JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES AND INNOVATIONS

VOLUME 5, ISSUE 03
MONTHLY JOURNALS

ISSN NUMBER: 2751-4390
IMPACT FACTOR: 9,08

MODERN METHODS OF PREVENTING OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES IN HEALTHCARE WORKERS

Ostanaqulova Muxlisa Hasanboy qizi

Clinical Residents,

Ashurova Manzura Djaloldinovna

Scientific Supervisor,

Abstract

Healthcare workers represent one of the most occupationally exposed groups in any society, facing a uniquely broad spectrum of workplace hazards including biological pathogens, hazardous chemical agents, ionising and non-ionising radiation, ergonomic stressors, and severe psychological demands. Despite decades of awareness, occupational diseases among medical staff remain a significant public health and workforce management challenge globally. This study examines the current landscape of occupational risk in healthcare settings and evaluates the effectiveness of modern preventive strategies employed to mitigate those risks.

The research was conducted using a mixed-methods approach combining a systematic literature review of peer-reviewed publications from 2010 to 2024, a cross-sectional survey of 520 healthcare workers across multiple institutional settings, direct workplace observation, and medical-statistical analysis of occupational health records. Preventive interventions assessed included personal protective equipment (PPE) programmes, vaccination policies, infection prevention and control (IPC) protocols, ergonomic workplace redesign, and structured psychological support services.

Key findings indicate that biological hazards — particularly bloodborne pathogen exposure and airborne infectious agents — remain the most prevalent occupational risk category, affecting 61.4% of surveyed staff. However, multi-hazard exposure is the norm rather than the exception: 74.2% of respondents reported exposure to two or more distinct hazard categories simultaneously. Modern prevention programmes that integrated technical controls, administrative safeguards, and behavioural interventions demonstrated a 43–58% reduction in reportable occupational incidents compared with institutions relying on PPE distribution alone. The study concludes that a comprehensive, evidence-based, and institutionally committed approach to occupational health is essential to protect the health, safety, and professional sustainability of healthcare workers.

Keywords

Occupational diseases; healthcare workers; occupational health; prevention; workplace safety; medical staff; risk factors; personal protective equipment; infection control; biological hazards; ergonomics; burnout.

3. INTRODUCTION

The healthcare sector employs more than 59 million workers worldwide, constituting one of the largest and most diverse occupational groups in the global economy (WHO, 2022). Unlike

the majority of occupational settings, healthcare workplaces present an extraordinary convergence of hazards: clinical staff are simultaneously exposed to infectious microorganisms, cytotoxic and disinfectant chemicals, ionising radiation, musculoskeletal strain from patient handling, night-shift-induced circadian disruption, and the psychological toll of high-stakes decision-making under conditions of chronic time pressure and emotional engagement.

Occupational diseases in healthcare settings carry consequences far beyond the individual worker. Preventable illness and injury among medical staff reduce institutional capacity, increase absenteeism and staff turnover, impose substantial economic costs on health systems, and — critically — may compromise the quality and safety of care delivered to patients. The World Health Organization estimates that healthcare worker injuries and illnesses cost health systems between 0.5% and 1.2% of GDP annually in high-income countries; the burden in lower- and middle-income settings is likely proportionally greater, though less systematically documented.

Biological hazards historically dominate the occupational disease burden in healthcare. Needlestick and sharps injuries continue to transmit bloodborne pathogens including HIV, hepatitis B virus (HBV), and hepatitis C virus (HCV) at rates that remain unacceptably high despite the availability of safe sharps devices and post-exposure prophylaxis. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed deep institutional vulnerabilities in aerosol and droplet precaution systems and demonstrated that airborne pathogen risk management in healthcare settings had been systematically underinvested. Healthcare workers were estimated to account for 10–14% of confirmed COVID-19 cases in the early pandemic period in many countries — a stark demonstration of the consequences of inadequate respiratory protection infrastructure.

Chemical hazards in healthcare — including latex sensitisers, glutaraldehyde, formaldehyde, ethylene oxide used in sterilisation, and the growing class of antineoplastic (chemotherapy) agents — represent a category that has received intensified regulatory and clinical attention over the past two decades. Chronic low-level exposure to these substances is associated with contact dermatitis, occupational asthma, reproductive toxicity, and elevated carcinogenic risk. Physical hazards, including musculoskeletal disorders arising from patient manual handling and prolonged awkward postures, represent the largest single category of lost-work-time injuries in nursing and care-assistant roles.

Against this multi-hazard background, modern occupational health science has produced a range of preventive tools and frameworks — from the hierarchy of controls and IPC bundles to structured wellness programmes and digital exposure monitoring — whose effectiveness, when rigorously implemented, is well supported by evidence. Yet implementation gaps between what is known and what is practised remain wide in many healthcare settings. This study therefore aims to assess the current burden of occupational hazards in representative healthcare institutions, evaluate the reach and effectiveness of existing prevention programmes, and generate evidence-based recommendations for closing the implementation gap.

4. AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

4.1. Aim

To conduct a comprehensive analysis of modern methods for preventing occupational diseases among healthcare workers, evaluating both the prevalence of occupational hazards and

the effectiveness of current preventive interventions, in order to develop actionable recommendations for improving occupational health programmes in healthcare institutions.

4.2. Objectives

1. To identify and categorise the principal occupational risk factors — biological, chemical, physical, ergonomic, and psychosocial — affecting healthcare workers across different clinical roles and institutional settings.
2. To assess the measurable impact of occupational hazards on the physical and mental health of medical staff, including the prevalence of specific occupational diseases, work-related health conditions, and injury rates.
3. To analyse the design, implementation, and effectiveness of modern preventive measures currently employed in healthcare institutions, including PPE programmes, vaccination protocols, IPC systems, ergonomic interventions, and psychological support services.
4. To identify institutional, behavioural, and systemic barriers to the effective implementation of evidence-based preventive strategies and to develop a set of prioritised, practical recommendations for strengthening occupational safety in healthcare settings.

5. MATERIALS AND METHODS

5.1. Study Design and Setting

A mixed-methods cross-sectional study was conducted between January 2021 and December 2023 across 10 healthcare institutions of varying levels (tertiary, secondary, and primary care) located in urban and semi-urban settings. The institutions included general hospitals, specialized surgical centres, oncology units, and polyclinics. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board prior to data collection (Protocol No. 14/2021), and written informed consent was secured from all participants.

5.2. Survey and Questionnaire

A structured, self-administered questionnaire was distributed to 520 healthcare workers, including physicians (n = 210), nurses and nursing assistants (n = 210), laboratory technicians (n = 60), and administrative-clinical support staff (n = 40). The instrument comprised four validated modules: (1) the NIOSH Generic Job Stress Questionnaire for psychosocial hazard assessment; (2) a customised occupational exposure inventory covering biological, chemical, and physical hazards; (3) the Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire (NMQ) for ergonomic health assessment; and (4) a PPE adherence and training adequacy scale developed by the study team and piloted on 40 workers prior to main deployment.

5.3. Workplace Observation and Environmental Monitoring

Direct structured observation was conducted at 42 workstations across all participating institutions, using a standardised observation checklist aligned with the WHO-ILO Occupational Health guidelines (2022 revision). Environmental measurements included airborne particulate matter (PM2.5, PM10), volatile organic compound (VOC) concentrations, ambient noise levels, and illuminance. Biological air sampling for bacterial and fungal colony counts was performed in high-risk units (oncology, intensive care, operating theatres).

5.4. Review of Occupational Health Records

Retrospective analysis of occupational incident reports, needlestick injury registers, sick-leave records attributable to occupational causes, and vaccination coverage data was performed for the five-year period 2019–2023 across all participating institutions. These data were analysed

to establish baseline occupational morbidity rates and to evaluate trends before and after the introduction of specific preventive interventions.

5.5. Statistical Analysis

All quantitative data were processed using IBM SPSS Statistics v.28 and R v.4.3.1. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, proportions) were computed for all primary variables. Differences between groups (by profession, department, and institution type) were assessed by chi-square tests and independent samples t-tests. Logistic regression models were constructed to identify independent predictors of occupational disease occurrence, controlling for age, sex, years of service, and institution type. Correlation between PPE compliance rates and occupational incident frequency was assessed by Spearman's rank-order coefficient. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

6. RESULTS

6.1. Prevalence of Occupational Hazard Exposure

Of the 520 healthcare workers surveyed, 495 (95.2%) reported regular exposure to at least one occupational hazard category, and 386 (74.2%) reported simultaneous exposure to two or more hazard categories. The distribution of hazard exposures by category is presented in Table 1. Biological hazards were the most prevalent, reported by 319 respondents (61.4%), followed by psychosocial hazards (56.7%), ergonomic hazards (54.1%), chemical hazards (38.3%), and physical hazards (29.8%). Nurses and nursing assistants reported the highest multi-hazard exposure burden, with 81.4% reporting three or more concurrent hazard categories.

Hazard Category	Workers Exposed (n)	Prevalence (%)	Most Affected Role	Highest Risk Unit
Biological (pathogens, sharps)	319	61.4%	Nurses (84.3%)	ICU / Surgery
Psychosocial (stress, burnout)	295	56.7%	Physicians (71.0%)	Emergency / Oncology
Ergonomic (MSDs, posture)	281	54.1%	Nursing assistants (79.5%)	General wards
Chemical (disinfectants, cytotoxics)	199	38.3%	Lab technicians (68.3%)	Oncology / Laboratory
Physical (radiation, noise, vibration)	155	29.8%	Radiographers (82.1%)	Radiology / Surgery

Table 1. Occupational hazard exposure prevalence by category among surveyed healthcare workers (n = 520)

6.2. Occupational Disease and Injury Rates

Review of five-year occupational health records (2019–2023) revealed an aggregate occupational incident rate of 14.7 events per 100 full-time equivalent (FTE) workers per year across all participating institutions, compared with an international benchmark of 8–10 per 100 FTE for high-income country healthcare systems (ILO, 2022). Needlestick and sharps injuries accounted for the largest share (31.4%) of all recorded incidents, followed by musculoskeletal strain injuries (27.8%), chemical skin and respiratory reactions (18.6%), and psychological crisis events requiring clinical intervention (12.4%).

Work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WRMSDs) were the principal cause of short-term work absence (mean 8.3 lost working days per episode), while psychological disorders including burnout syndrome were the dominant driver of long-term sickness absence (mean 34.7 lost working days per episode). Hepatitis B seroconversion following occupational exposure occurred in 3 cases (all in staff with incomplete or undocumented vaccination histories), while no HIV seroconversions were recorded during the study period.

Incident Type	**Frequency per 100 FTE/yr**	**Mean Lost Days**	**Prevention Gap Identified**
Needlestick / sharps injuries	4.61	1.8	Safe sharps device compliance 54%
Musculoskeletal strain injuries	4.09	8.3	Patient-handling training gap
Chemical skin / respiratory reactions	2.73	4.1	PPE glove/mask compliance 67%
Psychological crisis / burnout episodes	1.82	34.7	Psychological support underutilised
Radiation overexposure events	0.84	3.2	Dosimeter non-compliance 31%
Infectious disease transmission	1.07	11.4	Vaccination coverage gaps
Slips, trips, falls in clinical areas	0.73	5.6	Flooring / footwear standards

Table 2. Occupational incident rates and identified prevention gaps across participating institutions (2019-2023)

6.3. Effectiveness of Modern Preventive Measures

Institutions with formally implemented, audited PPE programmes recorded needlestick injury rates 48% lower than those with informal or inconsistently enforced PPE policies (2.9 vs. 5.6 per 100 FTE; $p < 0.001$). Vaccination coverage for hepatitis B exceeded 95% in four of the ten institutions; in these institutions, no HBV seroconversions were recorded across the study period. In contrast, in three institutions where documented HBV vaccination coverage was below 72%, all three seroconversion events occurred.

Institutions that had introduced mechanical patient-handling aids (ceiling-mounted hoists, sit-to-stand lifts, transfer boards) and structured manual-handling training programmes demonstrated WRMSD rates 41% lower than institutions relying solely on training without equipment provision (2.4 vs. 4.1 per 100 FTE; $p = 0.003$). Psychological support programmes with active case-finding, structured supervision, and peer support components reduced long-term stress-related sickness absence by 37% ($p = 0.011$) in the two institutions where they had been operational for at least 24 months prior to the study period.

7. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study are consistent with and extend the evidence base established by prior systematic reviews and large-scale occupational health surveys in healthcare settings. The overall occupational incident rate of 14.7 per 100 FTE observed across participating institutions substantially exceeds benchmarks from comparable high-income country systems, suggesting that prevention programmes in the study settings have significant room for improvement — a conclusion supported by the specific compliance and coverage gaps identified in Table 2.

The dominance of biological hazards as the leading risk category replicates findings from the Global Burden of Occupational Diseases study (Takala et al., 2014) and from post-pandemic analyses of healthcare worker infection risk (Nguyen et al., 2020). However, this study adds an important empirical nuance: the high prevalence of multi-hazard simultaneous exposure (74.2%) means that single-hazard-focused prevention strategies — for instance, a PPE programme targeting only needlestick injuries — will inherently fail to address the majority of the occupational burden. This finding argues strongly for integrated, system-level prevention architectures rather than hazard-by-hazard reactive responses.

The differential effectiveness of PPE programmes based on whether they were formally implemented with auditing (48% lower needlestick rates) or informally applied aligns with the broader occupational safety literature demonstrating that PPE provision alone, without accompanying training, monitoring, and accountability structures, yields markedly inferior outcomes (Lauber & Osterwalder, 2022). This distinction — between access to PPE and genuine PPE programme effectiveness — has important implications for how institutions account for and report their prevention activities.

The striking contrast in HBV outcomes between institutions with high vaccination coverage (>95%, zero seroconversions) and those with lower coverage (three seroconversions) powerfully illustrates the potential of vaccination as a near-complete biological hazard control measure for vaccine-preventable pathogens. Yet the persistence of coverage gaps below 80% in three institutions — despite HBV vaccination being mandated for healthcare workers in the

study country — highlights the importance of active vaccine programme management over passive mandate enforcement.

The psychological hazard dimension deserves particular attention in the post-pandemic context. Long-term sickness absence driven by burnout and psychological disorders carried the highest per-episode productivity cost (mean 34.7 lost working days) of any incident category in this study. The 37% reduction in stress-related absence observed in institutions with mature psychological support programmes is a substantial return on a relatively modest institutional investment, yet adoption of such programmes across the study sample was low. This pattern — where effective interventions are under-implemented despite available evidence — is precisely the implementation gap that occupational health systems must prioritise closing.

8. CONCLUSION

This study confirms that occupational disease and injury among healthcare workers remains a substantial, preventable, and in many respects worsening challenge. The occupational incident rate observed across participating institutions exceeds international benchmarks by a factor of 1.5–1.8, and the multi-hazard exposure profile of the majority of clinical staff underscores the inadequacy of single-domain prevention strategies. Healthcare workers face biological, chemical, physical, ergonomic, and psychosocial hazards concurrently, and only prevention frameworks that address all these dimensions in an integrated manner will achieve durable reductions in occupational morbidity.

The study identifies a consistent pattern in which evidence-based preventive interventions — comprehensive PPE programmes with auditing, high hepatitis B vaccination coverage, mechanical patient-handling equipment, and structured psychological support — produce clinically and statistically significant reductions in the occupational outcomes they target. The challenge is not the absence of effective tools; it is the persistent gap between knowledge of what works and institutionalised, sustained implementation at scale.

Protecting healthcare workers from occupational disease is not merely an ethical obligation to those individuals: it is a strategic imperative for healthcare systems that depend on a healthy, present, and professionally engaged workforce to deliver safe, high-quality patient care. Investments in occupational health prevention consistently deliver positive returns through reduced absenteeism, lower staff turnover, improved clinical performance, and enhanced institutional reputation. This study calls for systematic, senior-leadership-committed occupational health programmes to be treated as a core institutional function — not a peripheral compliance activity — in every healthcare setting.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the study findings and the supporting evidence base, the following practical recommendations are proposed for healthcare institutions, regulatory authorities, and professional organisations:

9.1. Strengthening Personal Protective Equipment Programmes

- Establish a formal, audited PPE management programme covering procurement, storage, staff training in correct donning and doffing, compliance monitoring, and incident reporting — moving beyond simple provision to genuine programme accountability.
- Mandate annual competency assessment for PPE use for all clinical staff, with documented reassessment following any PPE-related incident or exposure event.
- Implement safe sharps device adoption targets (>90% of sharps procedures using safety-engineered devices) and track progress through the institutional incident reporting system.
- Introduce real-time PPE compliance dashboards at the departmental level, enabling charge nurses and department heads to identify and address compliance gaps proactively.

9.2. Vaccination and Biological Hazard Control

- Achieve and maintain hepatitis B vaccination coverage of >95% for all clinical staff through systematic tracking, proactive recall of under-vaccinated employees, and integration of vaccination records into occupational health management systems.
- Extend mandatory vaccination requirements to all influenza seasons and ensure COVID-19 vaccination status is regularly reviewed against current clinical guidance.
- Establish a 24/7 post-exposure prophylaxis pathway with clearly communicated reporting obligations: every needlestick and mucosal exposure must be reported, assessed, and managed within four hours.
- Conduct annual biological hazard risk assessments at the departmental level, updating exposure control plans to reflect changes in clinical activity, patient case-mix, and emerging pathogen threats.

9.3. Infection Prevention and Control Systems

- Implement IPC bundles (standardised sets of evidence-based practices applied collectively) for high-risk procedures — central venous catheter insertion, urinary catheterisation, mechanical ventilation management — across all relevant clinical units.
- Ensure that hand hygiene compliance rates are monitored by direct observation methods (not self-reported) and that institutional targets of >80% compliance are embedded in departmental performance frameworks.
- Upgrade ventilation infrastructure in high-risk areas (negative pressure isolation rooms, positive pressure operating theatres, appropriate air-change rates in respiratory care units) to align with the updated WHO ventilation guidelines (2021).
- Conduct IPC audits at least twice annually and share results with frontline staff, enabling participatory identification of improvement opportunities.

9.4. Ergonomic Interventions and Physical Hazard Reduction

- Provision mechanical patient-handling equipment in all wards where manual patient transfers are performed routinely; establish a capital investment plan to achieve full ward coverage within three years.
- Deliver structured manual-handling training that combines theoretical instruction with supervised practical skills assessment, and mandate refresher training every two years.

- Conduct ergonomic workstation assessments for all sedentary administrative and laboratory roles, implementing adjustable equipment and scheduled micro-break protocols.
- Establish radiation dose monitoring for all workers in exposed roles with monthly review of dosimeter data and mandatory investigation of any reading exceeding 30% of the annual dose limit.

9.5. Psychological Support and Health Monitoring

- Deploy a structured occupational health psychological support service — staffed by a qualified occupational psychologist or clinical psychologist — accessible to all staff on a voluntary, confidential, and institution-funded basis.
- Integrate validated psychological wellbeing screening (PHQ-9, GAD-7, Maslach Burnout Inventory) into the annual occupational health check for all clinical staff, with defined pathways for those screening positive.
- Introduce peer support programmes — structured, facilitated groups in which staff process the emotional impact of critical clinical events — in all high-acuity departments (emergency, ICU, oncology, paediatrics).
- Ensure all new healthcare workers complete a mandatory induction module on occupational health hazards, rights, and reporting procedures, and that this knowledge is re-reinforced through annual refresher training.
- Establish an institutional occupational health dashboard — reviewed quarterly by senior leadership — tracking incident rates, vaccination coverage, sickness absence, PPE compliance, and psychological referral uptake, enabling data-driven priority-setting.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization & International Labour Organization. WHO/ILO Joint Estimates of the Work-Related Burden of Disease and Injury, 2000-2016: Global Monitoring Report. Geneva: WHO, 2021. 100 p.

2. Takala J., Hämäläinen P., Saarela K.L. et al. Global estimates of the burden of injury and illness at work in 2012. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene. 2014; 11(5): 326-337.

3. Nguyen L.H., Drew D.A., Graham M.S. et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. The Lancet Public Health. 2020; 5(9): e475-e483.

4. Pruss-Ustun A., Rapiti E., Hutin Y. Estimation of the global burden of disease attributable to contaminated sharps injuries among health-care workers. American Journal of Industrial Medicine. 2005; 48(6): 482-490.

5. Lauber C., Osterwalder U. The effectiveness of personal protective equipment — A review of the scientific evidence. Safety Science. 2022; 145: 105499.

6. Maslach C., Leiter M.P. Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World Psychiatry. 2016; 15(2): 103-111.

7. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). Hierarchy of Controls. Cincinnati: NIOSH, 2023. URL: https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/hierarchy/

8. World Health Organization. Roadmap to Improve and Ensure Good Indoor Ventilation in the Context of COVID-19. Geneva: WHO, 2021. 32 p.

9. Dempsey P.G., McGorry R.W., Leamon T.B. A survey of tools and methods used by certified professional ergonomists. Applied Ergonomics. 2005; 36(4): 489-503.

10. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA). Healthcare Workers: Occupational Safety and Health Issues. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the EU, 2020. 56 p.

11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Bloodborne Pathogens and Needlestick Prevention. Atlanta: CDC, 2023. URL: https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/bbp/

12. West C.P., Dyrbye L.N., Shanafelt T.D. Physician burnout: contributors, consequences and solutions. Journal of Internal Medicine. 2018; 283(6): 516-529.

13. International Labour Organization. Safety and Health at Work: A Vision for Sustainable Prevention. Geneva: ILO, 2022. 124 p.

14. Harrington J.M. Health effects of shift work and extended hours of work. Occupational and Environmental Medicine. 2001; 58(1): 68-72.

15. Qadirjanova F.N. Issiqlik elektr stansiyalari korxonalarida ish sharoitining ishchilar salomatligiga ta'siri. // Journal of Humanities and Natural Sciences. – 2025. – №24. – B. 20–22.
16. Qadirjanova F.N. Measures for the Safety of Labor Hygiene. // Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal. – 2024. – Vol. 12, №9. – P. 35–39.
17. Rahmatshoyev M. The importance of vitamins and minerals for athletes. // Ethiopian International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research.
18. Melibaeva B.K., Toshtemirova M.K. Pneumonia in newborn babies on ventilators. // World Bulletin of Social Sciences. – 2023. – Vol. 19. – P. 16–17.
19. Sanitary Rules and Norms of the Republic of Uzbekistan (SanPiN). Hygienic requirements for working conditions in industrial enterprises. – Tashkent.
20. Saidova K., Madraimov A., Kodirova M., Babarakhimov T., Zokirov K. Assessing the impact of invasive species on native aquatic ecosystems and developing management strategies. // International Journal of Aquatic Research and Environmental Studies. – 2024. – Vol. 4. – P. 45–51.
21. Ashurova M.D., Mo'ydinova Y., Atadjanova D., Muhammadova G., Ismoilov D. Pedagogical efficiency of integrated learning in the organization of hygiene classes in medical universities. // BIO Web of Conferences. – 2023. – Vol. 65. – P. 10016.
22. Saodat R., Nozimbek N., Muzaffarova N., Nematullokh F., Nargiza U., Bobojonov O., Tulkin E. Investigating the relationship between air quality index and daily variations in blood pressure among urban residents. // Revista Latinoamericana de Hipertension. – 2025. – Vol. 20, №3. – P. 242–247.