictions were placed on the location of  
75 studies, except time (2007 – 2017). The following inclusion criteria for selection were used: 1). Paper  
76 title and abstract addressed the questions of interest i.e. “occupational health hazards report on  
77 veterinary professionals and students in the past 10 years (2007 - 2017) and document the associated  
78 risk factors or practices 2). Papers should be cross-sectional observational studies, cohort, case-  
79 control studies relevant to research focus 3). Studies providing association data either univariable or  
80 multivariable analyses were included. 4). Confirmed zoonoses reports using laboratory detection  
81 methods. Mining and filtering of articles were carried out based on set inclusion criteria, and the  
82 selected papers were scrutinized critically to find the best available pieces of evidence. Paper  
83 abstracts that reported intervention studies, reviews, systematic reviews and meta-analysis, and  
84 conference proceedings were excluded.

85 Two of the authors independently read and examined all titles and abstracts of papers identified in  
86 the search, retrieved and selected articles that focused on and met the inclusion criteria. During full-  
87 text study final selection, duplicated studies were removed and approval from both authors was  
88 obtained for a paper to be included.

## 89 **2.3 Data extraction and analysis**


90 Data extracted onto Excel spreadsheet (Microsoft Office Package 2016; Microsoft Corporation,  
91 Redmond, USA) included: 1) year of publication, 2) Authors, 3) location of study, 4) study design,  
92 5) study population, 6) identified hazards, 7) laboratory methods, 8) prevalence and, 9) associated  
93 risk factors. Initial descriptive statistics were carried out to summarize the various data retrieved.  
94 Then random-effects meta-analysis was carried out to allow for any heterogeneity between studies.  
95 Two random-effects meta-analysis was done, firstly, to calculate the pooled (weighted) proportions  
96 with respective 95% confidence intervals for the different types of occupational hazards (i.e.  
97 biological, physical, and chemical hazards) among veterinarians. Second meta-analysis was done to  
98 calculate the pooled (weighted) ratio measures (Odds ratio or relative risk) of risk factors associated  
99 with occupational hazards. The risk factor meta-analysis was only done for working or contact with  
100 animals as a risk factor for occupational hazards among veterinarians. This is premised on sufficient  
101 published articles reporting ratio measures for working or contact with animals compared with other  
102 reported risk factors. The pooled prevalence and associated study estimate, and pooled Odds ratio  
103 and study estimates were presented using forest plots. The  $I^2$  statistic (a measure of inconsistency)  
104 was used to assess the variation between studies due to heterogeneity. A value of 0% shows no  
105 observed heterogeneity; increasing values indicate increasing heterogeneity. The  $I^2$  statistic with  
106 cutoff values  $\leq 25\%$ ,  $26\text{--}50\%$ , and  $\geq 75\%$  was considered as low, moderate, and substantial  
107 heterogeneity. Subgroup analysis was performed to account for potential sources of heterogeneity  
108 between studies. Statistical significance was set at  $P < 0.05$  while statistical analysis was carried out  
109 using STATA SE/15.0 (College Station, Texas 77845 USA).

## 110 **3. RESULTS**


### 111 **3.1 Literature search outcome**

112 The preliminary search retrieved 5,258 articles and a total of 33 articles were retained for the review  
113 following paper filtering for eligibility. Rejections were mainly based on the unavailability of either  
114 the risk association or prevalence data or microbiological confirmation methods. These 33 articles

115 cut across various territories such as Africa, Switzerland, Europe, Asia, South and North America,  
116 the United States, and the United Kingdom (figure 1). Summary of the article selection process  
117 presented in figure 2.  
118



119 Figure1. Spatial distribution of countries from which information on occupational hazards and  
120 exposure among the veterinary profession were retrieved.  
121



122

123

124 Figure 2. Flow chart for literature selection.

### 125 **3.2 Characteristics of included published articles**

126 Included studies originated from Africa (n = 2), Asia (n = 4), Australia/Oceania (n = 4), Europe (n =  
127 12), North America (n = 8), and South America (n = 3). Of the 33 papers included, twenty – six  
128 (78.8%, 95% CI [ 61.9 - 89.62]) were cross-sectional, five (15.1%, 95% CI [6.2 - 31.4]) case-control,  
129 and two (6.1%, 95% CI [0.7 - 20.6]) cohort studies. The target populations for the various studies  
130 include: 1) Veterinarians (57.6%, 95% CI [40.8 - 72.3]), 2) Veterinary students (9.1%, 95% CI [2.4  
131 - 24.3]), 3) Both Veterinarians and Veterinary students (9.1%, 95% CI [2.4 - 24.3]), and 4)  
132 Veterinarians, veterinary students and others (24.4%, 95% CI [12.6 - 41.3]). Twenty – five articles  
133 (75.8%, 95% CI [ 58.8 - 87.4]) described exposures to varieties of biological hazards mainly  
134 zoonoses, two chemical (6.1%, 95% CI [0.7 - 20.6]), three physical (9.1%, 95% CI [2.4 - 24.3]) and  
135 three (9.1%, 95% CI [2.4 - 24.3]) described all exposures. A total of 10 works (30.3%) employed  
136 serology only, 5 (15.1%) culture and molecular, 3(9.1%) culture and serology, 2 articles each (6.1%)  
137 molecular methods only, and culture, serology and molecular detection techniques respectively.  
138 Table 1 further showed the characteristics of papers included in the review.

139

Table 1. Summary of identified article characteristics according to year, authors, location, study design, study population, and hazard types.

S/N	Year	Authors	Location	Study design	Study population	Hazard type
1.	2012a	Epp & Waldner [ 4]	Canada	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Biological, Chemical, Physical
2.	2016	Fowler et al [5]	USA	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians & para veterinarians	Biological, Chemical, Physical
3.	2016	Mshelbwala et al [7]	Nigeria	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians	Physical
4.	2009	Shirangi et al [8]	Australia	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians	Chemical
5.	2015	Mesquita et al [9]	Portugal	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Physical
6.	2012b	Epp & Waldner [10]	Canada	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Physical, psychological, Chemical
7.	2012	Berry et al [11]	United States of America	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians	physical
8.	2014	Shirangi et al [12]	Australia	Cohort	Veterinarians	Chemical
9.	2008	Moodley et al [13]	Denmark	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Biological
10.	2009	Leggat et al [14]	Australia	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Biological
11.	2013	Paterson et al [15]	UK	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians & Veterinary students	Biological
12.	2010	Baer et al [16]	USA	Case study	Veterinarians	Biological
13.	2011	Boost et al [17]	Hong Kong	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians	Biological
14.	2017	Oteo et al [18]	Spain	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Biological
15.	2017	Teoh et al [19]	Australia	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Biological
16.	2014	Rivera Benitez et al [20]	Mexico	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians	Biological
17.	2014	Verkade et al [21]	Netherlands	Cohort	Veterinarians & Household	Biological
18.	2014	Zelenik et al [22]	Slovenia	Case study	Veterinarians	Biological
19.	2012	Sayin-Kutlu et al [23]	Turkey	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians & cattle handlers	Biological
20.	2012	Jackson & Villaroel [24]	USA	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Biological
21.	2010	Raso et al [25]	Brazil	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians, Veterinary Students, & other animal health workers	Biological
22.	2014	Vest & Clark [26]	USA	Cross- sectional	Army Veterinarians	Biological
23.	2011	Posthaus et a [ 27]	Switzerland	Case study	Veterinarians, veterinary students, lab technologists, animal nurses	Biological
24.	2016	Galuppi et al [28]	Italy	Case study	Veterinary students	Biological
25.	2012	Rahman et al [29]	Bangladesh	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians, livestock farmers	Biological
26.	2012	de Rooij et al [30]	Netherlands	Cross- sectional	Veterinary students	Biological
27.	2013	Van de Brom et al [31]	Netherlands	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians & Veterinary students	Biological
28.	2015	Fenga et al [32]	Italy	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians, other animal health workers	Biological
29.	2011	Archer et al [33]	South Africa	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians & Veterinary students	Biological
30.	2008	Gait et al [34]	United Kingdom	Case Study	Veterinary students	Biological
31.	2013	Moliner et al [35]	Argentina	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Biological
32.	2013	Ali et al [36]	Pakistan	Cross-sectional	Veterinarians, abattoir workers, livestock farmers	Biological
33.	2014	Lantos et al [37]	USA	Cross- sectional	Veterinarians	Biological

### 142 **3.3 Hazard exposure and risk factors**

#### 143 **3.3.1 Physical and psychological hazards**

144 The most common physical hazard identified was needlestick injury (NSI), followed by traumatic  
145 injuries and stress. High prevalence exposure to needlestick injuries (range: 65.0 - 79.5%) among the  
146 veterinary practice was commonly reported [4, 5,9,7]. Being a male subject (OR 2.8, 95% CI 1.4–  
147 6.0, and working with poultry daily (OR 2.4, 95% CI 1.1–6.2) were found to be significantly  
148 associated with NSI in a study conducted in Nigeria [7]. Another study reported veterinarians  
149 working in small animal practice especially with dogs were more likely to have experienced an NSI  
150 [9]. Furthermore, veterinary technicians were significantly ( $P < 0.001$ ) more likely than veterinarians  
151 to report NSI since their training include recapping needles at school or workplace, a study in the  
152 USA reported [5]. Besides NSI, exposure to animal bites was found to be common among companion  
153 animal and mixed animal veterinarians than the equine or food animal practitioners [4].

154 Furthermore, moderate stress and chronic traumatic disorders/injuries were documented among  
155 Veterinarians. Western Canadian veterinarians experienced severe (5.2%) to moderate stress (52.6%)  
156 related to the workplace [10]. Stress levels were found to be similar for veterinarians in the academia,  
157 industry and government but significantly higher ( $P < 0.001$ ) in female Veterinarians and those who  
158 worked more than 40-hour per week ( $P = 0.001$ ) [10]. Several injuries reported included back pain,  
159 limb strains, fall, vehicle accidents, concussion, head injuries and animal bites/scratch. Cumulative  
160 traumatic disorders (CTD) were also reported in females more than in male veterinarians, which  
161 required treatment or restriction from regular work activities [11]. Large animal practitioners were  
162 found more likely to report a CTD than other veterinary practitioners, and the injuries were more  
163 often around the shoulders, forearms, elbows, hands, or knees [11] with resultant one or more days  
164 off work [10]. No physical or psychological risk exposures were reported for veterinary students in  
165 the articles reviewed. Table 2 describes all physical and psychological hazards and associated risk  
166 factors.

167 **3.3.2 Chemical hazards**

168 Limited identified chemical hazards and associated risk factors are described in Table 2. Exposure  
169 to chemicals occurs in all vet work environment but highest in the private practice [8,10,12].  
170 Veterinarians in this category are more likely to be victims of accidental exposure to drugs  
171 (hormones, antimicrobials), sterilizing and cleansing agents, gas or injection anaesthesia and  
172 pesticides [10]. A gender-exclusive increased risk of birth defects in offsprings occurred more in  
173 female veterinarians working exclusively in small animal practice than in the other environments  
174 following exposure to high dose(s) of pesticides at least once per week or in other cases, cytotoxic  
175 drugs [8, 12].

176

Table 2. A description of all physical, chemical and psychological hazards identified in the systematic reviews and the associated risk factors/practices.

S/N	Year	Authors	Injury type/pathogens	OR/PRR, 95% CI, P value	Risk factors or suggested
1.	2009	Shirangi et al <sup>8</sup>	Birth defects in offspring	OR: 5.73, 95% CI: 1.27 - 25.80, and OR: 2.39, 95% CI: 0.99 - 5.77, respectively	High dose of radiation (>10 x-ray films exposure per week and exposure to pesticides at least once per week
2.	2014	Shirangi et al <sup>12</sup>	Birth defects in offspring	1. RR: 2.08, 95% CI: 1.05–4.15, P = 0.03 2. RR: 2.53, 95% CI: 1.00–3.48, P = 0.001 3. RR: 3.42, 95% CI: 1.68 – 6.92. P = 0.01	1. Pregnant female veterinarians handling cytotoxic drugs daily 2. Women with unplanned pregnancies more likely to handle cytotoxic drugs and experience increased risk of birth defects 3. Working in large animal
3.	2012b	Epp & Waldner <sup>10</sup>	Animal bites and allergies.	1. OR: 18.4, 95% CI: 8.4 – 40.2, P = 0.001; OR: 12.9, 95% CI: 5.8 – 28.6, P = 0.001 respectively. 2. OR: 1.4, 95% CI: 1.1 - 1.9, p < 0.05	1. Companion animal veterinarians at higher risk than food animal veterinarians; mixed animal veterinarians than food animal veterinarians 2. Female veterinarians more likely to develop allergies due to animal contact than male
4.	2016	Fowler et al <sup>5</sup>	Needlestick and animal-related injuries.	NA	Common physical hazards reported
5.	2016	Mshelbwala et al <sup>7</sup>	Needlestick	OR: 2.8, 95%CI: 1.4 – 6.0, p = 0.006 and OR: 2.4, 95%CI: 1.1–6.2, p = 0.036 respectively	Male sex and working with poultry daily respectively
6.	2015	Mesquita et al <sup>9</sup>	Needlestick	1. OR: 16.54, 95% CI: 3.69–74.26, p < .001 2. OR: 145.74, 95% CI: 40.94 –518.78, p < .001 3. OR: 62.73, 95% CI: 7.74–508.4, p < .001 and OR: 25.55, 95% CI: 3.75–174.12, p < .001respectively	1. 11 to 20 years of practice more at risk than 1 to 10 years. 2. Worked with dogs 3. Contact with household bovine and sheep
7.	2012b	Epp & Waldner <sup>10</sup>	All forms of injury (needlestick, back strain, limb strain, fall, hearing loss, vehicle accident, assault, head injury, burns/ frostbite/ heatstroke, bite/ scratch, crush/kick/ or trample.	1. OR: 2.2, 95% CI: 1.5 - 3.3; OR: 4.5, 95% CI: 1.2 - 17.1 respectively	1. Working with large animals, veterinarians who graduated 1990 – 2007 were more likely to be exposed to at least one injury than other practices and who graduated pre- 1990 respectively

S/N	Year	Authors	Injury type/pathogens	OR/PRR, 95% CI, P value	Risk factors or suggested
			Chemical e.g. accidental exposures to radiation, gas anaesthesia, drugs, pesticides, allergies. Psychological e.g. stress	2. OR: 1.7, 95% CI: 1.2 - 2.4  3. OR: 3.2, 95% CI: 2.2 - 4.7; OR: 4.9, 95% CI: 3.2 - 7.5 respectively  4. p = 0.005, p < 0.001, and p = 0.001 respectively	2. Risk of exposures to pesticides was more likely in Veterinarians who graduated pre-1990  3. Accidental exposures to x-ray and gas anesthetics were reported more likely in the pre-1990 graduates.  4. Stress was higher in post-1990 graduates, females and those who worked more than a 40-hour a week
8.	2012	Berry et al <sup>11</sup>	Cumulative Trauma Disorders	OR: 1.72, 95% CI: 1.24 - 2.39, p = 0.001; OR: 1.54, 95% CI: 1.03 - 2.32, p = 0.037; OR: 1.02, 95% CI: 1.01 - 1.03, p = 0.004; OR: 1.01, 95% CI: 1.00 - 1.01, p = 0.003 respectively	Risk factors associated with CTDs in veterinarians included sex (Female), working full-time, rectal palpations, and large animal practice respectively.

NA = Not Available or Not Applicable; OR = Odds Ratio; PRR = Prevalence Risk Ratio; RR= Relative risk ratio; CI = Confidence interval

178  
179

### 180 3.3.3 Specific biological hazards or Zoonoses common in the veterinary profession

181 Zoonoses naturally transmitted infections between vertebrate animals and man were recognized as  
182 major occupational risks for the veterinary profession due to the degree of animal contact. The most  
183 commonly identified zoonoses were methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), Q- fever,  
184 bartonellosis, cryptosporidiosis, and brucellosis.

185 **Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA):** Based on the reviewed literature, MRSA  
186 was identified by various diagnostic methods ranging from the traditional culture to molecular typing  
187 techniques [13, 15, 17, 21]. The proportions of MRSA colonization in veterinarians varied from 2.6  
188 – 14.7% and veterinarians were six times more at risk of MRSA exposure than non-veterinarians  
189 [13]. The direct contact with small animals, cattle or horses predisposed personnel to a higher chance  
190 of being MRSA carriers [13]. No exposure was reported among veterinary students

191 ***Coxiella burnetti*:** This pathogen of occupational importance causes Q-fever in humans. All the four  
192 studies included performed serological assays most especially immunofluorescent assays (IFAT) and  
193 Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA). The prevalence of seropositivity to pathogen ranged  
194 from 1.4 – 73.7% [4, 24, 26, 30-32]. One of the studies recorded 18.7 % among Dutch veterinary  
195 students [30]. Risk factors associated with exposure based on multivariable logistic regression model  
196 were identified to include contact with farm animals, students being in advanced year of study, having  
197 had exposure to a zoonosis before the study and having ever lived on a ruminant farm [30].  
198 Alternatively, among the Dutch veterinary professionals, the associated risk of exposure was linked  
199 with the hours of contact with animal per week, the number of years of post-graduation, being in the  
200 rural or suburban residence, being a practising veterinarian, and occupational contact with swine [31]  
201 (Table 3).

202 ***Cryptosporidium Parvum*:** Only two case reports of outbreaks among groups of veterinary students  
203 were reported from Italy [28] and the UK [34]. The species were identified in both studies by culture-  
204 based methods, PCR-restriction fragment length polymorphism, DNA sequence typing and nested

205 PCR. The outbreak among the Italian veterinary students was plausibly linked with the introduction  
206 of *Cryptosporidium* in an equine perinatology unit (EPU) due to an asymptomatic foal [28].  
207 Meanwhile, the outbreak among UK students was documented to be caused by a ‘lapse in hygiene’  
208 on a farm with known infected calves [34].

### 209 ***Bartonella* species**

210 *Bartonella* species are important emerging pathogens in human and veterinary medicine [37]. High  
211 (73.0%) seroprevalence of infection with *Bartonella* spp. was found among companion animal  
212 veterinary personnel from Spain in one of the studies reviewed [18]. Meanwhile, the other two  
213 reports indicated lower prevalence between 22.0 [23] and 28.0% [37]. A few risk determinants of  
214 exposure to pathogen included being less than 35 years of age [23], contact with ticks [23] and history  
215 of travel to Asia [37]. Culture, PCR, DNA sequencing and Immunofluorescence assay (IFA) were  
216 the main diagnostic techniques used in these studies.

### 217 ***Brucella* species**

218 The prevalence of infection ranged from 0.1 - 29.1% in our review [29,35,36]. The pathogen was  
219 identified mainly by serology and PCR based techniques including the Rose Bengal Test (RBT),  
220 Standard Tube Agglutination Test (STAT), indirect enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (iELISA),  
221 and Q-PCR). Contact with animals especially goats, number of years of practice or veterinarians  
222 working in a zone characterized by a high prevalence of brucellosis were identified as contributing  
223 factors for increased odds of exposure to brucellosis (Table 3). The review also showed the more the  
224 number of years accumulated as a graduate, the greater the likelihood of illness [35].

225 Table 3 A summary of biological hazards and the associated risk factors/practices identified for the systematic review

S/N	Year	Authors	Injury type/pathogens	Methods for pathogen confirmation	OR/PR, 95% CI, P value	Risk factors or suggested
1.	2012a	Epp & Waldner [4]	Zoonoses	NA	OR: 8.6, 95% CI: 1.1 - 65.1, P = <0.001	Mixed animal veterinarians had higher odds of developing a personal zoonosis than others
2.	2016	Fowler et al [5]	Infectious diseases (dermatophytosis, bite wound infection, salmonellosis, cryptosporidiosis)	NA	NA	Respondents reported acquiring at least 1 zoonotic infection at some point during their career.
3.	2008	Moodley et al [13]	MRSA	Culture and PCR	P=0.02, P<0.001, P<0.001 respectively	MRSA exposure 6 times higher in Veterinarians than non-veterinarian professionals, exposure to small animals, horses respectively
4.	2009	Leggat et al [14]	Hand dermatitis (HD)	NA	1. OR: 4.3, 95% CI: 2.7–6.6, P < 0.001 2. OR: 3.5, 95% CI: 2.2–5.4, P < 0.001 3. OR: 15.5, 95% CI: 5.4–44.5, P < 0.001	1. Veterinarians with a current allergic disease 2. In female veterinarians 3. Reporting allergies within last 1 year
5.	2013	Paterson et al [15]	Methicillin-resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (MRSA)	Culture, multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR), matrix assisted laser desorption/ionization (MALDI-TOF)	NA	Contact with livestock
6.	2008	Baer et al [16]	<i>Leptosira</i>	Microscopic agglutination test	NA	Contact with an apparently healthy pet rat
7.	2008	Boost et al [17]	MRSA	Culture, PCR, multilocus sequence typing (MLST)	P < 0.001, P = 0.03 respectively	Contact with large animals

S/N	Year	Authors	Injury type/pathogens	Methods for pathogen confirmation	OR/PR, 95% CI, P value	Risk factors or suggested
8.	2017	Oteo et al [18]	<i>Bartonella</i>	Culture, PCR, DNA sequencing,	NA	Veterinarians working with companion animal
9.	2017	Teoh et al [19]	<i>Rickettsia felis</i> and <i>R. typhi</i>	Indirect immunofluorescence antibody testing (MIFAT)	OR: 0.756, 95% CI: 0.582–0.982, P = 0.04; OR: 0.752, 95% CI: 0.579–0.975, P = 0.034 respectively 2. OR: 0.611, 95% CI: 0.38–0.982, P = 0.044 3. OR: 1.381, 95% CI: 0.973–1.96, P = 0.075	Older veterinarians > 60 years at reduced risk <i>R. felis</i> or generalized <i>R. felis</i> or <i>R. typhi</i> 2. Veterinarians recommending flea treatments 3. Veterinarians located at southeastern Australian states of Victoria or Tasmania
10.	2012	Rivera Benitez et al [20]	Rubula virus, Encephalomyocarditis virus & <i>Leptospira</i>	Hemagglutination inhibition test, viral neutralization test	OR: 1.38, P < 0.05	Number of visits to farm increased exposure to Encephalomyocarditis virus
11.	2014	Verkade et al [21]	MRSA	Culture, (spa) typing and multiple-locus variable-number tandem repeat analysis (MLVA)	PRR: 9.3; 95% CI 2.8 – 38.5; PRR: 2.1; 95% CI 1.0 – 4.6 respectively	Veterinarians with persistent MRSA significantly increased carriage in household members
12.	2012	Zelenik et al [22]	<i>Listeria</i>	Culture, serology, and pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE)	NA	Assisted delivery of a stillborn calf
13.	2010	Sayin-Kutlu et al [23]	<i>Bartonella</i>	Indirect IFA	1. OR: 5.166; 95% CI, 1.532–17.425, P = 0.008.	1. Age <35 years' old
14.	2010	Jackson & Villaroel [24]	Zoonoses - Rabies, Ringworm, Sarcoptic mange, Campylobacteriosis, Cryptosporidiosis, Giardiasis	NA	1. P = 0.034; P = 0.031 respectively	1. Veterinarians below 30 years and recent graduates than experienced veterinarians had reduced risk
15.	2008	Raso et al [25]	<i>Chlamydia psittaci</i>	Microimmunofluorescence (MIF)	NA	Authors suggested an under-reporting of this disease in Brazil and the need for risk studies

S/N	Year	Authors	Injury type/pathogens	Methods for pathogen confirmation	OR/PR, 95% CI, P value	Risk factors or suggested
16.	2012	Vest & Clark [26]	<i>Coxiella burnettii</i>	IFAT	1. PR: 1.96; 95% CI 1.15–3.35, P = 0.015 2. PR: 2.16, 95% CI 0.91–5.1, P = 0.09 3. PR: 2.89, 95% CI 1.13–7.4, P = 0.032, and PR: 3.17, 95% CI 1.03–9.71, P = 0.039 respectively	1. Women veterinarians than the men category 2. Veterinarians within 40–49 age group 3. Women deployed to Operation Iraqi Freedom
17.	2011	Posthaus et al [27]	<i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>	IFN-g release assay	NA	This case study reported the potential infection in veterinary personnel with <i>M. tuberculosis</i> due to contact infected dog
18.	2016	Galuppi et al [28]	<i>Cryptosporidium parvum</i>	Ziehl–Neelsen staining, nested PCR, PCR-restriction fragment length polymorphism analysis (PCR-RFLP)	NA	The case study linked the transmission of the pathogen from foals hospitalized in an equine perinatology unit (EPU) to an outbreak in veterinary students.
19.	2012	Rahman et al [29]	<i>Brucella</i>	Rose Bengal Test (RBT), Standard Tube Agglutination Test (STAT), iELISA, Q-PCR	1. OR: 59.8, 95% CI: 6.40 - 559.93, p < 0.001 2. OR: 9.9, 95% CI: 1.03 - 95.30, p = 0.047; OR: 14.2, 95% CI: 1.56 - 129.6, p = 0.019 respectively	1. More likely in handling goats than cattle. 2. Duration of contact with animals for 16 – 25 and > 26 years than ≤ 5 years respectively
20.	2012	de Rooij et al [30]	<i>Coxiella burnettii</i>	Immunofluorescence assay (IFA)	OR: 3.27, 95% CI: 2.14 – 5.02; OR year 6: 2.31, 95% CI: 1.22 – 4.39; OR year 3–5: 1.83, 95% CI : 1.07 – 3.10; OR: 1.74, 95% CI :1.07–2.82; OR: 2.73, 95% CI :1.59 – 4.67 respectively	The study direction; contact with farm animals; advanced year of study (years 6 and 3-5); having had a zoonosis during the study, and ever lived on a ruminant farm respectively
21.	2013	Van de Brum et al [31]	<i>Coxiella burnettii</i>	Indirect immunofluorescent assay and Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA)	1. OR: 3.9, 95% CI: 1.5 – 10.1, p = 0.005; OR: 13.1, 95% CI: 4.7 – 36.2, p < 0.001; OR: 26.8, 95% CI: 8.1 – 88.2, p < 0.001 respectively. 2. OR: 6.3, 95% CI: 2.6 – 15.1, p < 0.001; OR: 7.9, 95% CI: 3.1 – 20, p <	1. The number of hours with animal contact per week that is 10 -19 or 20 – 29 or > = 30 hours than < 10 hours. 2. Number of years as veterinarian graduate i.e. 3 -13 or 14 – 21 or > 22 years than ≤ 2 years

S/N	Year	Authors	Injury type/pathogens	Methods for pathogen confirmation	OR/PR, 95% CI, P value	Risk factors or suggested
					<p>0.001; OR: 17.4, 95% CI: 6.0 – 50.8, &lt; 0.001 respectively.</p> <p>3. OR: 17.9, 95% CI: 3.6–88.1, p &lt; 0.001; OR: 11.9, 95% CI: 2.1–68.5, p = 0.037 respectively</p> <p>4. OR: 15.8, 95% CI: 2.9–87.2, p &lt; 0.001</p> <p>5. OR: 3.4, 95% CI: 1.1–10.2, p &lt; 0.001</p> <p>6. OR: 6.3, 95% CI: 3.1 – 12.9, p &lt; 0.001</p> <p>7. OR: 7.0, 95% CI: 1.5 – 31.9, p = 0.004</p> <p>8. OR: 4.7, 95% CI: 2.4 – 9.3, p &lt; 0.001</p>	<p>3. Living in a rural or semi urban area</p> <p>4. Livestock veterinarian</p> <p>5. Contact with cows</p> <p>6. Contact with ruminants birth products</p> <p>7. Contact with birth products of pets</p> <p>8. Practicing on cow farm with reports of abortion</p>
22.	2015	Fenga et al [32]	<i>Coxiella burnetii</i>	ELISA	NA	The study demonstrated a high seroprevalence of <i>C. burnetii</i> in animal health workers including veterinarians
23.	2011	Archer et al [33]	Rift Valley Virus	ELISA, Real time- PCR (RT-PCR) and/or loop-mediated isothermal amplification assay) and/or virus isolation	RR: 16.3, 95% CI: 2.3 - 114.2	Performing an animal autopsy
24.	2008	Gait et al [34]	<i>Cryptosporidium parvum</i>	(PCR-RFLP) and DNA sequencing	NA	A case report of outbreak cryptosporidiosis among veterinary students. The outbreak was linked to poor hand hygiene on a farm with enzootic <i>C parvum</i> in calves.


S/N	Year	Authors	Injury type/pathogens	Methods for pathogen confirmation	OR/PR, 95% CI, P value	Risk factors or suggested
25.	2013	Moliner et al [35]	<i>Brucella</i> , <i>Toxoplasma</i> , <i>Bacillus anthracis</i> , <i>Tricophyton</i> , <i>Leptospira</i> , <i>Mycobacterium</i> , others	NA	1. OR: 4.79, 95% CI: 2.29 –10.01, p = 0.0001; OR: 8.40, 95% CI: 4.28 – 16.48, p = 0.0001 respectively 2. OR: 2.08, 95% CI: 1.19 – 3.62, p = 0.0099	Risk factors identified for brucellosis were: 1. The number of years of Practice i.e. 11- 20 and > 20years than <10 years 2. Veterinarians working in a zone characterized by a high prevalence of brucellosis and specialized agriculture and milk farms zone
26.	2013	Ali et al [36]	<i>Brucella</i>	RBT, Serum agglutination test, RT- PCR	OR: 1758.5, 95% CI: 48.47- 63799.12, p < 0.001.	Consumption of raw milk increased exposure to brucellosis
27.	2014	Lantos et al [37]	<i>Bartonella</i>	Culture, PCR, IFA, DNA sequencing	p = 0.006	A history of travel to Asia was more common among veterinary subjects

227 **3.3.4 Meta-analysis of proportion estimates of occupational hazards and ratio measure for**  
228 **working or contact with animals as a risk factor for occupational hazards among**  
229 **veterinarians.**

230 Based on a meta-analysis, the pooled proportion estimate of biological hazards among veterinarian  
231 was 17% (95% CI: 15.0-19.0,  $p < 0.001$ ). The overall between-study heterogeneity was significant  
232 and substantial ( $I^2 = 98.98\%$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Subgroup analysis of different biological hazards was  
233 presented in Figure 3, relatively high proportions 31.0% (95% CI: 0.0-62%,  $P=0.05$ ), 26.0% (95%  
234 CI: 16.0-36.0%,  $p < 0.001$ ) and 24.0% (95% CI: 0.0-49.0%,  $p < 0.05$ ) were recorded for bartonellosis,  
235 Q-fever and viral infections respectively. However, the estimated proportion for other biological  
236 hazards including brucellosis, leptospirosis, cryptosporidiosis, and MRSA was between 7.0% and  
237 14.0% and statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . For the chemical hazard, the pooled proportional  
238 estimate was calculated from two studies with 7.0% (95% CI: 6.0-9.0%,  $P < 0.001$ ) estimated  
239 proportion (Figure 4). However, for physical hazard, a pooled estimate of 65.0% (95% CI: 39.0-  
240 91.0%,  $p < 0.001$ ) was calculated. The overall between-study heterogeneity was significant and  
241 substantial ( $I^2 = 99.71\%$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The subgroup analysis returned an estimated proportion of  
242 75.0% (95% CI: 68.0-82.0%,  $p < 0.001$ ) for needle stick injury among veterinarians and 25% (95%  
243 CI: 23.0-27.0%,  $p < 0.001$ ) for cumulative trauma disorders among the veterinarians (Figure 5). Meta-  
244 analysis was done for only working or contact with animals as a risk factor for occupational hazards  
245 among veterinarians (Figure 6). The pooled odds ratio for working or contact with animals was  
246  $OR=1.013$  (95% CI: 1.008-1.017,  $p < 0.001$ ) with overall between-study heterogeneity significant and  
247 substantial ( $I^2 = 99.7\%$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Subgroup analysis returned a pooled odds ratio of  $OR=1.012$   
248 (95% CI: 1.008-1.017,  $p < 0.001$ ) for working or contact with animals as a risk factor for physical  
249 hazards among veterinarian. However, the pooled odds ratio for working or contact with animals as  
250 a risk factor for biological hazards among veterinarian was  $OR=2.07$  (95% CI: 1.70-2.52,  $p < 0.001$ ).

251

252




253

254 Figure 3. Forest plot of pooled prevalence of biological hazards among veterinarians

255

256



257

258 Figure 4. Forest plot of pooled prevalence of chemical hazards among veterinarians

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268


269

270

271

272

273



274

275 Figure 5. Forest plot of pooled prevalence of physical hazards among veterinarians

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283


284

285

286

287

288



289

290 Figure 6. Forest plot of pooled odds ratio estimate of working or contact with animals as a risk factor  
291 for occupational hazards among veterinarians.

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

#### 300 4. DISCUSSION

301 This work has shown that veterinarians and students are at high risk of diverse physical, chemical  
302 and biological hazards based on their work profiles - contact with animals. Data on occupational  
303 health and safety, particularly associated risks, are very limited in the developing countries, unlike in  
304 the developed ones. We were able to retrieve two papers from Nigeria and South Africa published  
305 between 2007 – 2017. This may be attributed to weak veterinary services and infrastructures in many  
306 developing countries, attitudinal issues to occupational health and safety, adherence to and  
307 implementation of existing policies, lack of disease/risk surveillance and monitoring systems at  
308 national or regional levels, poor laboratory capacitation for early detection and responses, poor  
309 disease/risk assessments, reporting and communication. These factors listed above are potential  
310 contributors to supposed underestimation of the hazards and may give the false impression that  
311 animal health-related workplace occupational hazards are not a problem in Africa. While this review  
312 focused on synthesizing and identifying literature on occupational hazards and associated factors in  
313 the veterinary setting, it has also revealed a gap with respect to the African continent.

314 Overall, veterinarians are exposed to diverse forms of hazards in their workplace. Significant physical  
315 hazards, particularly the needlestick injuries (NSI) (75.0%; 95% CI: 68.0-82.0%,  $p < 0.001$ ) and  
316 cumulative traumatic disorder (CTD) (25%; 95% CI: 23.0-27.0%,  $p < 0.001$ ) among veterinarians has  
317 been a source of worries for professionals due to their high prevalence [4,5,7,9,38]. NSI remains a  
318 major hazard and issue in the veterinary profession especially with regards to recapping of needles  
319 and consequent accidental needle prick [9]. Besides, frequent contact with and handling of large  
320 animals such as pigs, goats and sheep increased the risk of NSI in veterinary students[38]. The lack  
321 of in-depth understanding of animal behaviour (ethology), improper handling and disposal of  
322 needles, and poor or inadequate restraint techniques applied to these large animals predispose to  
323 increased risk of NSIs [38]. Emphasizing mitigation measures including the competent training and  
324 impartation of skills in the best practices relating to the handling, recapping and disposal of needles  
325 and sharps, as well as standard restraining techniques and facilities for animals must be the priority.

326 Cumulative traumatic disorders (CTDs) are chronic injuries marked with excessive pains in the  
327 musculoskeletal system due to overuse or repetitive strain from forceful motions or prolonged  
328 uncomfortable positions [39]. In veterinary practices, many activities are physically demanding and  
329 have increased potential for injury, especially when dealing with untamed or raging animals [11].  
330 Veterinarians have  $\approx 3$  times higher likelihood of CTDs in their workplace when compared with the  
331 human doctors [40]. Similarly, large animal veterinarians were more predisposed to CTDs than  
332 counterparts in other practices and injuries more often occurred in the upper extremities and knees,  
333 cases which may become more severe with the pressure of time and work-related stress [11, 41].

334 Although few papers were obtained for chemical exposures and risk practices, the pooled estimate  
335 proportion was 7.0% (95% CI: 6.0-9.0%). It will appear that chemical hazards and quantitative  
336 exposure in the veterinary profession are less studied compared with physical and biological ones.  
337 Previous workers have suggested under-reporting, inconclusive data and the inability to recognize  
338 the causal link of hazard as possible reasons for the low prevalence of chemical risks observed in  
339 veterinary practices [41]. Veterinarians by practices undertake activities that expose them to  
340 chemicals and ionizing rays like radiations from radiography and radiology, pesticides and cytotoxic  
341 drugs during prophylaxis or therapy, anaesthetic gases during preparation for surgeries, and these can  
342 lead to life-threatening illnesses, disorders or complications as grave as cancer [42], reproductive  
343 health challenges like birth defects [8,12], disorders of the central nervous system, liver and kidney  
344 [42]. Our results indicated that female veterinarians more than male, especially those working in  
345 small animal practice are at higher odds of chemical exposures and attendant consequences [12].  
346 Early notification of pregnancies and risk assessments at the workplace may be useful to mitigate the  
347 associated health risks.

348 Biological hazards, most particularly zoonoses remained the most emphasized, studied and  
349 documented risks based on our observation during this review. Significantly, these diseases still go  
350 under-reported in many countries and most especially in the developing ones where the risk of co-  
351 infections also exists. In this study, almost all of the reported studies originated from the developed

352 economies (72.7% originating from Europe, North America and Australia alone). Approximately  
353 61% of all human pathogens are zoonotic, and 75% of all emerging pathogens during the past decade  
354 have animal source. [43] The constant interaction and contact of veterinarians with animals  
355 categorize them as one of the high-risk groups for zoonoses and or emerging infectious diseases with  
356 the consequences of exposure ranging from the simple seroconversion to the disease with extremely  
357 variable symptomatic manifestations until the onset of irreversible sequelae or death [41]. This risk  
358 is especially problematic to people, such as companion animal owners and veterinary health workers  
359 who are immunocompromised [44]. in this work, zoonoses incidence ranged from 0.1 to 73.7% and  
360 some common zoonoses identified as threats with relatively high proportions were recorded for  
361 bartonellosis (31%), Q-fever (26.0%) and other viral infections (24%). Contact with or handling  
362 animals increases the risk of exposure to zoonoses by twice in veterinarians (OR=2.07, 95% CI: 1.70-  
363 2.52,  $p < 0.001$ ), emphasizing the importance of zoonoses in the veterinary profession. Mitigation  
364 strategies to reduce occupational-related zoonotic threats should be addressed through the  
365 implementation of policies and legal document that encourages compliance, improved mechanisms  
366 for effective risks assessment, communication and surveillance for domestic and wild animals and  
367 veterinary population. Targeted educational programme on zoonoses and EIDs and control strategies  
368 among veterinarians and students also becomes needed. We encourage more surveys on occupational  
369 health, documenting and reviewing the risks and the impact of zoonotic diseases on the veterinary  
370 profession would contribute to occupational risk prevention [45]. Development of risk assessment  
371 plans, health and safety guidelines, good practices, and mitigation systems to reduce workplace-  
372 related hazards must be carried out from training institutions to workplace postgraduation [38].  
373 Finally, the fact that zero cases of MRSA and physical/psychological trauma were reported in  
374 students and the sections of students that experienced other forms of occupational exposures were in  
375 the clinical years were indications that practising veterinarians particularly based on years of  
376 experience on the job are at higher risks of occupational risks.

## 377 **CONCLUSIONS**

378 We acknowledge this review may have experienced some limitations based on the number of search  
379 database (3) used and the omission of some important studies may have occurred.

380 However, this review has provided a better understanding of occupational health and safety status of  
381 veterinarians and gaps within the developing countries. We reported the veterinary field is challenged  
382 with diverse physical, chemical and biological hazards mainly zoonoses. Handling or being in contact  
383 with animals poses higher exposures to physical and biological hazards. Therefore, protecting the  
384 health and safety of veterinarians in their various workplaces becomes essential through collaborative  
385 efforts of all experts in the field, improved and efficient implementation of occupational health and  
386 safety policies, encouraging best preventive practices and safety standards, surveillance, targeted  
387 continuing educational programmes, risk assessment, reporting and communication. Furthermore,  
388 more studies may be required to quantify hazard exposures and impact on the health of veterinarians  
389 and students globally but more importantly in the developing countries where little studies have been  
390 conducted.

## 391 **Authors contributions**

392 OOA and MA generated the protocol with input from all authors. OOA, FOG, BB did the database  
393 search, abstract screening, and data extraction. BB did the data analysis. OOA drafted the manuscript  
394 with input from all the authors. FOF revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual  
395 content. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript to be published and agreed  
396 to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

## 397 **Acknowledgement**

398 We thank the College Librarian, Dr K.A. Owolabi, College of Veterinary Medicine, Federal  
399 University of Agriculture Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria for his technical support with the systematic  
400 reviews.

## 401 References

- 402 1. International Labour Office (2012). Estimating the economic costs of occupational injuries  
403 and illnesses in developing countries: Essential information for Decision-makers.  
404 [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_protect/---protrav/---](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---safework/documents/publication/wcms_207690.pdf)  
405 [safework/documents/publication/wcms\\_207690.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---safework/documents/publication/wcms_207690.pdf). Accessed March 29, 2020.
- 406 2. ILO (2020). Summary of work-related mortality. World Bank division. Available at:  
407 [https://www.ilo.org/moscow/areas-of-work/occupational-safety-and-](https://www.ilo.org/moscow/areas-of-work/occupational-safety-and-health/WCMS_249278/lang--en/index.htm)  
408 [health/WCMS\\_249278/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/moscow/areas-of-work/occupational-safety-and-health/WCMS_249278/lang--en/index.htm).
- 409 3. Ryder G. (2017). ILO: Global cost of work-related injuries and deaths totals almost \$3  
410 trillion. Safety & Health Magazine. Available at:  
411 [https://www.safetyandhealthmagazine.com/articles/16112-ilo-global-cost-of-work-related-](https://www.safetyandhealthmagazine.com/articles/16112-ilo-global-cost-of-work-related-injuries-and-deaths-totals-almost-3-trillion#:~:text=Safety%20culture%20Leadership-.ILO%3A%20Global%20cost%20of%20work%2Drelated%20injuries%20and,deaths%20to)  
412 [injuries-and-deaths-totals-almost-3-trillion#:~:text=Safety%20culture%20Leadership-](https://www.safetyandhealthmagazine.com/articles/16112-ilo-global-cost-of-work-related-injuries-and-deaths-totals-almost-3-trillion#:~:text=Safety%20culture%20Leadership-.ILO%3A%20Global%20cost%20of%20work%2Drelated%20injuries%20and,deaths%20to)  
413 [.ILO%3A%20Global%20cost%20of%20work%2Drelated%20injuries%20and,deaths%20to](https://www.safetyandhealthmagazine.com/articles/16112-ilo-global-cost-of-work-related-injuries-and-deaths-totals-almost-3-trillion#:~:text=Safety%20culture%20Leadership-.ILO%3A%20Global%20cost%20of%20work%2Drelated%20injuries%20and,deaths%20to)  
414 [tals%20almost%20%243%20trillion&text=The%20total%20cost%20of%20illnesses,global](https://www.safetyandhealthmagazine.com/articles/16112-ilo-global-cost-of-work-related-injuries-and-deaths-totals-almost-3-trillion#:~:text=Safety%20culture%20Leadership-.ILO%3A%20Global%20cost%20of%20work%2Drelated%20injuries%20and,deaths%20to)  
415 [%20GDP%2C%20or%20%242.99%20trillion](https://www.safetyandhealthmagazine.com/articles/16112-ilo-global-cost-of-work-related-injuries-and-deaths-totals-almost-3-trillion#:~:text=Safety%20culture%20Leadership-.ILO%3A%20Global%20cost%20of%20work%2Drelated%20injuries%20and,deaths%20to). Accessed 31 August 2020.
- 416 4. Epp T, Waldner C. Occupational health hazards in veterinary medicine: Zoonoses and other  
417 biological hazards. *Can Vet J.* 2012a; 53 (2): 144–1450. PMID: 22851775
- 418 5. Fowler HN, Holzbauer SM, Smith KE, Scheftel JM. Survey of occupational hazards in  
419 Minnesota veterinary practices in 2012. *J Am Vet Med Assoc.* 2016;248(2):207-18.
- 420 6. Sánchez A, Prats-van der Ham M, Tatay-Dualde J, et al. Zoonoses in Veterinary Students:  
421 A Systematic Review of the Literature. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(1): e0169534. Published 2017  
422 Jan 4. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169534
- 423 7. Mshelbwala PP, Weese JS, Idris JM. Prevalence of Needlestick Injury and Its Potential Risk  
424 among Veterinarians in Nigeria. *Vet Med Int.* 2016; 2016:7639598
- 425 8. Shirangi A, Fritschi L, Holman C J, Bower C. Birth Defects in Offspring of Female  
426 Veterinarians. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2009; 51(5): 525 – 533
- 427 9. Mesquita, J. R., Sousa, S. I. V., Vala, H., & Nascimento, M. S. J. (2015). The Epidemiology  
428 of Blood-Contaminated Needlestick Injuries Among Veterinarians in Portugal. *Journal of*  
429 *Agromedicine.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2015.1010061>
- 430 10. Epp, T., & Waldner, C. (2012b). Occupational health hazards in veterinary medicine:  
431 Zoonoses and other biological hazards. *Canadian Veterinary Journal.*
- 432 11. Berry, S. L., Susitaival, P., Ahmadi, A., & Schenker, M. B. (2012). Cumulative trauma  
433 disorders among California veterinarians. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine.*  
434 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22076>
- 435 12. Shirangi, A., Bower, C., Holman, C. D. A. J., Preen, D. B., & Bruce, N. (2014). A study of  
436 handling cytotoxic drugs and risk of birth defects in offspring of female veterinarians.  
437 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.*  
438 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph110606216>
- 439 13. Moodley A, Nightingale EC, Stegger M, Nielsen S, Skov RL, Guardabassi L. High risk  
440 for nasal carriage of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* among Danish veterinary  
441 practitioners. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2008;34(2):151–157
- 442 14. Leggat, P. A., Smith, D. R., & Speare, R. (2009). Hand dermatitis among veterinarians from  
443 Queensland, Australia. *Contact Dermatitis.* [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0536.2009.01562.x)  
444 [0536.2009.01562.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0536.2009.01562.x)
- 445 15. Paterson, G. K., Harrison, E. M., Craven, E. F., Petersen, A., Larsen, A. R., Ellington, M. J.,  
446 Torok, M.E., Peacock, S.J., Parkhill, J., Zadoks, R., Holmes, M. A. (2013). Incidence and  
447 Characterisation of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) from Nasal

- 448 Colonisation in Participants Attending a Cattle Veterinary Conference in the UK. PLoS  
449 ONE. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0068463>
- 450 16. Baer, R., Turnberg, W., Yu, D., & Wohrle, R. (2010). Leptospirosis in a small animal  
451 veterinarian: Reminder to follow standardized infection control Procedures. *Zoonoses and*  
452 *Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2009.01240.x>
- 453 17. Boost, M. V., So, S. Y. C., & Perreten, V. (2011). Low rate of methicillin-resistant  
454 coagulase-positive staphylococcal colonization of veterinary personnel in Hong Kong.  
455 *Zoonoses and Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2009.01286.x>
- 456 18. Oteo, J. A., Maggi, R., Portillo, A., Bradley, J., García-Álvarez, L., San-Martín, M., Roura,  
457 X., Breitschwerdt, E. (2017). Prevalence of Bartonella spp. By culture, PCR and serology,  
458 in veterinary personnel from Spain. *Parasites and Vectors*. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-017-2483-z)  
459 [017-2483-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-017-2483-z)
- 460 19. Teoh, Y. T., Hii, S. F., Stevenson, M. A., Graves, S., Rees, R., Stenos, J., & Traub, R. J.  
461 (2017). Serological evidence of exposure to Rickettsia felis and Rickettsia typhi in  
462 Australian veterinarians. *Parasites and Vectors*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-017-2075-y>
- 463 20. Rivera-Benitez, J. F., Rosas-Estrada, K., Pulido-Camarillo, E., De la Peña-Moctezuma, A.,  
464 Castillo-Juárez, H., & Ramírez-Mendoza, H. (2014). Serological survey of veterinarians to  
465 assess the zoonotic potential of three emerging swine diseases in Mexico. *Zoonoses and*  
466 *Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.12055>
- 467 21. Verkade, E., Kluytmans-van Den Bergh, M., Van Benthem, B., Van Cleef, B., Van Rijen,  
468 M., Bosch, T., Schouls, L., & Kluytmans, J. (2014). Transmission of methicillin-resistant  
469 Staphylococcus aureus CC398 from livestock veterinarians to their household members.  
470 PLoS ONE. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0100823>
- 471 22. Zelenik, K., Avberšek, J., Pate, M., Lušicky, M., Krt, B., Ocepek, M., & Zdovc, I. (2014).  
472 Cutaneous listeriosis in a veterinarian with the evidence of zoonotic transmission - A case  
473 report. *Zoonoses and Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.12075>
- 474 23. Sayin-Kutlu, S., Ergin, C., Kutlu, M., Akkaya, Y., & Akalin, S. (2012). Bartonella henselae  
475 Seroprevalence in Cattle Breeders and Veterinarians in the Rural Areas of Aydin and  
476 Denizli, Turkey. *Zoonoses and Public Health*. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2012.01486.x)  
477 [2378.2012.01486.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2012.01486.x)
- 478 24. Jackson, J., & Villarroel, A. (2012). A Survey of The Risk of Zoonoses for Veterinarians.  
479 *Zoonoses and Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2011.01432.x>
- 480 25. Raso, T. F., Carrasco, A. O. T., Silva, J. C. R., Marvulo, M. F. V., & Pinto, A. A. (2010).  
481 Seroprevalence of antibodies to chlamyphila psittaci in zoo workers in Brazil. *Zoonoses*  
482 *and Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2009.01237.x>
- 483 26. Vest, K. G., & Clark, L. L. (2014). Serosurvey and observational study of US Army  
484 veterinary corps officers for Q fever antibodies from 1989 to 2008. *Zoonoses and Public*  
485 *Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.12067>
- 486 27. Posthaus, H., Bodmer, T., Alves, L., Oevermann, A., Schiller, I., Rhodes, S. G., &  
487 Zimmerli, S. (2011). Accidental infection of veterinary personnel with Mycobacterium  
488 tuberculosis at necropsy: A case study. *Veterinary Microbiology*.  
489 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2010.11.027>
- 490 28. Galuppi, R., Piva, S., Castagnetti, C., Sarli, G., Iacono, E., Fioravanti, M. L., & Caffara, M.  
491 (2016). Cryptosporidium parvum: From foal to veterinary students. *Veterinary Parasitology*.  
492 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2016.02.001>
- 493 29. Rahman, A. K. M. A., Dirk, B., Fretin, D., Saegerman, C., Ahmed, M. U., Muhammad, N.,  
494 Hossain, A & Abatih, E. (2012). Seroprevalence and risk factors for brucellosis in a high-  
495 risk group of individuals in Bangladesh. *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease*.  
496 <https://doi.org/10.1089/fpd.2011.1029>

- 497 30. de Rooij, M. M. T., Schimmer, B., Versteeg, B., Schneeberger, P., Berends, B. R.,  
498 Heederik, D., van der Hoek, W & Wouters, I. M. (2012). Risk factors of coxiella burnetii (Q  
499 fever) seropositivity in veterinary medicine students. PLoS ONE.  
500 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0032108>
- 501 31. van den Brom, R., Schimmer, B., Schneeberger, P. M., Swart, W. A., van der Hoek, W., &  
502 Vellema, P. (2013). Seroepidemiological Survey for Coxiella burnetii Antibodies and  
503 Associated Risk Factors in Dutch Livestock Veterinarians. PLoS ONE.  
504 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0054021>
- 505 32. Fenga, C., Gangemi, S., De Luca, A., Calimeri, S., Lo Giudice, D., Pugliese, M., ... Costa,  
506 C. (2015). Seroprevalence and occupational risk survey for Coxiella burnetii among  
507 exposed workers in Sicily, Southern Italy. International Journal of Occupational Medicine  
508 and Environmental Health. <https://doi.org/10.13075/ijom.1896.00448>
- 509 33. Archer, B. N., Weyer, J., Paweska, J., Nkosi, D., Leman, P., Tint, K. S., & Blumberg, L.  
510 (2011). Outbreak of Rift Valley fever affecting veterinarians and farmers in South Africa,  
511 2008. South African Medical Journal. <https://doi.org/10.7196/samj.4544>
- 512 34. Gait, R., Soutar, R. H., Hanson, M., Fraser, C., & Chalmers, R. (2008). Outbreak of  
513 cryptosporidiosis among veterinary students. Veterinary Record.  
514 <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.162.26.843>
- 515 35. Molineri, A., Signorini, M. L., Pérez, L., & Tarabla, H. D. (2013). Zoonoses in rural  
516 veterinarians in the central region of Argentina. Australian Journal of Rural Health.  
517 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajr.12054>
- 518 36. Ali, S., Ali, Q., Neubauer, H., Melzer, F., Elschner, M., Khan, I., Abatih, E.N., Ullah, N.,  
519 Irfan, Akhter, S. (2013). Seroprevalence and risk factors associated with brucellosis as a  
520 professional hazard in Pakistan. Foodborne Pathogens and Disease.  
521 <https://doi.org/10.1089/fpd.2012.1360>
- 522 37. Lantos, P. M., Maggi, R. G., Ferguson, B., Varkey, J., Park, L. P., Breitschwerdt, E. B., &  
523 Woods, C. W. (2014). Detection of bartonella species in the blood of veterinarians and  
524 veterinary technicians: A newly recognized occupational hazard? Vector-Borne and  
525 Zoonotic Diseases. <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2013.1512>
- 526 38. Adebawale, O. O., Afolabi, M. O., Adesokan, H. K., Fasanmi, O. G., Adeyemo, O. K.,  
527 Awoyomi, O. J., & Fasina, F. O. (2020). Determinants of Work-Related Risks among  
528 Veterinary Clinical Students in South West Nigeria. Veterinary medicine international,  
529 2020, 2780378. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/2780378>
- 530 39. NIOSH. 1997. Bernard BP, editor. Musculoskeletal disorders and workplace factors—A  
531 critical review of epidemiologic evidence for work-related musculoskeletal disorders of the  
532 neck, upper extremity, and low back. Cincinnati, OH, USA: National Institute of  
533 Occupational Safety and Health, p. 141
- 534 40. Nienhaus A, Skudlik C, Seidler A. 2005. Work-related accidents and occupational diseases  
535 in veterinarians and their staff. Int Arch Occup Environ Health 78:230–238.
- 536 41. Bonini S, Buonacucina A, Selis L, Peli A, Mutti A, et al. (2016) Occupational Hazards in  
537 Veterinarians: An Updating. J Veterinar Sci Techno 7: 317. doi:10.4172/2157-  
538 7579.1000317
- 539 42. Fritschi L (2000) Cancer in veterinarians. Occup Environ Med 57: 289-297.
- 540 43. WHO (2020). Neglected Zoonotic Diseases. Available at:  
541 [https://www.who.int/neglected\\_diseases/diseases/zoonoses/en/](https://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/diseases/zoonoses/en/). Accessed 01 September  
542 2020.
- 543 44. Kahn L. H. (2006). Confronting zoonoses, linking human and veterinary medicine.  
544 Emerging infectious diseases, 12(4), 556–561. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1204.050956>

545 45. Sánchez, A., Prats-van der Ham, M., Tatay-Dualde, J., García-Galán, A., de la Fe, C.,  
546 Corrales, J. C., & Contreras, A. (2018). Zoonosis y salud laboral en la profesión veterinaria.  
547 Revista Espanola de Salud Publica.

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562