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

2 Adebawale OO^{1*}, Fasanmi OG², Awosile, B.B³, Afolabi, MO¹ and Fasina FO^{4,5}

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

5 ² Department of Veterinary Laboratory Technology, Federal College of Animal Health and
6 Production Technology, Oyo State, Nigeria.

7 ³ Department of Health Information and Performances, Health PEI Charlottetown, PE Canada

8 ⁴ECTAD, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

9 ⁵Department of Veterinary Tropical Diseases, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

10

11

12

13

*Corresponding Author: Adebawale OO, 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, 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

1. Introduction

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

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

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

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Type and Search approach

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

2.2 Eligibility criteria for the selection of relevant materials

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

Two of the authors independently read and examined all titles and abstracts of papers identified in the search, retrieved and selected articles that focused on and met the inclusion criteria. During full-text study final selection, duplicated studies were removed and approval from both authors was 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 $\leq 25\%$, $26\leq 50\%$, 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

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

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

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 ⁸	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 ¹²	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 ¹⁰	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 ⁵	Needlestick and animal-related injuries.	NA	Common physical hazards reported
5.	2016	Mshelbwala et al ⁷	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 ⁹	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 ¹⁰	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 ¹¹	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 burnetii*:** 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 micro 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 M. tuberculosis 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, < 0.001 respectively.</p> <p>3. OR: 17.9, 95% CI: 3.6–88.1, p < 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 < 0.001</p> <p>5. OR: 3.4, 95% CI: 1.1–10.2, p < 0.001</p> <p>6. OR: 6.3, 95% CI: 3.1 – 12.9, p < 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 < 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

Biological hazards, most particularly zoonoses remained the most emphasized, studied and documented risks based on our observation during this review. Significantly, these diseases still go under-reported in many countries and most especially in the developing ones where the risk of co-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

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

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

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