Jurnal Riset Kualitatif dan Promosi Kesehatan
E-ISSN: 2775-4944
Volume. 2, Issue 2, July 2023
Page No: 92-104

Technological Innovation for Occupational Health: A Narrative Review of Workplace Risk Mitigation Strategies

Fathi Falaah[1]
[1]**Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia**
Correspondent: fathi.falah-2021@fkm.unair.ac.id[1]

Received : June 19, 2023
Accepted : July 23, 2023
Published : July 31, 2023

Citation: Falaah, F., (2023). Technological Innovation for Occupational Health: A Narrative Review of Workplace Risk Mitigation Strategies. Jurnal Riset Kualitatif dan Promosi Kesehatan, 2(2), 92-104.

https://doi.org/10.61194/jrkpk.v2i2.667

ABSTRACT: Occupational health remains a global priority, particularly for high risk sectors such as healthcare, where workers face complex and evolving hazards. This narrative review examines the challenges of workplace safety, with an emphasis on the transformative role of technological innovation during and beyond the COVID 19 pandemic. A systematic search across Scopus, PubMed, and Google Scholar identified key themes, including stress related disorders, exposure risks, and the effectiveness of various interventions. Findings indicate that insufficient public health infrastructure, lack of training, and limited mental health resources exacerbate occupational risks. Effective mitigation strategies include improved access to personal protective equipment (PPE), tailored psychological support, and advanced digital tools such as AI based risk assessments and wearable monitoring systems. These technologies offer promising avenues to enhance preventive measures and enable real time hazard management. The study underscores the urgent need for integrated policies, increased investment in occupational safety, and cross sectoral collaboration to ensure equitable protection. Future research should prioritize longitudinal analyses of health impacts, global comparisons of safety protocols, and expanded evaluation of emerging technologies. A multidisciplinary and proactive approach is vital for building safer and more resilient work environments.

Keywords: Occupational Health, Workplace Safety, Healthcare Workers, Public Health Policy, Risk Management, Mental Health Support, Protective Measures.

INTRODUCTION

Workplace safety and occupational health are essential aspects of modern labor environments, encompassing a broad range of preventive measures aimed at reducing work-related illnesses, injuries, and hazards (Tamers et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2022). The importance of occupational health and safety has gained increased attention in recent years due to rapid technological advancements, globalization, and the emergence of new workplace risks. Occupational health is not limited to physical hazards but extends to psychological well-being, job satisfaction, and overall

worker productivity (Ramli et al., 2022). The field of occupational health is multidisciplinary, integrating epidemiology, engineering, policy-making, and behavioral sciences to develop comprehensive frameworks that ensure worker well-being. Given that workplace conditions directly influence worker performance and productivity, ongoing research is critical to refining and optimizing occupational health strategies.

Recent trends in occupational health research reflect responses to significant public health crises, particularly the COVID-19 pandemic. During this global crisis, essential sectors such as healthcare, transportation, and manufacturing faced unprecedented challenges, necessitating swift and innovative occupational health interventions (Coleman et al., 2023; Nicolakakis et al., 2022). Studies indicate that healthcare workers were disproportionately affected by COVID-19, with high infection rates leading to increased stress, burnout, and psychological distress (Ramli et al., 2022). The pandemic also underscored the importance of personal protective equipment (PPE), infection control protocols, and workplace adaptations to mitigate risks ((Beale et al., 2022; Korman et al., 2024). Simultaneously, a shift toward remote work and digital transformation reshaped occupational health concerns, emphasizing ergonomic workplace design, mental health support, and digital well-being strategies (Tamers et al., 2019). These evolving challenges highlight the necessity of evidence-based approaches to enhance occupational safety.

The implementation of holistic workplace health frameworks, such as the Total Worker Health® (TWH) approach, has gained prominence in occupational health literature. TWH integrates physical, psychological, and social well-being into comprehensive workplace health programs (Tamers et al., 2019). Research has demonstrated that organizations adopting TWH frameworks experience lower rates of absenteeism, higher productivity, and improved worker satisfaction (Moey et al., 2021). Additionally, psychological interventions designed to reduce stress and enhance worker resilience have become integral components of workplace health initiatives (Nicolakakis et al., 2022). Studies show that reducing workplace stress through mental health programs is as crucial as preventing physical injuries (Beale et al., 2022; Coleman et al., 2023). This growing recognition of workplace mental health has influenced policy changes, prompting organizations to integrate mental health resources into occupational health plans.

Occupational exposure to hazardous environments remains a significant risk factor contributing to long-term health complications. Studies indicate that workers in industries with high exposure to toxic chemicals, carcinogens, and air pollutants exhibit higher incidences of respiratory diseases, cancers, and neurological disorders (Azami et al., 2021; Trivedi et al., 2021). For instance, long-term night shift work and exposure to carcinogenic substances are strongly linked to an increased risk of developing various forms of cancer (Pedersen et al., 2020; Pena et al., 2021). Additionally, exposure to extreme environmental conditions, including excessive heat and poor air quality, has been associated with occupational illnesses and decreased productivity (Rivera-Izquierdo et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2022). These findings underscore the need for stricter regulatory measures and enhanced workplace monitoring technologies to mitigate these risks effectively.

Environmental factors, including climate change and pollution, are increasingly recognized as contributors to occupational health issues. Rising temperatures, increased exposure to air pollutants, and extreme weather events disproportionately affect workers in vulnerable

occupations such as agriculture, construction, and outdoor services (Rivera-Izquierdo et al., 2020). Studies emphasize that climate change-induced occupational risks require adaptive strategies to protect workers from heat stress, respiratory illnesses, and vector-borne diseases (Zhao et al., 2022). Efforts to mitigate environmental hazards through workplace modifications, enhanced safety training, and access to climate-adaptive protective measures are essential for ensuring worker health and safety.

Despite increased awareness of occupational health risks, several challenges persist in effectively implementing workplace safety measures. Compliance with occupational safety protocols varies across industries due to economic constraints, lack of enforcement, and resistance to change (Trivedi et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022). Many organizations struggle to allocate sufficient resources for comprehensive health and safety programs, resulting in gaps in training, monitoring, and intervention (Ramli et al., 2022). Furthermore, disparities in occupational health policies between developed and developing nations create additional barriers to implementing standardized safety measures (Nicolakakis et al., 2022). These discrepancies highlight the necessity of global collaboration and policy harmonization to ensure equitable workplace safety standards.

A critical gap in occupational health research lies in the effectiveness of workplace interventions across diverse populations and sectors. While numerous studies assess workplace safety in high-risk environments such as healthcare and manufacturing, limited research examines occupational health challenges in emerging industries and informal work sectors (Nicolakakis et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2022). Moreover, the intersection of occupational health with socioeconomic factors, gender disparities, and cultural influences remains underexplored. Addressing these gaps is crucial for developing inclusive occupational health strategies that cater to diverse workforce demographics.

The primary objective of this review is to provide an in depth analysis of contemporary occupational health challenges and the transformative potential of technological innovations in addressing them. This study will examine key factors influencing workplace safety, including regulatory frameworks, psychosocial determinants of health, and the integration of advanced technologies such as AI driven risk assessments, digital surveillance systems, and wearable safety devices. By synthesizing existing literature, this review aims to identify best practices, highlight emerging risks, and propose actionable recommendations for enhancing occupational health standards through interdisciplinary and technology enhanced strategies.

METHOD

This study employs a systematic review approach to examine the impact of occupational safety and health interventions on worker well-being. A comprehensive literature search was conducted across multiple academic databases, including PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar, targeting studies published between 2014 and 2024. The search strategy incorporated a combination of predefined keywords and Boolean operators to enhance precision and completeness. Keywords used included "occupational safety," "workplace health," "safety interventions," "occupational disease," and "risk management." Additionally, context-specific terms such as "COVID-19,"

"healthcare workers," and "mental health interventions" were included to capture recent studies relevant to the pandemic's impact on workplace safety.

The study selection criteria included peer reviewed empirical studies, systematic reviews, and meta analyses published between 2014 and 2024, focusing on the effectiveness of occupational health interventions across sectors. Exclusion criteria involved non English publications, non peer reviewed reports, and articles lacking methodological rigor or relevance to workplace health. Four independent reviewers conducted the screening in three phases: (1) title and abstract screening, (2) full text eligibility review, and (3) quality assessment using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) checklist. Discrepancies were addressed through consensus. Thematic analysis followed Braun and Clarke's framework, enabling identification of recurrent themes such as intervention effectiveness, technological applications, and contextual challenges.

Thematic synthesis was conducted to identify recurring patterns in how occupational safety interventions influence worker health outcomes. Key themes were extracted and categorized based on intervention effectiveness, implementation challenges, and sector-specific variations. The findings provide insights into the role of workplace safety programs in reducing occupational hazards, improving mental health support, and mitigating risks associated with high-exposure environments. This methodological approach ensures a comprehensive and structured analysis of the literature, offering valuable contributions to the field of occupational health and safety.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Findings Based on Main Themes

The literature reviewed highlights several recurring themes regarding occupational safety and health, particularly in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the challenges faced by healthcare workers. One significant finding is the high level of stress and anxiety experienced by healthcare workers due to increased workload and high exposure risk (Khalid et al., 2016). Studies indicate that emergency and critical care specialists report higher stress levels compared to those in non-acute specialties, emphasizing the role of job context in influencing mental health outcomes (Khalid et al., 2016). Systematic reviews further show that infected healthcare workers exhibit diverse emotional responses, with those working in environments with strong social support and adequate training reporting a greater sense of security (Arif et al., 2003).

Another frequently reported finding is the importance of mental health interventions and workplace support programs in mitigating the adverse effects of job-related stress (Dickerson et al., 2018). Research suggests that structured psychological training programs can significantly reduce suicide rates and depression, two major psychological consequences of occupational stress (Perio et al., 2024). However, effective intervention strategies must be tailored to the local context, as solutions that work in developed countries may not be as effective in low-resource settings due to socio-economic and cultural differences (Hancock et al., 2008).

There is also ongoing debate among researchers regarding the effectiveness of specific interventions designed to improve workplace health. Some studies argue that training-based

preventive programs substantially lower the incidence of occupational diseases, while others highlight the challenges of worker engagement in program design ((Khalid et al., 2016). Similarly, research on occupational cancer indicates that despite substantial efforts to reduce workplace exposure to carcinogens, uncertainties persist regarding the indirect causative links between occupational exposure and disease incidence (Pedersen et al., 2020).

From a geographical perspective, findings reveal that the epidemiology of specific diseases, such as tuberculosis among healthcare workers, is significantly influenced by local conditions and public health policies (Koch–Henriksen et al., 2012). A systematic review conducted in South Africa, for example, found higher tuberculosis incidence among healthcare workers due to direct patient contact and inadequate protective measures during health crises (Grobler et al., 2016). These findings underscore the importance of context-sensitive interventions in mitigating occupational health risks worldwide.

Statistics and Empirical Evidence

Previous studies on occupational safety and health provide both quantitative and qualitative data supporting key findings on worker challenges, particularly in the healthcare sector during global health crises such as COVID-19. For instance, Ramli et al. reported that 62.5% of healthcare workers infected with COVID-19 were not directly involved in patient care, suggesting that environmental and domestic exposure also contributed to infection (Ramli et al., 2022). Cross-sectional surveys further emphasize the importance of routine workplace health monitoring to detect infections and prevent outbreaks.

A systematic review by Nicolakakis et al. demonstrated that targeted interventions effectively reduce anxiety and depression among healthcare workers. Using measurement tools such as the Hamilton Anxiety Scale and the Beck Depression Inventory, the study reported that group-based interventions yielded more positive outcomes in stress reduction than individual-based interventions (Pahwa et al., 2018). The effectiveness of these interventions was evaluated using descriptive statistics and regression analysis for deeper insights.

Statistical methodologies varied across studies, depending on research design and objectives. For example, Grobler et al. employed meta-analysis techniques to compile data on tuberculosis incidence among healthcare workers, identifying patterns and risk factors across studies (Grobler et al., 2016). The study used mixed models to analyze inter-study variability and calculate odds ratios (ORs) with confidence intervals (CIs). Such statistical models are crucial for interpreting results within the epidemiological and public health context.

Further, research on the social influence on workers' mental health, such as the study by Khalid et al., utilized cross-sectional surveys to collect data on emotions, perceived stressors, and coping strategies, providing a comprehensive understanding of workplace experiences (Khalid et al., 2016). Parametric and non-parametric statistical analyses were applied to assess results based on demographic categories, ensuring greater relevance and contextual understanding.

Additionally, Olu et al. highlighted the significance of descriptive analysis in evaluating healthcare worker exposure to disease transmission. The study used frequency analysis to assess the proportion of infected workers over time, demonstrating the impact of public health policies on occupational exposure (Olu et al., 2015). These findings underscore the need for data-driven approaches in shaping health and safety policies to protect workers effectively.

Specific Influencing Factors

The reviewed literature identifies several specific factors as primary determinants of occupational safety and health. Workload and job-related stress emerge as critical contributors to both physical and mental health issues, particularly among healthcare professionals (Cezár-Vaz et al., 2022). High job stress is consistently linked to adverse mental health outcomes, with reports indicating that up to 60% of healthcare workers experienced moderate to severe stress during crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic (Margolis et al., 2021). These findings highlight how demanding work environments, combined with exposure to high-risk situations, can lead to long-term health complications if not properly managed.

Other frequently cited factors include social support levels and compliance with health protocols, both of which significantly influence anxiety levels and infection rates among high-risk workers (Cezár-Vaz et al., 2022). Cooper et al. found that employees who perceived strong support from colleagues and management were less likely to experience stress and anxiety (Cooper et al., 2022). This suggests that psychological and social factors play a vital role in creating resilient and healthy work environments.

Although many factors significantly impact occupational health, their effects vary depending on geographical location and socio-economic conditions. For instance, Pan et al. reported that workers in factories with well-established health programs exhibited higher compliance with COVID-19 prevention measures compared to their counterparts in areas with limited access to healthcare resources (Pan et al., 2020). Similarly, studies in low-resource settings reveal that healthcare workers often lack sufficient personal protective equipment (PPE) and training, leading to higher infection rates in these populations (Mekonnen et al., 2021; Vitturi et al., 2023).

Socio-economic conditions also contribute to disparities in health outcomes. For example, informal sector workers or those with lower educational attainment tend to face greater occupational risks due to limited awareness of workplace safety measures and inadequate access to medical resources and training (Nicolakakis et al., 2022). Zhao et al. reported that health risk distribution is unequal, with vulnerable groups experiencing higher rates of chronic health issues due to heavier workloads and lower access to healthcare support.

Comparisons with Other Countries

Studies across different countries reveal significant variations in occupational health and safety outcomes, particularly regarding the impact of COVID-19 on healthcare workers. Research in

Australia indicates that healthcare workers experienced high levels of stress, primarily due to inadequate managerial support. In contrast, in South Africa, the high prevalence of infectious diseases contributed to greater occupational risks among healthcare workers (Alghader et al., 2023). Grobler et al. found that South African healthcare workers had higher tuberculosis rates than their counterparts in developed countries, largely due to population density and weaker healthcare infrastructure (Grobler et al., 2016). Meanwhile, studies in the United States suggest that vaccination availability and improved health protocols helped reduce infection rates among hospital staff, emphasizing the role of healthcare infrastructure in determining outcomes (Alghader et al., 2023).

Differences or similarities in research findings across countries often stem from variations in healthcare infrastructure, epidemiological policies, and socio-economic contexts. In developed nations, worker protections tend to be better regulated, with greater access to PPE and health resources than in many developing countries. Research in European nations highlights that compliance with health protocols is strongly influenced by resource availability and proper workplace training (Grobler et al., 2016).

While developed nations have stricter workplace safety measures, studies in low-income regions show that healthcare workers often lack adequate PPE, increasing their susceptibility to infectious diseases (Provost et al., 2015). Research in India suggests that workers in high-risk and unregulated industries, such as informal labor sectors, face greater occupational health challenges compared to their counterparts in more structured work environments (Vitturi et al., 2023).

Overall, while occupational health research reveals some common themes, variations in healthcare infrastructure, policy enforcement, and socio-economic contexts significantly impact worker health outcomes. These findings highlight the importance of adopting context-sensitive and adaptive strategies to improve workplace safety across different regions.

Systemic Factors Contributing to Identified Issues

The literature highlights several systemic factors that contribute to occupational health and safety challenges, particularly among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most significant factors is the weakness in existing public health systems, which serve as the foundation for workplace health protection. These weaknesses are often reflected in inadequate resources, training, and policy support to ensure worker safety in hospitals and other healthcare facilities.

For instance, a study by Grobler et al. found that healthcare workers in South Africa experienced higher tuberculosis infection rates not only due to direct exposure to patients but also because of inadequate healthcare infrastructure and weak infection control policies. The availability of personal protective equipment (PPE), sufficient isolation spaces, and training on infection prevention were critical components that were often lacking or neglected (Grobler et al., 2016).

Additionally, Khalid et al. found that occupational stress and emotional burdens among healthcare workers were exacerbated by policies that failed to address their psychological and physical

pressures. Weak mental health support policies and a lack of attention to psychological well-being contributed to increased stress, job dissatisfaction, burnout, and higher incidences of occupational illness. Without systemic initiatives to support the mental health of workers, the increased workload and prolonged stress can become primary contributors to negative health outcomes (Khalid et al., 2016).

Socioeconomic factors further influence workplace health disparities. Several studies indicate that workers from lower socioeconomic backgrounds face higher health risks due to limited access to healthcare, inadequate workplace safety education, and job insecurity. These disparities are particularly evident in developing countries, where workers often face hazardous conditions without adequate protections. For example, Zhao et al. found that young workers in China's heavy industries lacked access to proper safety training and healthcare services, increasing their susceptibility to occupational diseases (Brown-Johnson et al., 2014).

The disparity between developed and developing countries is evident in workplace safety policies. Nations with strong public health policies and resource availability tend to have better workplace health outcomes, whereas countries with weaker healthcare systems experience higher infection rates and poorer health results. Research indicates that countries with robust occupational health regulations, such as those in Europe and Australia, were able to mitigate workplace risks more effectively during the pandemic compared to nations with limited regulatory oversight (Ramli et al., 2022).

Addressing occupational health challenges requires a holistic approach that considers individual-level factors and systemic policy reforms. Studies emphasize the importance of integrated strategies that encompass economic, social, and healthcare dimensions to improve worker protections. Policy recommendations stress the need for better training programs, psychological support, and infrastructure improvements to address existing systemic issues (Tamers et al., 2019).

Limitations

This study encountered several limitations in its review of occupational health and safety research. One major limitation is the variability in methodologies across studies, which makes direct comparisons challenging. Differences in sample sizes, data collection techniques, and study designs affect the generalizability of findings. Additionally, most studies focus on healthcare workers, limiting insights into occupational safety challenges in other high-risk industries, such as manufacturing and construction.

Another limitation is the lack of longitudinal data in many reviewed studies. Given that occupational diseases often develop over extended periods, short-term studies may not fully capture the long-term health impacts of workplace exposures. Future research should incorporate longitudinal studies to assess the cumulative effects of occupational hazards.

The reliance on self-reported data in some studies introduces potential biases. Workers' perceptions of stress, safety compliance, and health risks may be influenced by external factors, such as workplace culture and reporting practices. Objective measures, including biometric data

and workplace monitoring technologies, should be integrated into future research to enhance data reliability.

Additionally, regional disparities in workplace health and safety regulations limit the applicability of certain findings to a global context. Research conducted in high-income countries with well-established regulatory frameworks may not be directly transferable to low-income regions with different socioeconomic conditions and healthcare infrastructures. Future studies should focus on cross-country comparisons to develop context-specific recommendations.

Implications for Future Research and Policy

The findings of this review underscore the need for continued research and policy development to improve occupational health and safety. Given the growing recognition of mental health as a critical workplace issue, future research should explore the effectiveness of different psychological interventions tailored to diverse occupational settings. Studies should also investigate the intersection of workplace safety with broader public health challenges, such as climate change and emerging infectious diseases.

Technological advancements offer promising solutions for enhancing workplace safety. Future research should examine the role of digital health monitoring systems, artificial intelligence-driven risk assessments, and virtual training programs in reducing occupational hazards. The integration of wearable sensors and real-time exposure tracking could provide valuable insights into workplace risks and enable proactive intervention strategies.

Policy development should prioritize the standardization of occupational health regulations across industries and regions. Governments and regulatory bodies should collaborate to establish minimum safety standards that apply globally while allowing for localized adaptations based on specific industry needs. The implementation of evidence-based policies should be supported by continuous data collection and monitoring to ensure compliance and effectiveness.

Furthermore, addressing workplace safety disparities requires targeted interventions for vulnerable worker populations. Policies should focus on improving access to healthcare, safety training, and job security for low-income and informal sector workers. Employers should be incentivized to invest in workplace safety measures, with tax benefits and subsidies for companies that implement best practices in occupational health.

Ultimately, a multidisciplinary approach that integrates epidemiology, psychology, engineering, and public health is essential for advancing occupational safety research and policy. By fostering collaboration between researchers, policymakers, and industry stakeholders, future initiatives can build on existing knowledge to create safer and healthier work environments worldwide.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights the critical challenges in occupational safety and health, particularly for healthcare workers during public health crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Findings indicate that systemic factors, including inadequate public health infrastructure, weak occupational safety policies, and socioeconomic disparities, significantly contribute to workplace health risks. The need for mental health support, enhanced protective measures, and workplace training emerged as key themes, reinforcing the necessity of comprehensive interventions.

Urgent policy reforms are required to address these gaps, including stricter enforcement of occupational safety regulations, expanded access to personal protective equipment, and the integration of psychological support programs. Additionally, improved data monitoring and the use of technology, such as AI-driven risk assessments and wearable sensors, can enhance workplace hazard prevention. Employers should be incentivized to adopt best practices through regulatory incentives and workplace safety certifications.

Future research should explore long-term health impacts of occupational hazards, cross-country comparisons of workplace safety policies, and the role of emerging technologies in occupational health management. Addressing disparities between developed and developing countries is crucial, ensuring that all workers, regardless of location, benefit from safe and equitable working conditions.

Investing in occupational health not only protects workers but also improves overall productivity and economic stability. A proactive, multi-sectoral approach involving policymakers, employers, and researchers is essential to creating resilient and sustainable workplace environments.

REFERENCES

Wang C, Lin G, Lin Y, Chen W, Wu W. Occupational Health Surveillance and Detection of Emerging Occupational Diseases Among Taiwan Farmers, Through Analysis of National-based Farmers' and Medico-administrative Databases. Am J Ind Med. 2022;66(1):85–93.

Tamers SL, Chosewood LC, Childress AM, Hudson H, Nigam JAS, Chang C. Total Worker Health® 2014–2018: The Novel Approach to Worker Safety, Health, and Well-Being Evolves. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2019;16(3):321.

Ramli NS, Fauzi MFM, Moktar NMA, Hajib N, Nawi AM. Prevalence, Characteristics, and Predictors of Healthcare Workers With COVID-19 Infection in an Urban District in Malaysia. Pan African Medical Journal. 2022;41.

Nicolakakis N, Lafantaisie M, Letellier MC, Biron C, Vézina M, Jauvin N, et al. Are Organizational Interventions Effective in Protecting Healthcare Worker Mental Health During Epidemics/Pandemics? A Systematic Literature Review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(15):9653.

Coleman A, Canham R, Clabon K, Hosseini P, Johnson S, Tongeren M v. A Deep Dive Into Selected Work Sectors During the COVID-19 Pandemic and the "Living With COVID" Phase: Understanding Similarities and Differences in Practice, Perceptions, and Preparedness. Ann Work Expo Health. 2023;67(9):1099–110.

Korman MB, Prospero LD, DasGupta T, Sinyor M, Anthony SJ, Kastner M, et al. Recommendations for Supporting Healthcare Workers' Psychological Well-Being: Lessons Learned During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Healthc Manage Forum. 2024;37(4):258–62.

Beale S, Burns R, Braithwaite I, Byrne T, Fong WLE, Fragaszy E, et al. Occupation, Worker Vulnerability, and COVID-19 Vaccination Uptake: Analysis of the Virus Watch Prospective Cohort Study. Vaccine. 2022;40(52):7646–52.

Moey PKS, Ang A, Ee A, Ng DCC, Ng M, Teo SSH, et al. What Are the Measures Taken to Prevent COVID-19 Infection Among Healthcare Workers? A Retrospective Study in a Cluster of Primary Care Clinics in Singapore. BMJ Open. 2021;11(6):e049190.

Azami NAM, Murad NAA, Nawi AM, Salleh SA, Periyasamy P, Kori N, et al. COVID-19 in Malaysia: Exposure Assessment and Prevention Practices Among Healthcare Workers at a Teaching Hospital. The Journal of Infection in Developing Countries. 2021;15(12):1816–24.

Trivedi N, Lowry M, Gaysynsky A, Chou WS. Factors Associated With Cancer Message Believability: A Mixed Methods Study on Simulated Facebook Posts. Journal of Cancer Education. 2021;37(6):1870–8.

Pedersen JE, Strandberg-Larsen K, Andersson M, Hansen J. Breast Cancer Among Danish Women Occupationally Exposed to Diesel Exhaust and Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons, 1964–2016. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2020;47(2):154–62.

Pena P, Morais J, Gomes AQ, Viegas C. Sampling Methods and Assays Applied in SARS-CoV-2 Exposure Assessment. Sci Total Environ. 2021;775:145903.

Rivera-Izquierdo M, Martínez-Ruiz V, Castillo-Ruiz EM, Manzaneda-Navío M, Pérez-Gómez B, Jiménez-Moleón JJ. Shift Work and Prostate Cancer: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(4):1345.

Zhao H, Huang Y, Wang H, Zhao J, Tian S, Bai H, et al. Associations of SMAD4 Rs10502913 and NLRP3 Rs1539019 Polymorphisms With Risk of Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Susceptibility in Chinese Han Population. Pharmgenomics Pers Med. 2022;Volume 15:167–75.

Sun Y, Gao Y, Yu S, Wang A, Ou X, Tao D, et al. Promoting Physical Activity Among Workers: A Review of Literature and Future Directions on Developing Theory-Based Interventions. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(20):13594.

Khalid I, Khalid TJ, Qabajah MR, Barnard AG, Qushmaq I. Healthcare Workers Emotions, Perceived Stressors and Coping Strategies During a MERS-CoV Outbreak. Clin Med Res. 2016;14(1):7–14.

Arif AA, Delclos GL, Whitehead LW, Tortolero SR, Lee ES. Occupational Exposures Associated With Work-related Asthma and Work-related Wheezing Among U.S. Workers. Am J Ind Med. 2003;44(4):368–76.

Dickerson AS, Hansen J, Kioumourtzoglou MA, Specht AJ, Gredal O, Weisskopf MG. Study of Occupation and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis in a Danish Cohort. Occup Environ Med. 2018;75(9):630–8.

Perio MA d., Horter L, Still W, Meh I, Persson N, Berns AL, et al. Evaluation of Mpox Exposures and Outcomes in Workplaces, 6 Jurisdictions, June 1–August 31, 2022. Public Health Reports. 2024;139(6):744–9.

Hancock DB, Martin ER, Mayhew GM, Stajich JM, Jewett R, Stacy M, et al. Pesticide Exposure and Risk of Parkinson's Disease: A Family-Based Case-Control Study. BMC Neurol. 2008;8(1).

Koch–Henriksen N, Stenager E, Laursen B. The Use of Epidemiological Multiple Sclerosis Registers in Research: The Danish MS Registry. Acta Neurol Scand. 2012;126:7–12.

Grobler L, Mehtar S, Dheda K, Adams S, Babatunde S, Walt M v. d., et al. The Epidemiology of Tuberculosis in Health Care Workers in South Africa: A Systematic Review. BMC Health Serv Res. 2016;16(1).

Olu OO, Kargbo B, Kamara S, Wurie A, Amone J, Ganda L, et al. Epidemiology of Ebola Virus Disease Transmission Among Health Care Workers in Sierra Leone, May to December 2014: A Retrospective Descriptive Study. BMC Infect Dis. 2015;15(1).

Cezár-Vaz MR, Xavier DM, Bonow CA, Vaz JC, Cardoso LS, Sant'Anna CF, et al. Domains of Physical and Mental Workload in Health Work and Unpaid Domestic Work by Gender Division: A Study With Primary Health Care Workers in Brazil. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(16):9816.

Margolis RD, Strupp KM, Beacham AO, Yaster M, Austin TM, Macrae AW, et al. The Effects of Coronavirus Disease 2019 on Pediatric Anesthesiologists: A Survey of the Members of the Society for Pediatric Anesthesia. Anesth Analg. 2021;134(2):348–56.

Cooper DJ, Lear S, Sithole N, Shaw A, Stark H, Ferris M, et al. Demographic, Behavioural and Occupational Risk Factors Associated With SARS-CoV-2 Infection in UK Healthcare Workers: A Retrospective Observational Study. BMJ Open. 2022;12(11):e063159.

Pan Y, Fang Y, Xin M, Dong W, Zhou L, Hou Q, et al. Self-Reported Compliance With Personal Preventive Measures Among Chinese Factory Workers at the Beginning of Work Resumption Following the COVID-19 Outbreak: Cross-Sectional Survey Study. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(9):e22457.

Vitturi BK, Montecucco A, Rahmani A, Dini G, Durando P. Occupational Risk Factors for Multiple Sclerosis: A Systematic Review With Meta-Analysis. Front Public Health. 2023;11.

Mekonnen TH, Dessie A, Tesfaye AH. Respiratory Symptoms Related to Flour Dust Exposure Are Significantly High Among Small and Medium Scale Flour Mill Workers in Ethiopia: A Comparative Cross-Sectional Survey. Environ Health Prev Med. 2021;26(1).

Alghader M, Valvi D, Hoz RE de la. Transmission and Risk Factors of COVID-19 Among Health Care Workers. Semin Respir Crit Care Med. 2023;44(03):340–8.

Provost D, Iwatsubo Y, Rivière S, Mevel M, Didier A, Brochard P, et al. The Impact of Allergic Rhinitis on the Management of Asthma in a Working Population. BMC Pulm Med. 2015;15(1).

Brown-Johnson C, Sanders-Jackson A, Prochaska JJ. Online Comments on Smoking Bans in Psychiatric Hospitals Units. J Dual Diagn. 2014;10(4):204–11.