Journal of Medical & Pharmaceutical Sciences

Volume (6), Issue (6): 30 Dec 2022 P: 71 - 83



مجلة العلوم الطبية والصيدلانية المجلد (6)، العدد (6): 30 ديسمبر 2022 م

ص: 71 - 83

Prevalence of Needlestick Injuries (NSIs) among Laboratory Personnel at The National Center of Public Health Laboratory in Aden, Yemen

Adel Jumaan Awadh Binsaad

Faculty of Medicine and Health Science || University of Aden || Yemen

Abstract: Background: Needlestick injuries (NSIs) are one of the most common health hazards facing healthcare workers (HCWs) worldwide.

Objectives: The aims of this study were to determine the prevalence of occupational exposure to NSIs among laboratory personnel working at the national center of public health laboratory in Aden, Yemen. Also, to identify the risk factors associated with NSIs and HBV vaccination status.

Method: A descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted among laboratory personnel in the national center of public health laboratory in Aden. Data collection was done using a pretested administered questionnaire.

Results: A total of 33 (34.4%) participants had been exposed to needlestick injuries during their work in the laboratory. Only 33.3% of needlestick injuries were reported to administrator in the laboratory. The prevalence rate of needlestick injury was significantly higher (65.6%) among those who had an experience of less than 5 years (P< 0.05) and those who had not (41.9%) received training course on biosafety (P< 0.05). About one-third (32.3%) of participants reported that they had been vaccinated against HBV. The vaccination coverage rate against HBV was significantly higher among laboratory personnel who had received a bachelor's degree (P< 0.05), and those who received biosafety training course (P< 0.05).

Conclusions and Recommendations: This study showed relatively higher prevalence rate of NSIs among the laboratory personnel. The rate of non-reported NSIs is also high among laboratory personnel who had needlestick injuries. Low rate of receiving biosafety training courses and low vaccination coverage among laboratory personnel. Therefore, laboratory personnel should be trained on safety measures for handling and disposing of needles and should be encouraged to report NSIs to get the right treatment and counseling. Also, the laboratory should be provided with protective equipment in sufficient quantities to reduce the incidence of NSIs and HBV vaccination should be achieved for laboratory personnel working at the national center of public health laboratory in Aden.

Keywords: Healthcare workers; Needlestick injury; Laboratory personnel; Vaccination; Aden

معدل انتشار إصابات الوخز بالإبر بين طاقم المختبر الوطني المركزي للصحة العامة في مدينة عدن، اليمن

عادل جمعان عوض بن سعد كلية الطب والعلوم الصحية || جامعة عدن || اليمن

المستخلص: الخلفية: تعتبر اصابات الوخز بالإبر أحد المخاطر الصحية المهنية الخطيرة وأكثرها شيوعا بين عمال الرعاية الصحية حول العالم.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.L220622 (71) Available at: https://www.ajsrp.com

اهداف الدراسة: هدفت هذه الدراسة لتحديد معدل انتشار التعرض المني للوخز بالإبر بين العاملين في المركز الوطني لمختبر الصحة العامة في مدينة عدن، اليمن. وكذلك لتحديد عوامل الخطورة المرتبطة بالوخز بالإبر وكذلك حالة التطعيم ضد فيروس الكبد البائي. الطربقة: أجربت دراسة مقطعية وصفية بين العاملين في المركز الوطني لمختبر الصحة العامة في مدينة عدن، اليمن وتم استخدام استبيان الذي تم اختباره مسبقًا لجمع البيانات.

النتائج: تبين ان 33 (4.44٪) من المشاركين كانوا قد تعرضوا لإصابات الوخز بالإبر أثناء عملهم في المختبر. وقد تم الإبلاغ فقط عن 33.3 ٪ من هذه الإصابات لإدارة المختبر. وقد كانت نسبة الإصابات كبيرة (65.6٪) وذو دلالة إحصائية بين العاملين الذين تقل خبرتهم عن 5 سنوات وبين أولئك الذين لم يتلقوا تدريبات على السلامة الحيوية (41.9٪). وقد أفاد تقريبا ثلث المشاركين (32.3٪) بأنهم قد تلقوا تطعيمًا ضد فيروس النهاب الكبد البائي. وقد كانت نسبة تغطية التطعيم ضد فيروس النهاب الكبد الوبائي عالية وذات دلالة احصائية بين العاملين الذين يحملون شهادة البكالوربوس وكذلك العاملين الذين تلقوا تدريبات على السلامة الحيوبة.

الاستنتاجات والتوصيات: اظهرت الدراسة بأن معدل انتشار الإصابات بوخز الإبر عالي نسبيا بين طاقم المختبر كما ان نسبة الإصابات التي لم يتم الإبلاغ عنها ايضا عالية. وكانت نسبة كلاً من التدريب على السلامة الحيوية ونسبة التلقيح ضد فيروس التهاب الكبد البائي منخفضة. لذلك، يجب تدريب عمال المختبر على اجراءات السلامة المتبعة للتعامل والتخلص من الإبر الملوثة كما يجب تشجيعهم على الإبلاغ عن الإصابات الناتجة عن الوخز بالإبر حتى يتمكنوا من الحصول على العلاج والاستشارة الطبية الصحيحة. كما يجب ترويد المختبر بمعدات الوقاية والسلامة بكميات كافية كما يجب توفير اللقاحات ضد فيروس التهاب الكبد البائي لعمال المختبر المركزي الوطني للصحة العامة في مدينة عدن.

الكلمات المفتاحية: عمال الرعاية الصحية، إصابات الوخز بالإبر، طاقم المختبر، التلقيح، عدن.

Introduction

Needlestick injuries (NSIs) are defined as injuries caused by blood collection needles, hypodermic needles, cannula and needles used to connect parts of intravenous delivery systems contaminated with blood or body secretions (Himmelreich *et al.*, 2013). Needlestick injuries are serious occupational hazards facing healthcare workers (HCWs) throughout the world. Healthcare workers are exposed to contaminated needlestick injuries during their daily activities in the healthcare settings, and they are at higher risk of acquiring infection with blood-borne pathogens (Isara & Ofili, 2012). There are more than 20 blood-borne pathogens that could be transmitted through contaminated NSIs with patient's blood or body fluids to healthcare workers, and the most common are hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)(Cui, Zhu, Zhang, Wang, & Li, 2018; Marusic, Markovic-Denic, Djuric, Protic, & Dubljanin-Raspopovic, 2017). Worldwide, about three million HCWs are exposed to blood-borne viruses per year. Out of this, 2.5% and 40% of cases are owing to exposure to HIV and HBV and HCV respectively, and more than 90% of these cases occur in the developing countries (Cui *et al.*, 2018; Shaghaghian, Golkari, Pardis, & Rezayi, 2015). It was estimated that the risk of transmission following a percutaneous injury for HBV, HCV, and HIV infection to be 40%, 3% to 10%, and 0.2% to 0.5% respectively(Goel, Kumar, Lingaiah, & Singh, 2017).

The prevalence of NSIs differs from country to county even it can be vary within a country. However, in developing countries, the prevalence of needlestick injuries is higher due to high poor health settings, lack of training, adopting of safer working practices, awareness about HBV prevalence, and unavailability of occupational protective measures such as vaccination against HBV (Cui *et al.*, 2018;

Shaghaghian, Golkari, Pardis, & Rezayi, 2015). Also, in developing countries, the incidence of NSIs is high and underestimated due to the absence of surveillance and reporting systems in the healthcare institutions (Chalya *et al.*, 2015).

Conducting a study regarding the prevalence of NSIs is very important for intervention and policy to decrease bloodborne infection transmission among laboratory personnel. In Yemen, a few studies conducted to assess the prevalence of needlestick injuries among laboratory personnel reported prevalence rates of 14.6% and 54.8% in Sana'a city(Al-Abhar, Moghram, Al-Gunaid, Al Serouri, & Khader, 2020; Al Eryani *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, the aim of this study was to determine the prevalence of NSIs among laboratory personnel working at the national center of public health laboratory in Aden. Also, to identify the risk factors associated with NSIs and HBV vaccination status.

Methodology

Study design and study area:

This is a descriptive cross-sectional study conducted in the national center of public health laboratory in Aden over three months (October - December 2021). Aden is the second important city in the Republic of Yemen holding a population of around 590,413. Aden is a seaport city, located by the eastern approach to the Red Sea (the Gulf of Aden), some 170 kilometers (110 mi) east of Bab-El-Mandeb southern Yemen within longitude 45°02′12″ E and latitude 12°46′45″ N(Saleh, Amer, & Al-Alawi, 2018).

Study population:

The study included laboratory personnel working in the national center of public health laboratory in Aden.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria:

The laboratory personnel who were involved in handling and processing clinical samples were included, while laboratory personnel who were not involved such as administrative staff, were excluded.

Sample size:

All the laboratory personnel who were present and who gave verbal consent were considered as the sample size for the study.

Data collection:

Administered structured questionnaire was used to collect data. The questionnaire was developed based on previously reviewed similar literatures (Al-Abhar, Moghram, Al-Gunaid, Al Serouri, & Khader, 2020; Al Eryani et al., 2019; Goel, Kumar, Lingaiah, & Singh, 2017; Nagi et al., 2017), as well as it was modified by experts from the Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health

Science, University of Aden. The questionnaire was pretested, and a pilot testing was conducted with a random sample of 10 laboratory personnel to check its reliability, clarity, time required, acceptability, and missing data. Required changes were made and laboratory personnel who participated in pilot study were excluded from the study. The questionnaire included three parts. The first part contained information on sociodemographic characteristics of participants, and the second part included information on the usage and availability of the personal protective equipments (PPE). In the third part, the participants were asked if they had a history of exposure to needlestick injury during their work in the laboratory, and if they were vaccinated against HBV.

Ethical consideration:

Permission for conducting this research was granted by the administrators of the national center of public health laboratory in Aden before the study initiation and verbal consent was obtained from each participant after providing a clear explanation about the study's purpose before participation, and the anonymity of participants was maintained.

Statistical analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 20 was used to enter, clean and analyze the data. Descriptive statistics like frequencies and proportions were used to summarize the data. Chi-square test was used to determine the associations between categorical variables. A p-value of \leq 0.05 was regarded as statistically significant.

Results

Table 1 shows the participants' sociodemographic characteristics.

A total of 96 laboratory personnel have participated in this study. The majority (59.4%; 57/96) of them were female and forty (41.7%) of the participants were among the age group of 20 to 29 years. More than half (56.2%; 54/96) of the participants had received a diploma degree, and 36 (37.5%) had more than 10 years of work experience. Only 34 (35.4%) and 31 (32.3%) of laboratory personnel received biosafety training course and vaccination against the hepatitis B virus respectively.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of laboratory personnel at the national center of public health laboratory in Aden(n=96).

Variable	Laboratory personnel						
	Frequency	(%)					
Gender							
Male	39	40.6					
Female	57	59.4					
Age group (year)							
20-29	40	41.7					

V + 11	Laboratory personnel							
Variable	Frequency	(%)						
30-39	18	18.8						
40-49	16	16.7						
50-59	18	18.8						
>59	4	4.2						
Education								
Diploma	54	56.2						
Bachelor	24	25.0						
Master	18	18.8						
	Work experience (years)							
<5	32	33.3						
5-10	28	29.2						
>10	36	37.5						
Received biosafety training								
Yes	34	35.4						
No	62	64.6						
HBV vaccine								
Yes	31	32.3						
No	65	67.7						

Table 2 shows the prevalence of NSIs according to sociodemographic characteristics.

Out of 96 laboratory personnel, thirty-three of them had been exposed to needlestick injury during their work in the laboratory. Thus, the prevalence of NSIs was 34.4%. On the other hand, only 11 (33.3%) of those exposed to needlestick injury reported the incidence while majority (22/33; 66.7%) of participants did not.

The prevalence of NSIs was slightly higher in males (35.9% vs. 33.3%) than in females. A similar NSIs prevalence rate of 50% was found among laboratory personnel in the age group 30 to 39 and those with more than 59 years. According to educational level, the highest prevalence rate of 35.2% was in laboratory personnel who had received a diploma degree. Significant higher NSI prevalence rates of 65.6% and 41.9% were found in those who had less than 5 years of work experience (P< 0.05), and those who had not received a biosafety training course (P< 0.05), respectively.

Table 2. Prevalence of needlestick injury among laboratory personnel according to sociodemographic characteristics (n=96).

Variables	Total	Injured		Not injured		O l
	Number	N	(%)	N	(%)	<i>P</i> value
Gender						
Male	39	14	35.9	25	64.1	P=0.79503
Female	57	19	33.3	38	66.7	χ2=0.0675

Variables	Total	lnj	Injured		njured	0.1
variables	Number	N	(%)	N	(%)	<i>P</i> value
Age (year)						
20-29	40	12	30	28	70	
30-39	18	9	50	9	50	P=0.500676
40-49	16	4	25	12	75	$\chi_2 = 3.3524$
50-59	18	6	33.3	12	66.7	χ2-3.33 24
>59	4	2	50	2	50	
	Educatio	on				
Diploma	54	19	35.2	35	64.8	D_0 092202
Bachelor	24	8	33.3	16	66.7	P=0.982203
Master	18	6	33.3	12	66.7	χ2=0.0359
,	Work experienc	e (year:	s)			
<5	32	21	65.6	11	34.4	P=000011* χ2=22.9077
5-10	28	8	28.6	20	71.4	
>10	36	4	11.1	32	88.9	
Received biosafety training						
Yes	34	7	20.6	27	79.4	P=0.035193*
No	62	26	41.9	36	58.1	χ2=4.4358

^{*} Significant.

Table 3 shows the availability and the use of personal protective equipments by laboratory personnel. A total of 93.8% (90/96), 95.8% (92/96) and 94.8% (91/96) of laboratory personnel were found to wear gloves, laboratory coats, and masks respectively. Eye goggles, eye washers and safety cabinets were less available and used only by 3.13% (3/96), 1.04% (1/96), and 7.3% (7/96) of laboratory personnel, respectively.

Table 3. Availability and usage of personal protective equipment in the national center of public health laboratory in Aden

Personal protective equipment (PPE)	Total			
reisonai protective equipment (FFL)	N	(%)		
Gloves	90	93.8		
Lab coats	92	95.8		
Masks	91	94.8		
Eye Goggles	3	3.13		
Eye washer	1	1.04		
Safety cabinet	7	7.3		

In regard to vaccination status, only 32.3% (31/96) of participants reported that they had been vaccinated against HBV. The vaccination coverage rate against HBV was significantly higher among laboratory personnel who had received a bachelor's degree (48.4%), and those who received the biosafety training (74.2%,)(Table 4).

Table 4. Hepatitis B virus vaccination according to some sociodemographic characteristics (n=96).

Variables	Vaccinated		Not Vaccinated		r Pvalue		
	N	(%)	N	(%)	Pvalue		
Education							
Diploma	7	22.6	47	72.3	P=0.000018*		
Bachelor	15	48.4	9	13.8	$\chi_2 = 21.8256$		
Master	9	29.0	9	13.8	χ ² -21.0230		
Work experience (years)							
<5	7	22.6	25	38.5	P=0.122635 χ2=4.1971		
5-10	8	25.8	20	30.8			
>10	16	51.6	20	30.8			
Received biosafety training course							
Yes	23	74.2	11	16.9	P=0.00001*		
No	8	25.8	54	83.1	$\chi 2 = 30.098$		

^{*} Significant.

Discussion

Worldwide, about three million HCWs are exposed to blood-borne viruses per year. Out of this, 2.5% and 40% of cases are owing to exposure to HIV, HBV and HCV respectively, and more than 90% of these cases occur in the developing countries (Cui, Zhu, Zhang, Wang, & Li, 2018; Goel, Kumar, Lingaiah, & Singh, 2017).

In the current study, 34.4% (33/96) of laboratory personnel suffered from needlestick injury during their work in the laboratory. This result was in line with previous studies from India (34%) (Nagi *et al.*, 2017), Ghana (33.6%)(Kumah *et al.*, 2020), and Yemen (37.5%)(Alwabr, 2018). However, higher prevalence rates were reported from Yemen (54.8%)(Al Eryani *et al.*, 2019), Iran (76%) (Jahangiri, Rostamabadi, Hoboubi, Tadayon, & Soleimani, 2016), and India (68.3%) (Archana Lakshmi, Raja, Meriton Stanly, Paul, & Gladius Jennifer, 2018). On the other hand, lower results were reported from Yemen(14.6%)(Al-Abhar, Moghram, Al-Gunaid, Al Serouri, & Khader, 2020) and Ethiopia (13.2%)(Dilie, Amare, & Gualu, 2017). This relatively high prevalence rate of NSI found in the current study could be explained by less work experience, lack of training on occupational health and infection prevention and lack of adequate and/or proper personal protective devices(Al-Abhar, Moghram, Al-Gunaid, Al Serouri, &

Khader, 2020; Alwabr, 2018; Kebede & Gerensea, 2018). In addition, in developing countries, the prevalence of NSIs is higher and underestimated, and it varies between countries and even can vary within a country. The possible reasons for these variations could be due to differences in awareness, degree of exposure to needles, and methodological differences among studies. Moreover, the prevalence can vary from facility to facility depending on standards, workload overload, overcrowding, type of profession, level of skills, and accessibility and use of resources(Kebede & Gerensea, 2018; Kumah et al., 2020).

In this study, a significant high NSIs prevalence rates of 65.6% and 41.9% were found among those who had less than 5 years of work experience (P<.000011), and those who had not received training courses on biosafety (P<.035193). These findings were in agreement with previous studies (Al-Abhar, Moghram, Al-Gunaid, Al Serouri, & Khader, 2020; Al Eryani *et al.*, 2019), and disagreed with other studies (Kebede & Gerensea, 2018). However, this finding could be explained by the long duration of services and experience and training on biosafety are important and helpful in enhancing awareness and improving attitudes and protective practices of laboratory personnel towards NSI(Khabour, Al Ali, & Mahallawi, 2018; Zhang, Gu, Cui, Stallones, & Xiang, 2015). Therefore, the implementation of universal infection prevention measures and biosafety training of laboratory personnel is crucial in reducing the exposure to NSIs(Al-Abhar, Moghram, Al-Gunaid, Al Serouri, & Khader, 2020; Kebede & Gerensea, 2018; Rajpal, Garg, Bano, & Singh, 2021; Zhang, Gu, Cui, Stallones, & Xiang, 2015).

In many previous studies, syringe needles were identified as the major source of NSIs(Kumah *et al.*, 2020; Zhang, Gu, Cui, Stallones, & Xiang, 2015), and the reasons which may be accounted for NSIs were recapping of used needles, improper handling, and poor disposal of needles by HCWs(Kumah *et al.*, 2020; Rajpal, Garg, Bano, & Singh, 2021). Therefore, in order to decrease the incidence of NSIs, sharp devices with safety engineering controls such as auto-disposable syringes, needle-free devices, and blunt immediately after use needles were introduced. These devices are help in reduce the risk of NSIs and are widely used in North America and Europe and they are required by law in some countries such as the USA(Alfulayw, Al-Otaibi, & Alqahtani, 2021).Implementation and the use of sharp devices with safety engineering controls should be considered, and laboratory personnel should be properly trained on how to use these devices, how safely handle sharp equipment, and dispose of used sharp, and needle recapping should be avoided(Alfulayw, Al-Otaibi, & Alqahtani, 2021).

In this study majority (66.7%; 22/33) of laboratory personnel who were exposed to needlestick injury during their work did not report the incidence of NSIs, while only one-third (33.3%; 11/33) were reported the incidence of NSIs. In the current study, the reason for not reporting might be because laboratory personnel did not know who and where to report needlestick injuries due to lack of reporting system. Consequently, in developing countries, the prevalence of NSIs is high and underreported (Goel, Kumar, Lingaiah, & Singh, 2017; Kumah *et al.*, 2020). In addition, this finding indicates the lack of

knowledge of the benefit of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)(Chalya *et al.*, 2015). Also, this result reflects the wrong belief that there is very low risk of infection transmission following needlestick injury(Alfulayw, Al-Otaibi, & Alqahtani, 2021; Chalya *et al.*, 2015; Kumah *et al.*, 2020). However, this result was in line with other developing countries(AlDakhil, Yenugadhati, Al-Seraihi, & Al-Zoughool, 2019; Kumah *et al.*, 2020; Rajpal, Garg, Bano, & Singh, 2021), and disagreed with another study which reported high (68.1%)reporting rate(Kumah *et al.*, 2020). However, it is important for all laboratory personnel to report all work-related needlestick injuries in order to get the treatment, prophylaxis, and advice (Alfulayw, Al-Otaibi, & Alqahtani, 2021; Rajpal, Garg, Bano, & Singh, 2021)Reporting system is very important for policies and interventions on occupational health exposure of healthcare workers. Therefore, reporting systems should be achieved, and healthcare organizations should motivate reporting(Mursy & Mohamed, 2019).

In this study more than ninety percent of laboratory personnel were found to wear gloves, laboratory coats, and masks. These findings were in accordance with a previous study(Afridi, Kumar, & Sayani, 2013; Al Eryani *et al.*, 2019; Alfulayw, Al-Otaibi, & Alqahtani, 2021; Kebede & Gerensea, 2018) and differ from other studies in which a low proportion of laboratory personnel used such personal protective devices (PPE)(Afridi, Kumar, & Sayani, 2013; Alfulayw *et al.*, 2021). The reasons for did not wear PPE could be attributed to the unavailability of the safety devices, overcrowding in health institution, and overlook to wear the protective devices (Alwabr, 2018).

It was estimated that healthcare workers who don't use PPE during their work are at higher risk of acquiring needlestick injury and subsequent infection with blood-borne pathogens in comparison with those who use personal protective equipment(Beyene & Yirsaw, 2014; Kebede & Gerensea, 2018; Velvzhi, Senthil, Sucilathangam, & Revathy, 2016). Thus, laboratory personnel should adhere to standard precautions such as wearing gloves and other protective equipment(Alfulayw, Al-Otaibi, & Alqahtani, 2021). Similar to other studies, other protective equipments such as safety cabinets, goggles, and eye washers were less available(Al-Abhar, Moghram, Al-Gunaid, Al Serouri, & Khader, 2020; Al Eryani *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, laboratories should be provided with protective equipment in sufficient quantities in order to reduce the incidence of NSIs(Alfulayw, Al-Otaibi, & Alqahtani, 2021; Arafa, Mohamed, & Anwar, 2016).

For pre-exposure prophylaxis to HBV, the commercially available throughout the world, since 1982 HBsAg vaccine (HBV vaccine) is currently recommended for all susceptible, at-risk groups, while, the specific hepatitis B immune globulin (HBIG) is recommended for post-exposure prophylaxis(Zhao, Zhou, & Zhou, 2020).HBV vaccine is up to 95% effective against hepatitis B if all the doses in the vaccination series is received (3 or 4 shots given at different times) and it provides protection for at least 20 years (Overturf, 2000; Schillie *et al.*, 2013).Persons exposed to HBV percutaneously or by contamination of mucosal surfaces should immediately receive both HBV vaccine and HBIG administered simultaneously at

different sites to provide passively acquired immunity and active acquired immunity (Arafa, Mohamed, & Anwar, 2016; Overturf, 2000). However, in developing countries, although HBV is endemic most HCWs are not vaccinated (Tatsilong et al., 2016). In this study, only 32.3% (31/96) of the participants had been vaccinated against HBV at the time of the study, while 67.7%(65/96) had never been vaccinated. Similar finding was reported in a previous study conducted among healthcare workers by Al Eryani et al from Yemen(Al Eryani et al., 2019) and by Mursy et al from Sudan(Mursy & Mohamed, 2019) and differ from a study finding in Yemen reported by Al-Abhar et al(Al-Abhar, Moghram, Al-Gunaid, Al Serouri, & Khader, 2020) and in Ethiopia by Kebede et al (Kebede & Gerensea, 2018) in which higher vaccination rate of 76.5% and 74,4% were reported respectively. However, this lower HBV vaccination rate reported in this study could be explained by the lack of awareness about occupational safety measures such as vaccination against HBV and post-exposure prophylaxis(Badawi, Atif, & Mustafa, 2018; Chalya et al., 2015). In addition, this could be due to that HBV vaccination is not routinely provided to HCWs in Yemen. Therefore, HBV vaccination should be achieved for laboratory personnel working at national center of public health laboratory in Aden. However, this study showed significant HBV vaccination rate among those who had received a bachelor's degree (P<0.000018), and those who received biosafety training(P<.0.00001). Similar result was reported by Al-Abhar et al in Yemen(Al-Abhar et al., 2020). This could reflect that knowledge and training courses on biosafety are helpful in increasing awareness as well as improving attitudes towards vaccination(Barbieri, Feitosa, Ramos, & Teixeira, 2019).

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study showed relatively higher NSIs prevalence rate among the laboratory personnel. The rate of underreporting of NSIs is also high among laboratory personnel whohad suffered from needlestick injuries. Moreover, low rate of receiving biosafety training course in laboratory and low vaccination coverage rate. Therefore, laboratory personnel should be trained on safety measures for handling and disposing of needles and sharp devices with safety engineering controls should be considered. In addition, laboratory personnel should be encouraged to report NSIs in order to get the treatment and consultation and laboratory should be provided with protective equipment in sufficient quantities in order to reduce the incidence of NSIs, and HBV vaccination should be achieved for laboratory personnel at the national center of public health laboratory in Aden.

Limitation

One of the of study's limitations; the sample was small and the participants were recruited from only one laboratory in Aden. Thus, the results cannot be generalized to all laboratories in Aden city.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank all the study participants and the administrators in the national center of public health laboratory in Aden, for their kind support to complete this study.

Funding

Funding for this research was covered by the author.

References

- Afridi, A. A. K., Kumar, A., & Sayani, R. (2013). Needle stick injuries—risk and preventive factors: a study among health care workers in tertiary care hospitals in Pakistan. *Global journal of health science*, *5*(4), 85.
- Al-Abhar, N., Moghram, G. S., Al-Gunaid, E. A., Al Serouri, A., & Khader, Y. (2020). Occupational exposure to needle stick injuries and hepatitis B vaccination coverage among clinical laboratory staff in Sana'a, Yemen: cross-sectional study. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance, 6*(1), e1581.
- Al Eryani, Y. M., Nooradain, N., Alsharqi, K., Murtadha, A., Al Serouri, A., & Khader, Y. (2019).
 Unintentional injuries in the three references laboratories: Sana'a, Yemen. *International journal of preventive medicine, 10*.
- AlDakhil, L., Yenugadhati, N., Al-Seraihi, O., & Al-Zoughool, M. (2019). Prevalence and associated factors for needlestick and sharp injuries (NSIs) among dental assistants in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. *Environmental health and preventive medicine, 24*(1), 1-7.
- Alfulayw, K. H., Al-Otaibi, S. T., & Alqahtani, H. A. (2021). Factors associated with needlestick injuries among healthcare workers: implications for prevention. *BMC Health Services Research*, *21*(1), 1-8.
- Alwabr, G. M. A. (2018). Knowledge and practice of needlestick injury preventive measures among nurses of Sana'a city hospitals in Yemen. *Indian Journal of Health Sciences and Biomedical Research* (KLEU), 11(1), 70.
- Arafa, A. E., Mohamed, A. A., & Anwar, M. M. (2016). Nurses' knowledge and practice of blood-borne pathogens and infection control measures in selected Beni-Suef hospitals Egypt. *Journal of the Egyptian Public Health Association*, *91*(3), 120-126.
- Archana Lakshmi, P., Raja, A., Meriton Stanly, A., Paul, C. M., & Gladius Jennifer, H. (2018). A cross sectional study onneedle stick and sharp injuries among health care providers in tertiary centers, Tamil Nadu. *International Journal Of Community Medicine And Public Health, 5*(3), 982.
- Badawi, M., Atif, M., & Mustafa, Y. (2018). Systematic review and meta-analysis of HIV . HBV and HCV infection prevalence in Sudan. *Virology journal, 15*(1), 1-16.
- Barbieri, A. A., Feitosa, F., Ramos, C. J., & Teixeira, S. C. (2019). Biosafety measures in dental practice: Literature Review. *Brazilian Dental Science*, *22*(1), 9-16.

- Beyene, H.& .Yirsaw, B. (2014). Occupational risk factors associated with needle-stick injury among healthcare workers in Hawassa City, Southern Ethiopia. *Occup Med Health Aff, 2*(156), 2.
- Chalya, P. L., Seni, J., Mushi, M. F., Mirambo, M. M., Jaka, H., Rambau, P.F., . . . Kalluvya, S. E. (2015). Needle-stick injuries and splash exposures among health-care workers at a tertiary care hospital in north-western Tanzania. *Tanzania Journal of Health Research*, 17(2).
- Cui, Z., Zhu, J., Zhang, X., Wang, B., & Li, X. (20 .(18Sharp injuries: a cross-sectional study among health care workers in a provincial teaching hospital in China. *Environmental health and preventive medicine*, *23*(1), 1-7.
- Dilie, A., Amare, D., & Gualu, T. (2017). Occupational exposure to needle stick and sharp injuries and associated factors among health care workers in Awi Zone, Amhara Regional State, Northwest Ethiopia, 2016. *Journal of environmental and public health, 2017*.
- Goel, V., Kumar, D., Lingaiah, R., & Singh, S. (2017). Occurrence of needlestick and injuries among health-care workers of a tertiary care teaching hospital in North India. *Journal of laboratory physicians*, *9*(01), 020-025.
- Himmelreich, H., Rabenau, H. F., Rindermann, M., Stephan, C., Bickel, M., Marzi, I., & Wicker, S. (2013). The management of needlestick injuries. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International, 110*(5), 61.
- Isara, A., & Ofili, A. (2012). Prevalence of occupational accidents/Injuries among health care workers in a federal medical centre in southern Nigeria. *West African journal of medicine, 31*(1), 47–51-47–51.
- Jahangiri, M., Rostamabadi, A., Hoboubi, N., Tadayon, N., & Soleimani, A. (2016). Needle stick injuries and their related safety measures among nurses in a university hospital, Shiraz, Iran. *Safety and health at work, 7*(1), 72-77.
- Kebede, A., &Gerensea, H. (2018). Prevalence of needle stick injury and its associated factors among nurses working in public hospitals of Dessie town, Northeast Ethiopia, 2016. *BMC research notes,* 11(1), 1-6.
- Khabour, O. F., Al Ali, K. H., & Mahallawi, W. H. (2018) .Occupational infection and needle stick injury among clinical laboratory workers in Al-Madinah city, Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Occupational Medicine* and Toxicology, 13(1), 1-7.
- Kumah, A., Agortimevor, H., Akakpo, F., Akpeke, H., Azi, G., & Gblende, E. (.(2020Prevalence and Risk Factors Associated with Needle Sticks and Sharp Injuries among Nurses at the Accident and Emergency Department of Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital, Kumasi-Ghana. *International Journal of Research in Nursing*, 11, 47-53.
- Marusic, V ..Markovic-Denic, L., Djuric, O., Protic, D., & Dubljanin-Raspopovic, E. (2017). Knowledge about blood-borne pathogens and the prevalence of needle stick injuries among medical students in Serbia. *Slovenian Journal of Public Health*, *56*(3), 179-184.

- Mursy, S. M.-e. M., & Mohamed, S. O. O. (2019). Knowledge, attitude, and practice towards Hepatitis B infection among nurses and midwives in two maternity hospitals in Khartoum, Sudan. *BMC public health*, *19*(1), 1-7.
- Nagi, M. L. F., Kazmi, S. T. H., Saleem, A. A., Khan, D., Afsar, H. H., & Akhtar, H. S. (2017). Needle stick and sharps injuries;: frequency and the factors contributing among health care workers of a tertiary care private hospital of lahore. *The Professional Medical Journal*, *24*(11), 1685-1690.
- Overturf, G. (2000). American Academy of Pediatrics. Committee on Infectious Diseases. Technical report: prevention of pneumococcal infections, including the use of pneumococcal conjugate and polysaccharide vaccines and antibiotic prophylaxis. *Pediatrics*, 106 (2 Pt 1), 367-376.
- Rajpal, S., Garg, S. K., Bano, T., & Singh, G. (2021). 'Prevalence of needle stick injuries among health care workers of various hospitals: a cross sectional study in an urban district of North India. *International Journal Community Medicine Public Health, 8*, 1976-1979.
- Saleh, S. M., Amer, A. T., & Al-Alawi, A.-h. (2018). Potential ecological risk of heavy metals in surface sediments from the Aden coast, Southern Yemen. *J. Environ. Sci. Toxicol. Food Technol, 12*(10), 42-55.
- Schillie, S. F., Murphy, T. V., Sawyer, M., Ly, K., Hughes, E., Jiles, R., . . . Ward, J. W. (2013). CDC guidance for evaluating health-care personnel for hepatitis B virus protection and for administering postexposure management.
- Shaghaghian, S., Golkari, A ..Pardis, S., & Rezayi, A. (2015). Occupational exposure of shiraz dental students to patients' blood and body fluid. *Journal of Dentistry*, *16*(3), 206.
- Tatsilong, H. O. P., Noubiap, J. J. N., Nansseu, J. R. N., Aminde, L. N., Bigna, J. J. R., Ndze, V. N. & Moyou, R. S. (2016). Hepatitis B infection awareness, vaccine perceptions and uptake, and serological profile of a group of health care workers in Yaoundé, Cameroon. *BMC public health*, 16(1), 1-7.
- Velvzhi, G., Senthil, K., Sucilathangam, G., & Revathy, C. (2016). Knowledge and attitude of medical students towards hepatitis B infection. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci, 5*(6), 570-576.
- Zhang, X., Gu, Y., Cui, M., Stallones, L., & Xiang, H. (2015). Needlestick and sharps injuries among nurses at a teaching hospital in China. *Workplace health & safety, 63*(5), 219-225.
- Zhao, H., Zhou, X., & Zhou, Y.-H. (2020). Hepatitis B vaccine development and implementation. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics, 16*(7), 1533-1544.