

1 **TITLE OF THE PAPER**

2 Title: ***Unmasking the determinants of knowledge, attitude and practice of Personal***
3 ***Protective Equipment use among Nepalese farmers using pesticides***

4 Authors: Reecha Piya^{1*}, Krishna G.C¹, Ajay K. Rajbhandari¹, Sampurna Kakchapati²

5

6

7 Affiliations:

8 ¹Patan Academy of Health Sciences, Lagankhel, Lalitpur, Nepal

9 ²HERD International, Bhaisepati, Lalitpur, Nepal

10

11 *Corresponding Author

12 Email: reecha.piya@gmail.com, reecha.piya@outlook.com (RP)

13 **Title: Unmasking the determinants of knowledge, attitude and practice of Personal Protective**
14 **Equipment use among Nepalese farmers using pesticides**

15 **Abstract**

16 Background: Farmer using commercially available chemical pesticides are at high risk to develop
17 various pesticide-related-illnesses. To mitigate the adverse effect of pesticides, it is crucial for
18 famers to wear Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). This study aimed to assess the factors
19 influencing knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) of PPE use among farmers using pesticides in
20 mid-hills of Nepal.

21 Methods: We conducted a cross-sectional study among 256 farmers in Kirtipur Municipality. We
22 collected data using structured questionnaire via telephone. Bi-variate and multivariate logistic
23 regression was done to identify the association between individual, household and farming
24 related characteristic with knowledge, attitude, and practice of PPE use.

25 Results: The study found that the knowledge, attitude, and practice of PPE use was 53.75%,
26 55.11%, and 47.16%, respectively. The farmers with primary level schooling (AOR= 2.63; 95% CI
27 1.00-6.88) and secondary level schooling or higher (AOR= 4.19; 95% CI 1.64-0.68) had higher odds
28 of having knowledge on PPE use rather than the farmers with no formal schooling. Farmers of
29 upper lower socioeconomic status had higher odds (AOR=6.40; 95% CI 1.68-24.45) of having
30 positive attitude towards PPE use compared to farmers of upper middle and upper socio-
31 economic status. On the contrary, farmers with good knowledge (AOR=0.20; CI 0.09-0.48) and
32 experience of pesticide-related-illness (AOR=0.29; 95% CI 0.13-0.65) had lower odds of having

33 positive attitude towards PPE use. Married farmers (AOR=10.63; 95% CI 1.11-101.95), farmers
34 using pesticides for more than 10 years (AOR=5.22; 95% CI 1.27-21.43), and farmers using
35 pesticides for 10 hours or more in their lifetime (AOR=4.86; 95% CI 1.63-14.50) had higher odds
36 of wearing basic set of PPE while handling pesticides. However, farmers who were involved in
37 farming for more than 10 years (AOR=0.26; 95% CI 0.07-1.03), farmers who were using pesticide
38 applying methods other than knapsack sprayer (AOR=0.03; 95% CI 0.00-0.34), and farmers having
39 positive attitude towards PPE use (AOR=0.28; 95% CI 0.11-0.70) had lower odds of wearing basic
40 set of PPE while handling pesticides.

41 Conclusion: Farmers in Nepal have a positive outlook on PPE use but multitude of factors
42 including knowledge, farming related factors and socio-economic condition have acted as barrier
43 to its use. Tailored educational programs that not only encompasses knowledge dissemination
44 but also cultivation of positive safety attitudes towards PPE can help increase PPE use.

45 **Introduction**

46 The advent of pesticides has created a new era in farming, the use of pesticides has helped in
47 creating an increment in crop yields. This increment in crop yields has in turn helped to mitigate
48 global food shortages created due to rapid population growth by controlling the effects of
49 harmful pests in the farms [1]. The use of pesticides is growing and as the trend suggests that in
50 a study conducted between 1945 - 1995 the use of pesticides had doubled every year, especially
51 in the case of developing countries [2]. Similar is the case of Nepal, where the use of pesticides
52 has been increasing year on year since its inception in 1952, a study shows that there is yearly

53 10-20% growth in use of pesticides in the country to reap short-term and quick benefits from the
54 production of crops [2,3]. It is more prevalent in commercial vegetable farming in Nepal where
55 the use of pesticides is above the national average that is 1.6 kg a.i/ha [4–6].

56 Pesticides, in general, use a mix of toxic chemicals or biological substances which neutralize pests
57 by killing the population or by repelling them. These toxins not only are harmful to the pests but
58 also to the ecosystem and to human health. The people who are at most risk are the farmers and
59 field workers who are directly exposed to the pesticides during the application process [4]. Many
60 acute and chronic diseases including diarrhoea, nausea, vomiting, asthma, cancer, Parkinson's
61 diseases, infertility, etc. are directly linked to the exposure to such pesticides[7–9]. Such health
62 conditions are also found to be prevalent among pesticide using farmers in Nepal [10]. It is
63 observed that globally there are more than 3 million (1 million intentional and 2 million
64 unintentional) cases of pesticides poisoning resulting in more than 220,000 deaths every year
65 caused by pesticides [2]. In Nepal also, it was seen that out of 258 cases of acute pesticide
66 poisoning, 6.2% cases were cases of occupational exposure [2].

67 But these harmful effects caused by pesticides can be mitigated. Studies have shown that the use
68 of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) can help in reducing health hazards created as a result of
69 direct exposure to pesticides, especially during spraying [11,12]. PPE refers to any items like
70 gloves, safety glasses, bodysuits, or shoes which help to protect various body parts from direct
71 exposure to pesticides [13]. As pesticides can interact with the human body through various
72 sources like skin, eyes or mouth, partial use of PPE cannot be deemed fully protective against
73 pesticides [14]. In Nepal there are instances where farmers were seen using only masks or goggles

74 while dealing with fertilizers, further, there were also instances where farmers were only using
75 long sleeve shirts and long trousers which do not eliminate the harmful effects of pesticides
76 [7,15,16].

77 Further, there are various social determining factors which influences an individual's knowledge,
78 attitude, and practice towards PPE use. Factors such as socio-economic status, education, and
79 culture can all have a significant impact [17]. For instance, education and awareness raising
80 activities can increase knowledge and foster positive attitude, eventually influencing the practice
81 of PPE use [18]. In addition, individuals with lower income may have difficulties acquiring PPE,
82 impacting their practice [17]. Likewise, cultural values also play an important role in shaping
83 attitude of PPE and affecting its acceptance and use [19].

84 Several studies have been conducted in Nepal but most of them have only been concerned with
85 the use of pesticides and its effects on farmers but the conditions relating to use of PPE, however,
86 have been minimal [7,10,15,20–24]. The knowledge, attitude and practices of PPE use and the
87 various factors associated with the use of PPE among farmers and field workers have not been
88 fully explored by studies conducted in the past. Thus, this study primarily focuses on these factors
89 and will help to better understand the risks exposure and the practices relating to use of PPE
90 among farmers while using pesticides.

91 **Methods**

92 **Study design, population, and setting**

93 We conducted a cross-sectional study among vegetable growing farmers of Kirtipur Municipality
94 of Nepal to identify their knowledge, attitude, practice, and associated factors of PPE use while
95 working with pesticides.

96 **Sample Size**

97 The sample size for the study was calculated based on a similar study conducted in Nepal. The
98 study reported that the proportion of farmers using combination of protective equipment is 20%
99 [23]. At 95% confidence and 5% margin of error, the minimum sample size required for the study
100 was calculated to be 246. However, to incorporate an anticipated 20% non-response rate, it was
101 inflated to 296.

102 **Sampling Technique**

103 Considering the situation of COVID-19 pandemic, data collection was done through telephone
104 interviews. The ward-wise list of the farmers along with their contact numbers were collected
105 with the help of local leaders. The list was further refined by selecting only those farmers who
106 were engaged in vegetable farming. From the list thus prepared, 296 farmers were selected
107 randomly using computer-generated random numbers to consider for participation in the study.
108 As data collection was telephone based, at least three attempts were made to contact the
109 selected participants.

110 **Data collection Tool**

111 The study conducted data collection from July 23, 2021 to September 30, 2021 marking the
112 recruitment period for respondents. A semi-structured questionnaire was developed after
113 extensive literature reviews and consultation with experts. The first section of the questionnaire
114 comprised of demographic characteristics of the participant followed by farming related details.
115 This section was followed by questions related to knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding
116 PPE use. The knowledge section included the harmful effects of pesticides, port of entry and
117 importance of PPE use. The attitude section focused on perception of the farmers regarding
118 perceived susceptibility from pesticides, perceived severity of pesticides, perceived barriers to
119 PPE use and perceived benefits of PPE use. Lastly, the practice section centered around assessing
120 the use of basic set of PPEs in different stages of pesticide handling.

121 Socio-economic status of the farmers was assessed using Kuppuswamy scale which is based on
122 the scoring of three variables i.e. education of the head of the family of the study participant,
123 occupation of the head of the family of the study participant, and monthly income of the family.
124 Categorization of the socioeconomic status was done based on the total score obtained from the
125 above three variables. Socioeconomic status was categorized as lower (<5), upper-lower (5-10),
126 lower-middle (11-15), upper-middle (16-25), and upper (26-29). The lower and upper-lower
127 category were categorized as poor, lower-middle was categorized as middle, and upper-middle
128 and upper were categorized as rich.

129 The knowledge section comprised of 19 questions. A score of “1” was attributed for the correct
130 answer and a score of “0” for the incorrect answer. Median score of the questionnaire was

131 calculated and a score below-median score was categorized as poor knowledge while those with
132 equal or above-median score was categorized as good knowledge. Section of attitude included
133 27 statements with responses documented in the form of a four-point Likert scale: Strongly
134 agree, Agree, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. For identifying the farmers who are practicing the
135 use of PPE, only those farmers who were using mask, gloves, and boot at the same time while
136 mixing the pesticides, spraying the pesticides in the vegetables, cleaning spilled pesticides and
137 disposal of the empty bottles of pesticides were considered as using basic set of PPE use while
138 handling pesticides.

139 **Operational Definition**

140 Gloves, boots, and mask worn together at a same time was considered as basic set of PPEs.
141 Activities like mixing the pesticides, spraying the pesticides in the vegetables, cleaning spilled
142 pesticides and disposal of the empty bottles of pesticides was considered as pesticide handling.

143 **Statistical Analysis**

144 A data entry form was prepared in Epi-Info similar to the questionnaire. The response of the
145 participants was extracted from an excel sheet where the data were cleaned and then exported
146 to STATA version 13 for analysis.

147 Frequency and percentage of the background variables were calculated. For inferential statistics,
148 bivariate analysis of the background variables was carried out with dependent variables. Odds
149 ratio (OR), Confidence Interval (CI), and p-values were obtained to determine important
150 candidate variables for multivariate analysis. The p- values less than 0.05 indicated the significant
151 relationship between variables. The VIF less than 2 with a p-value of less than 0.25 from bivariate

152 analysis were kept in the multivariate analysis. The multivariate analysis of final model was
153 carried out by controlling for both background and mediating variables. From the final model,
154 the p-value of less than 0.05 was considered as a significant association between independent
155 and dependent variable.

156 **Ethics**

157 Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Committee (IRC) of Patan Academy
158 of Health Sciences (PAHS)- PAHS IRC Reference PHP2107221558. Before the interview, each
159 participant was briefed about the study and its objectives. Verbal consent was obtained from all
160 the participants. The verbal consent was recorded separately in a mobile phone recorder, and
161 the audio files were copied to a folder in a password protected computer.

162 Results

163 Table 1 shows the socio-demographic and background characteristics of farmers. The median age
164 of the respondent was 40 years. The population of female farmers were nearly twice than male
165 farmers. Most of the farmers were married, comprising 93.68% of the total population. The
166 ethnicity leans heavily towards advantaged ethnic groups (Brahmin, Chettri and Newar) with
167 78.26% followed by 21.74% from disadvantaged group. More than half of the farmers had
168 completed their secondary schooling or higher (56.52%), followed by those who completed
169 primary school (24.9%), while small proportion (18.58%) had no formal schooling. Regarding the
170 involvement in occupation other than farming, 40.32% of the farmers had other occupation while
171 59.68% of the farmers were involved exclusively in farming. About the socio-economic status of
172 the farmers, 40.32% were rich, followed by 37.94% middle and 21.74% poor.

173 The majority of farmers were involved in farming for more than 10 years (62.58%) and farming
174 in their own land (61.26%). 54.94% were cultivating vegetables for self-consumption while
175 45.06% of the farmers were cultivating for commercial purposes. The majority, i.e., 69.57% used
176 pesticides in their vegetables. Among the pesticide users, 44.32% of the respondents were using
177 pesticides for less than 5 years while 44.32% of the respondents were using it for 5 to 10 years,
178 and 11.36% of the respondents were using pesticides for more than 10 years. Regarding the
179 exposure of pesticide in a lifetime, 21.47% of the pesticide users were exposed to pesticides for
180 10 hours or more in their lifetime. The majority of the farmers (90.34%) used knapsack sprayer
181 for application of pesticides. 53.75% had good knowledge about pesticides and PPE use while
182 55.11% had positive attitude towards PPE use. 57.31% of the farmers attended some type of

183 training related to agriculture. 42.05% of the pesticide users reported that they had experienced
 184 some symptoms related to adverse effects of pesticide use. Among the pesticide users, 94.89%
 185 were using at least one form of PPE while handling pesticides while only 47.16% of the farmers
 186 were using basic set of PPE while handling pesticides.

187 Table 1: Distribution of respondents by background variables

Background Variables	Number (n=253)	Percent (%)
Age		
16-30	35	13.83
31-45	132	52.17
46-59	62	24.51
≥60	24	9.49
Median age: 40 years		
Interquartile Range (IQR): 17 years		
Sex		
Male	80	31.62
Female	173	68.38
Marital status		
Single	16	6.32
Married	237	93.68
Relation with Household head		
Household head	81	32.02
Spouse	158	62.45
Others	14	5.53
Ethnicity		
Advantaged Ethnic Group	198	78.26
Disadvantaged Ethnic Group	55	21.74
Education of the respondent		
No formal schooling	47	18.58
Primary School	63	24.90
Secondary school and higher	143	56.52

Background Variables	Number (n=253)	Percent (%)
Involved in Occupation other than farming		
Yes	102	40.32
No	151	59.68
Socioeconomic Status		
Rich	102	40.32
Middle	96	37.94
Poor	55	21.74
Households with <5 years children		
Yes	76	30.04
No	177	69.96
Households with individual aged 60 or older		
Yes	131	51.78
No	122	48.22
Households with Pregnant women		
Yes	11	4.35
No	242	95.65
Years involved in farming		
<5 years	28	11.07
5 to 10 years	66	26.09
>10 years	159	62.85
Property Relationship		
Property holder	155	61.26
Lease	98	38.74
Surface area of farmland		
<10952 sq. ft.	100	39.53
≥10952 sq. ft.	153	60.47
Purpose of vegetable farming		
Self-consumption	139	54.94
Sell	114	45.06
Pesticide use		
Yes	176	69.57
No	77	30.43

Background Variables	Number (n=253)	Percent (%)
Years of pesticides used (N=176)		
<5 years	78	44.32
5 to 10 years	78	44.32
>10 years	20	11.36
Vegetable growth in a year (N=176)		
1 time	7	3.98
2 times	99	56.25
3 times	70	39.77
Number of hours of pesticide exposure in lifetime(N=176)		
<10 hours	139	78.53
≥10 hours	38	21.47
Methods of applying pesticides (N=176)		
Knapsack sprayer	159	90.34
Others	17	9.66
Knowledge (N=253)		
Good	136	53.75
Poor	117	46.25
Attitude(N=176)		
Positive	97	55.11
Negative	79	44.89
Training (N=253)		
Yes	145	57.31
No	108	42.69
Experience of illnesses (N=176)		
Yes	74	42.05
No	102	57.95
Use of at least one PPE while handling pesticides		
Yes	167	94.89
No	9	5.11
Basic Set of PPE use while handling pesticides		
Yes	83	47.16
No	93	52.84

188 Table 2 shows the factors associated with knowledge on PPE use among farmers in both bivariate
 189 and multivariate analysis. Education was found to be associated with knowledge of PPE use. The
 190 farmers who had completed their primary schooling (AOR= 2.63; 95% CI 1.00-6.88) and secondary
 191 level of education or higher (AOR= 4.19; 95% CI 1.64-0.68) had higher odds of having good
 192 knowledge about PPE use compared to the farmers who did not have formal education.

193 Table 2: Factors associated with knowledge of PPE use among farmers

Background variables	Knowledge of PPE use		Unadjusted OR [95% CI]	p-value	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	p-value
	Yes (%)	No (%)				
Age						
16-30	19 (54.29)	16 (45.71)	1		1	
31-45	86 (65.15)	46 (34.85)	1.57 [0.73-3.35]	0.24	1.64 [0.69-3.90]	0.262
46-59	24 (38.71)	38 (61.29)	0.53 [0.23-1.23]	0.14	0.73 [0.27-1.98]	0.541
≥60	7 (29.17)	70.83 (70.83)	0.34 [0.12-1.05]	0.06	0.57 [0.16-2.05]	0.386
Sex						
Male	47 (58.75)	33 (41.25)	1		1	
Female	89 (51.45)	84 (48.55)	0.74 [0.44-1.27]	0.28		
Marital status						
Single	5 (31.25)	11 (68.75)	1		1	
Married	131 (55.27)	106 (44.73)	2.72 [0.92-8.07]	0.07	2.12 [0.60-7.55]	0.244
Relation with household head						
Household head	43 (53.09)	38 (46.91)	1		1	
Spouse	86 (54.43)	72 (45.57)	1.05 [0.62-1.81]	0.84		
Others	7 (50.00)	7 (50.00)	0.88 [0.28-2.74]	0.83		
Ethnicity						
Advantaged Ethnic Group	108 (54.55)	90 (45.45)	1		1	
Disadvantaged Ethnic Group	28 (50.91)	27 (49.09)	0.86 [0.48-1.57]	0.632		
Education of the respondent						

No formal schooling	9 (19.15)	38 (80.85)	1		1	
Primary School	31 (49.21)	32 (50.79)	4.09 [1.70-9.85]	0.002	2.63 [1.00-6.88]	0.049
Secondary school and higher	96 (67.13)	47 (32.87)	8.62 [3.85-19.31]	<0.001	4.19 [1.64-0.68]	0.003
Involved in occupation other than farming						
Yes	73 (48.34)	78 (51.66)	1		1	
No	63 (61.76)	39 (38.24)	1.73 [1.04-2.88]	0.036	1.47 [0.82-2.64]	0.197
Socioeconomic status						
Rich	67 (65.69)	35 (34.31)	1		1	
Middle	49 (51.04)	47 (48.96)	0.54 [0.31-0.96]	0.037	0.64 [0.33-1.24]	0.185
Poor	20 (36.36)	35 (63.64)	0.30 [0.15-0.59]	0.001	0.61 [0.27-1.41]	0.250
Households with <5 years children						
No	96 (54.24)	81 (45.76)	1		1	
Yes	40 (52.63)	36 (47.37)	0.94 [0.55-1.61]	0.814		
Households with individual aged 60 or older						
No	64 (52.46)	58 (47.54)	1		1	
Yes	72 (54.96)	59 (45.04)	1.11 [0.67-1.81]	0.69		
Households with Pregnant women						
No	132 (54.55)	110 (45.45)	1		1	
Yes	4 (36.36)	7 (63.64)	0.48 [0.14-1.67]	0.25	0.55 [0.13-2.33]	0.414
Years involved in farming						
<5 years	14 (50.00)	14 (50.00)	1		1	
5 to 10 years	41 (62.12)	25 (37.88)	1.64 [0.67-4.00]	0.28		
>10 years	81 (50.94)	78 (49.06)	1.04 [0.47-2.32]	0.93		
Property Relationship						
I am the owner	80 (51.61)	75 (48.39)	1		1	
I took the land in lease	56 (57.14)	42 (42.86)	1.25 [0.75-2.08]	0.39		
Surface area of farmland						
<10952 sq. ft.	42 (42.00)	58 (58.00)	1		1	
≥10952 sq. ft.	94 (61.44)	59 (38.56)	2.2 [1.32-3.68]	0.003	1.40 [0.75-2.63]	0.290
Purpose of vegetable farming						
Self-consumption	63 (45.32)	76 (54.68)	1		1	
Sell	73 (64.04)	41 (35.96)	2.15 [1.29-3.57]	0.003	1.80 [0.97-3.31]	0.060

Years of pesticides used						
<5 years	45 (57.69)	33 (42.31)	1		1	
5 to 10 years	45 (57.69)	33 (42.31)	1 [0.53-1.89]	1.00		
>10 years	11 (55.00)	9 (45.00)	0.90 [0.33-2.41]	0.83		
Times of vegetable grown in a year						
1 time	5 (71.43)	2 (28.57)	1		1	
2 times	59 (59.60)	40 (40.40)	0.59 [0.11-3.19]	0.54		
3 times	37 (52.86)	33 (47.14)	0.45 [0.08-2.47]	0.36		
Number of hours of pesticide exposure						
<10 hours	77 (55.80)	61 (44.20)	1		1	
≥10 hours	24 (63.16)	14 (36.84)	1.36 [0.65-2.85]	0.42		
Methods of applying pesticides						
Knapsack sprayer	93 (58.49)	66 (41.51)	1		1	
Others	8 (47.06)	9 (52.94)	0.63 [0.23-1.72]	0.37		
Training						
No	53 (49.07)	55 (50.93)	1		1	
Yes	83 (57.24)	62 (42.76)	1.39 [0.84-2.29]	0.199	1.26 [0.71-2.25]	0.432
Experience of illnesses (N=185)						
No	55 (53.92)	47 (46.08)	1		1	
Yes	46 (62.16)	28 (37.84)	1.40 [0.76-2.58]	0.276		

194

195 Table 3 shows the factors associated with attitude towards PPE use among farmers in both
 196 bivariate and multivariate analysis. Socioeconomic status, knowledge with the farmers and
 197 experience of illness were found to be associated with attitude of farmers towards PPE use. The
 198 farmers belonging to the upper lower (IV) category (AOR=6.40; 95% CI 1.68-24.45) had higher
 199 odds of having positive attitude towards PPE use than the farmers belonging to upper and upper
 200 middle category. However, the farmers with good knowledge of PPE use had lower odds of having
 201 positive attitude towards PPE use (AOR=0.20; CI 0.09-0.48) than the farmers with poor

202 knowledge. Likewise, the farmers who had previous experience of illness related to pesticide use
 203 had lower odds of having positive attitude towards PPE use (AOR=0.29; 95% CI 0.13-0.65) than
 204 those farmers who did not experience any illnesses.

205 Table3: Factors associated with Attitude towards PPE use among farmers

Background Variables	Attitude towards PPE use		Unadjusted OR [95% CI]	p-value	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	p-value
	Yes (%)	No (%)				
Age						
16-30	20 (71.43)	8 (28.57)	1			
31-45	38 (42.22)	52 (57.78)	0.29 [0.12-0.73]	0.01	0.92 [0.27-3.17]	0.89
46-59	28 (66.67)	14 (33.33)	0.80 [0.28-2.27]	0.67	1.29 [0.31-5.46]	0.73
≥60	11 (68.75)	5 (31.25)	0.88 [0.23-3.35]	0.85	1.24 [0.21-7.46]	0.81
Sex						
Male	31 (53.45)	27 (46.55)	1		1	
Female	66 (55.93)	52 (44.07)	1.11 [0.59-2.08]	0.75		
Marital status						
Single	6 (60.00)	4 (40.00)	1		1	
Married	91 (54.82)	75 (45.18)	0.81 [0.22-2.97]	0.75		
Relation with household head						
Household head	31 (53.45)	27 (46.55)	1		1	
Spouse	63 (56.76)	48 (43.24)	1.14 [0.60-2.16]	0.68		
Others	3 (42.86)	4 (57.14)	0.65 [0.13-3.18]	0.60		
Ethnicity						
Advantaged Ethnic Group	73 (53.28)	64 (46.72)	1		1	
Disadvantaged Ethnic Group	24 (61.54)	15 (38.46)	1.40 [0.68-2.90]	0.36		
Education of the respondent						
No formal schooling	22 (81.48)	5 (18.52)	1		1	
Primary School	26 (65.00)	14 (35.00)	0.42 [0.13-1.36]	0.148	0.43 [0.09-1.86]	0.26
Secondary school and higher	49 (44.95)	60 (55.05)	0.19 [0.07-0.53]	0.002	0.42 [0.11-1.61]	0.21

Involved in occupation other than farming						
Yes	63 (57.80)	46 (42.20)	1		1	
No	34 (50.75)	33 (49.25)	0.75 [0.41-1.39]	0.362		
Socioeconomic Status						
Rich	27 (37.50)	45 (62.50)	1		1	
Middle	38 (57.58)	28 (42.42)	2.26 [1.14-4.48]	0.02	2.06 [0.84-5.06]	0.12
Poor	32(84.21)	6 (15.79)	8.88 [3.29-24.02]	<0.001	6.40 [1.68-24.4]	0.01
Households with <5 years children						
No	64 (52.03)	59 (47.97)	1		1	
Yes	33 (62.26)	20 (37.74)	1.52 [0.79-2.94]	0.21	2.18 [0.89-5.36]	0.09
Households with individual aged 60 or older						
No	51 (62.96)	30 (37.04)	1		1	
Yes	46 (48.42)	49 (51.58)	0.55 [0.30-1.01]	0.05	0.62 [0.27-1.42]	0.261
Households with pregnant women						
No	91 (55.15)	74 (44.85)	1		1	
Yes	6 (54.55)	5 (45.45)	0.98 [0.29-3.32]	0.97		
Years involved in farming						
<5 years	15 (60.00)	10 (40.00)	1		1	
5 to 10 years	28 (57.14)	21 (42.86)	0.89 [0.33-2.37]	0.81		
>10 years	54 (52.94)	48 (47.06)	0.75 [0.32-1.83]	0.53		
Property Relationship						
I am the owner	55 (56.12)	43 (43.88)	1		1	
I took the land in lease	42 (53.85)	36 (46.15)	0.91 [0.50-1.66]	0.76		
Surface area of farmland						
<10952 sq. ft.	34 (62.96)	20 (37.04)	1		1	
≥10952 sq. ft.	63 (51.64)	59 (48.36)	0.63 [0.33-1.21]	0.17	1.16 [0.47-2.87]	0.74
Purpose of vegetable farming						
Self-consumption	44 (55.70)	35 (44.30)	1		1	
Sell	53 (54.64)	44 (45.36)	0.96 [0.53-1.74]	0.89		
Years of pesticides used						
<5 years	47 (60.26)	31 (39.74)	1		1	
5 to 10 years	41 (52.56)	37 (47.44)	0.73 [0.39-1.38]	0.33	0.83 [0.35-1.96]	0.67
>10 years	9 (45.00)	11(55.00)	0.54 [0.20-1.45]	0.22	1.02 [0.29-3.61]	0.98

Times of vegetable grown in a year						
1 time	5 (71.43)	2 (28.57)	1		1	
2 times	61 (61.62)	38 (38.38)	0.64 [0.12-3.48]	0.61	0.47 [0.07-3.22]	0.44
3 times	31(44.29)	39 (55.71)	0.32 [0.06-1.75]	0.19	0.21 [0.03-1.48]	0.12
Number of hours of pesticide exposure						
<10 hours	78 (56.52)	60 (43.48)	1		1	
≥10 hours	19 (50.00)	19 (50.00)	0.77 [0.37-1.58]	0.48		
Methods of applying pesticides						
Knapsack sprayer	89 (55.97)	70 (44.03)	1		1	
Others	8 (47.06)	9 (52.94)	0.70 [0.26-1.91]	0.48		
Knowledge						
Poor	57 (76.00)	18 (24.00)	1		1	
Good	40 (39.60)	61 (60.40)	0.21 [0.11-0.40]	<0.001	0.20 [0.09-0.48]	<0.001
Training						
No	47 (67.14)	23 (32.86)	1		1	
Yes	50 (47.17)	56 (52.83)	0.44 [0.23-0.82]	0.01	0.55 [0.24-1.23]	0.14
Experience of illnesses (N=185)						
No	69 (67.65)	33 (32.35)	1		1	
Yes	28 (37.84)	46 (62.16)	0.29 [0.16-0.54]	<0.001	0.29 [0.13-0.65]	0.003

206

207 Table 4 shows the factors associated with practice on PPE use among farmers in both bivariate
 208 and multivariate analysis. Marital status, years involved in farming, years of pesticide use,
 209 number of hours of pesticide exposure, methods of applying pesticides, and attitude towards PPE
 210 use were found to be associated with practice of PPE use.

211 The farmers who were married had higher odds of wearing PPE while working with pesticides
 212 (AOR=10.63; 95% CI 1.11-101.95) compared to unmarried farmers. The farmers who were using
 213 pesticides in their vegetables for more than 10 years were had higher odds of wearing PPE while
 214 working with pesticides (AOR=5.22; 95% CI 1.27-21.43) than those farmers who were using

215 pesticides for less than 5 years. The farmers who were exposed to pesticides for 10 hours or more
216 in their lifetime had higher odds of wearing PPE while working with pesticides (AOR=4.86; 95%
217 CI 1.63-14.50) than the farmers who were exposed to pesticides for less than 10 hours in their
218 lifetime. In contrast, the farmers who were involved in vegetable farming for more than 10 years
219 had lower odds of using PPE while working with pesticides (AOR=0.26; 95% CI 0.07-1.03) than
220 those farmers who had been involved in farming for less than 5 years. The farmers who were
221 using other pesticide application methods other than knapsack sprayer had lower odds of
222 wearing PPE while working with pesticides (AOR=0.03; 95% CI 0.00-0.34) than those farmers
223 using knapsack sprayer. The farmers who had positive attitude towards PPE use had lower odds
224 of wearing PPE while working with pesticides (AOR=0.28; 95% CI 0.11-0.70) than those having
225 negative attitude towards PPE use.

226

227 Table 4: Factors associated with Practice of PPE use among farmers

Background Variables	Practice of PPE use while handling pesticides		Unadjusted OR [95% CI]	p-value	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	p-value
	Yes (%)	No (%)				
Age						
16-30	15(53.57)	13(46.43)	1			
31-45	44(48.89)	46(51.11)	0.83 [0.35-1.94]	0.67		
46-59	18(42.86)	24(57.14)	0.65 [0.25-1.70]	0.38		
≥60	6(37.50)	10(62.50)	0.52 [0.15-1.82]	0.31		
Sex						
Male	29(50)	29(50)	1			
Female	54(45.76)	64(54.24)	0.84 [0.45-1.53]	0.59		
Marital status						
Single	1(10)	9(90)	1		1	
Married	82(49.40)	84(50.60)	8.79 [1.09-70.91]	0.04	10.63 [1.11-101.95]	0.04
Relation with Household head						
Household head	28(48.28)	30(51.72)	1			
Spouse	53(47.45)	58(52.25)	0.98 [0.52-1.85]	0.95		
Others	2(28.57)	5(71.43)	0.43 [0.08-2.39]	0.33		
Ethnicity						
Advantaged Ethnic Group	62(45.26)	75(54.74)	1			
Disadvantaged Ethnic Group	21(53.85)	18(46.15)	1.41 [0.69-2.88]	0.34		
Education of the respondent						
No formal schooling	9(33.33)	18(66.67)	1		1	
Primary School	18(45.00)	22(55.00)	1.64 [0.59-4.51]	0.34	0.459 [0.12-1.71]	0.25
Secondary school and higher	56(51.38)	53(48.62)	2.11 [0.87-5.11]	0.09	0.64 [0.19-2.17]	0.48
Occupation other than farming						
Yes	29(43.28)	38(56.72)	1			
No	54(49.54)	55(50.46)	0.78 [0.42-1.43]	0.42		
Socioeconomic status						
Rich	39(54.17)	33(45.83)	1		1	

Middle	28(42.42)	38(57.58)	0.62 [0.31-1.22]	0.17	0.85 [0.32-2.24]	0.74
Poor	16(42.11)	22(57.89)	0.62 [0.28-1.36]	0.23	1.88 [0.54-6.52]	0.32
Households with <5 years children						
No	57(46.34)	66(53.66)	1			
Yes	26(49.06)	27(50.94)	1.12 [0.59-2.12]	0.74		
Households with individual aged 60 or older						
No	38(46.91)	43(53.09)	1			
Yes	45(47.37)	50(52.63)	1.02 [0.56-1.84]	0.95		
Households with pregnant women						
Yes	79(47.88)	86(52.12)	1			
No	4(36.36)	7(63.64)	0.62 [0.18-2.21]	0.46		
Years involved in farming						
<5 years	16(64)	9(36)	1		1	
5 to 10 years	24(48.98)	25(51.02)	0.54 [0.20-1.45]	0.22	0.40 [0.10-1.61]	0.19
>10 years	43(42.16)	59(57.84)	0.41 [0.17-1.01]	0.05	0.26 [0.07-1.03]	0.05
Property Relationship						
I am the owner	38(38.78)	60(61.22)	1		1	
I took the land in lease	45(57.69)	33(42.31)	2.15 [1.17-3.95]	0.013	0.83 [0.31-2.23]	0.72
Surface area of farmland						
<10952 sq. ft.	17(31.48)	37(68.52)	1		1	
≥10952 sq. ft.	66(54.10)	56(45.90)	2.57 [1.31-5.04]	0.01	2.23 [0.96-5.21]	0.06
Purpose of vegetable farming						
Self-consumption	27(34.18)	52(65.82)	1		1	
Sell	56(57.73)	41(42.27)	2.63 [1.42-4.87]	<0.001	1.03 [0.41-2.61]	0.95
Years of pesticides used						
<5 years	33(42.31)	45(57.69)	1		1	
5 to 10 years	37(47.44)	41(52.56)	1.23 [0.65-2.31]	0.52	1.72 [0.68-4.39]	0.25
>10 years	13(65)	7(35)	2.53 [0.91-7.04]	0.08	5.22 [1.27- 21.43]	0.02
Times of vegetable grown in a year						
1 time	4(57.14)	3(42.86)	1			
2 times	46(46.46)	53(53.54)	0.65 [0.14-3.06]	0.59		
3 times	33(47.14)	37(52.86)	0.67 [0.14-3.21]	0.62		
Number of hours of pesticide exposure						

<10 hours	55(39.86)	83(60.14)	1		1	
≥10 hours	28(73.68)	10(26.32)	4.23 [1.90-9.39]	<0.001	4.86 [1.63-14.50]	0.01
Methods of applying pesticides						
Knapsack sprayer	82(51.57)	77(48.43)	1		1	
Others	1(5.88)	16(94.12)	0.06 [0.01-0.45]	0.01	0.03 [0.00-0.34]	0.004
Knowledge						
Poor	26(34.67)	49(65.33)	1		1	
Good	57(56.44)	44(43.56)	2.44 [1.32-4.53]	0.01	1.87 [0.81-4.33]	0.14
Attitude(N=176)						
Negative	48(60.76)	31(39.24)	1		1	
Positive	35(36.08)	62(63.92)	0.36 [0.19-0.67]	<0.001	0.28 [0.11-0.70]	0.01
Training						
No	26(37.14)	44(62.86)	1		1	
Yes	57(53.77)	49(46.23)	1.97 [1.06-3.65]	0.03	1.68 [0.76-3.74]	0.20
Experience of illnesses (N=185)						
No	44(43.14)	58(56.86)	1		1	
Yes	39(52.70)	35(47.30)	1.47 [0.80-2.68]	0.21	0.91 [0.41-2.04]	0.82

228 Discussion

229 To the best of our understanding, this is the first study determining the knowledge, attitude,
 230 practice, and associated factors of PPE use among farmers in Nepal, as previously most of them
 231 had limited themselves to the safe handling of pesticides and illnesses resulting from pesticide
 232 use [7,10,20–24]. This study also found that more than half of farmers had adequate knowledge
 233 on the importance of PPE use and adverse effects of pesticides. This is quite different from other
 234 studies conducted in Nepal which had reported that more than 80% of the farmers possessed
 235 knowledge related to adverse health effects of pesticides, while, a study conducted in Thailand
 236 had reported a much lower knowledge ratio i.e. 22.8%, the difference in the result might be
 237 because most of these studies concentrated themselves with the study of harmful effects of

238 pesticides, while our study also focused on the use of PPE [7,22,25]. Also, while measuring the
239 attitude of farmers towards use of PPE in this study, the findings are quite different from the
240 findings revealed by a study conducted in Iran which reported less than half of the farmer's
241 intended to use PPE while handling pesticides [26].

242 Pesticides can enter the body through various routes like ingestion, inhalation, and skin
243 absorption thus wearing a combination of PPE is crucial in order to minimize this exposure [9]. Our
244 study showed that, almost all the farmers were wearing at least one form of PPE while handling
245 pesticides but when it came to wearing a combination of PPE, less than half of the population
246 were found to be wearing mask, gloves and boot at the same time which is considered as the
247 basic set of PPE, the proportion was similar to a study conducted in Brazil [27]. This prevalence
248 revealed by our study is higher in Nepal, than in countries like Ethiopia (10%) and Thailand (6%)
249 [25,28]. Further, other studies conducted in other parts of Nepal in various years showed a
250 comparatively lower proportion of PPE use as compared to our study [20,22,23]. The possible
251 reason behind this might be due to the fact that our study was conducted post COVID while other
252 studies were conducted before the pandemic [20,22,23]. The COVID pandemic heightened the
253 awareness about PPE for disease prevention and led to the heightened demand and usage of
254 PPE. The increase in production and distribution led to an increased availability, leading to an
255 increased proportion of PPE use among farmers in our study [29]. However, it is contradicting, as
256 our study also showed that more than half of the population of farmers do not use basic set of
257 PPE while handling pesticides, which implies that farmers in Nepal are still at high risk of
258 developing various pesticide-related-illnesses.

259 Further, association between education levels and knowledge regarding PPE use among farmers
260 also constitutes a notable finding in this study. This association is in line with previous studies
261 highlighting the influential role of education in shaping safety practices in various occupational
262 settings [30,31]. Higher levels of education are often linked with enhanced access to formalized
263 information channels, including agricultural training programs and workshops. These avenues
264 offer a platform for disseminating critical safety information, including the proper use of PPE.
265 Additionally, farmers with higher educational attainment may possess superior cognitive
266 abilities, potentially affording them a greater capacity to comprehend and retain safety-related
267 information [30,31].

268 In addition to that, this study also showed a significant association between lower socioeconomic
269 status and attitudes towards PPE use among farmers. This finding is in alignment with existing
270 literature, which underscores the intricate interplay between economic resources and safety
271 practices in occupational settings [32,33]. Farmers with limited financial means may encounter
272 barriers in adopting favorable attitudes towards PPE use [33]. Financial constraints often hinder
273 their capacity to invest in safety equipment, diverting resources towards more immediate needs.
274 Moreover, this association may be exacerbated by a lack of access to formalized safety training
275 programs and information materials, which are crucial for cultivating positive attitudes towards
276 safety practices. Moreover, a noteworthy observation emerged from the study, indicating that
277 farmers who reported instances of illness exhibited lower odds of holding favorable attitudes
278 towards the use of PPE. This finding resonates with prior research emphasizing the multifaceted
279 relationship between health status and safety practices in agricultural contexts [25,32].

280 Farmers who have experienced illness may also, understandably, face heightened challenges in
281 maintaining a positive outlook towards PPE. Illness can lead to physical discomfort, diminished
282 work capacity, and potentially increased economic strain due to healthcare expenses. Such
283 circumstances may divert attention and resources away from investing in protective gear [34].
284 Additionally, farmers who have personally encountered health issues may possess a different
285 perception of occupational risks, potentially underestimating the imperative nature of PPE [26].

286 Our study also finds an intriguing finding that needs to be interpreted cautiously, the knowledge
287 on PPE use being associated with lower odds of positive attitudes towards its PPE use. This
288 counterintuitive relationship prompts closer examination of potential underlying factors. Firstly,
289 it is relatable that farmers with extensive knowledge of PPE may, paradoxically, become
290 cognizant of its limitations or discomforts in practical application. This heightened awareness
291 may lead to a more relaxed attitude towards its use. Additionally, the excess of knowledge may
292 inadvertently lead to complacency, as farmers might overestimate their proficiency in
293 implementing safety measures, potentially reducing the perceived necessity of consistent PPE
294 adherence. Furthermore, it is crucial to consider that attitudes towards safety practices are
295 influenced by a lot of factors. Socio-cultural norms, personal experiences, and contextual
296 constraints play pivotal roles in shaping these attitudes [35,36].

297 The marital status of farmers, their years involved in farming, years of pesticide use, number of
298 hours of pesticide exposed, methods of applying pesticides, and their attitude towards PPE use
299 were all found to be associated with practice related to PPE use. The farmers who were married
300 were more likely to wear PPE while working with pesticides which is consistent with the study

301 conducted in Cameroon [30]. A plausible explanation for this might be that the married
302 individuals have a heightened sense of responsibilities towards their family, having any form of
303 illness not only affects the individuals but also adds financial burden to their family therefore
304 they might adhere to adopt responsible behaviors like wearing PPE while handling pesticides.
305 Likewise, their spouse and other family members may also encourage and pressurize them to
306 adopt precautionary measures.

307 Further, the odds of using PPE were found to be substantially lower among the farmers who were
308 involved in farming for more than 10 years. A similar finding was seen in a study conducted in
309 India where the farmers who had mean 18 years old farming exposure were not following safety
310 practices [29]. This could be because those farmers may have developed sense of confidence in
311 their work and have less perceived risk in their work by underestimating the potential hazard of
312 pesticide and have a false belief that they can manage the risk without the use of PPE.

313 However, unlike the years involved in farming, the farmers who were using pesticides for more
314 than 10 years had higher odds of using PPE. The plausible reason behind this may be because the
315 farmers who were using pesticides for a longer time might be more familiar with the potential
316 health hazards or might have experienced side effects and may be more familiar about the safety
317 measures to reduce the risk. Moreover, as farmers accumulate years of experience, they often
318 become more attuned to industry recommendations and regulatory guidelines regarding safety
319 practices [29]. Likewise, the farmers who were exposed to pesticides for 10 hours or more in their
320 lifetime were more likely to use PPE. This might be because the farmers might perceive that an

321 exposure to pesticides for a longer period can cause deleterious effects which has also been
322 mentioned in theory of toxicology [29,31].

323 Additionally, the finding that positive attitude was associated with lower odds of PPE use among
324 farmers presents an intriguing and potentially counterintuitive observation. A similar finding was
325 also presented in a study conducted in Ethiopia [27]. This result may be elucidated by several
326 factors outlined in existing literature. Firstly, individuals with an optimistic outlook towards their
327 work environment may exhibit a heightened perception of safety and reduced perceived risk,
328 potentially diminishing the perceived necessity for PPE. This phenomenon, known as the
329 "optimism bias," has been documented in various occupational contexts, where individuals tend
330 to underestimate their personal susceptibility to negative events [32]. Moreover, positive
331 attitude may inadvertently lead to overconfidence, as farmers may believe that their positive
332 outlook alone is sufficient to mitigate potential risks, thereby diminishing their motivation to
333 engage in precautionary measures like PPE use. Additionally, socio-cultural factors and peer
334 influence may play a pivotal role in shaping attitudes towards safety practices; downplaying the
335 necessity of PPE use [33,34]. This result underscores the importance of considering not only
336 attitudes but also their potential impact on behavior. It emphasizes the need for targeted
337 interventions that address the complex interplay between attitudes, risk perception, and actual
338 safety practices to ensure optimal PPE utilization among farmers.

339 This study also has some limitations. Firstly, the interviews were conducted through telephone
340 considering safety protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic; therefore, the responses are
341 subjected to differ from face-to-face interviews as the communication might have been subject

342 to various interference like lack of visual cues, body language and time constraint which might
343 have influenced the data and the study. Further, the pandemic increased the use of masks among
344 people and since this study is also related to the use of PPE, the situation may also have
345 influenced the result of the current study.

346 **Conclusion**

347 In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing the adoption of
348 PPE among farmers. The association between education and knowledge on PPE underscores the
349 pivotal role of formalized education in promoting safety awareness and practices within the
350 agricultural community. Additionally, the association between lower socioeconomic status and
351 attitudes towards PPE highlights the need for targeted interventions to address economic
352 barriers and ensure equitable access to protective gear. Furthermore, the finding that farmers
353 who have experienced illness exhibit lower odds of positive attitudes towards PPE emphasizes
354 the importance of considering health status as a determinant of safety behaviors. Moreover, the
355 positive relationship between years of pesticide uses and increased PPE utilization highlights the
356 evolution of safety consciousness over time, underlining the value of experiential learning in
357 shaping responsible pesticide handling behaviors. This study has several implications for policy
358 and practice. It underscores the need for tailored educational programs that consider the diverse
359 educational backgrounds and experiences of farmers. Additionally, targeted interventions
360 addressing economic constraints and health status are crucial in promoting consistent PPE use.

361 Finally, efforts to foster a culture of safety within the agricultural sector should encompass not
362 only knowledge dissemination but also the cultivation of positive safety attitudes.

363 **Acknowledgments**

364 We would like to express our gratitude to Professor Shital Bhandary, School of Public Health,
365 Patan Academy of Health Sciences for the support during data analysis. Additionally, we thank
366 Kirtipur Municipality for allowing us to conduct the study.

367 **References**

- 368 1. Sharma A, Kumar V, Shahzad B, Tanveer M, Sidhu GPS, Handa N, et al. Worldwide pesticide
369 usage and its impacts on ecosystem. *SN Appl Sci*. 2019;1: 1–16. doi:10.1007/s42452-019-
370 1485-1
- 371 2. Joshi SK. Pesticides poisoning in Nepal. *Kathmandu Univ Med J (KUMJ)*. 2003;1: 157.
372 Available:
373 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7383585_Pesticides_poisoning_in_Nepal
- 374 3. Diwakar J, Prasai T, Pant SR, Jayana BL. Study on Major Pesticides and Fertilizers used in
375 Nepal. *Scientific World*. 1970;6: 76–80. doi:10.3126/sw.v6i6.2638
- 376 4. Gyawali K. Pesticide Uses and its Effects on Public Health and Environment. *Journal of*
377 *Health Promotion*. 2018;6: 28–36. doi:10.3126/jhp.v6i0.21801
- 378 5. Central Bureau of Statistics. National Sample Census of Agriculture Nepal. 2013; 114.
- 379 6. Atreya K, Sitaula BK. Mancozeb: growing risk for agricultural communities? *Himalayan*
380 *Journal of Sciences*. 2011;6: 9–10. doi:10.3126/hjs.v6i8.1794
- 381 7. Aryal KK, Neupane S, Lohani GR, Jors E, Neupane D, Khanal PR, Jha BK, Dhimal M, Shrestha
382 BM, Bista B, Poudyal A A, KB K. Health Effects of Pesticide among Vegetable Farmers and
383 the Adaptation Level of Integrated Pest Management Program in Nepal , 2014. Nepal
384 Health Research Council, 2016. 2014; 1–3. Available: [http://nhrc.gov.np/wp-](http://nhrc.gov.np/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/pesticide-report_setting.pdf)
385 [content/uploads/2017/06/pesticide-report_setting.pdf](http://nhrc.gov.np/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/pesticide-report_setting.pdf)

- 386 8. Weisenburger DD. Human health effects of agrichemical use. *Hum Pathol.* 1993;24: 571–
387 576. doi:10.1016/0046-8177(93)90234-8
- 388 9. Kim KH, Kabir E, Jahan SA. Exposure to pesticides and the associated human health effects.
389 *Science of the Total Environment.* 2017;575: 525–535.
390 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.09.009
- 391 10. Atreya K, Rijal C, Neupane P. Pesticide use in agriculture and chronic health conditions: A
392 survey-based cross-sectional study in Nepal. *Archives of Agriculture and Environmental*
393 *Science.* 2020;5: 489–497. doi:10.26832/24566632.2020.050409
- 394 11. Yarpuz-Bozdogan N. The importance of personal protective equipment in pesticide
395 applications in agriculture. *Curr Opin Environ Sci Health.* 2018;4: 1–4.
396 doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2018.02.001
- 397 12. Khan M. Using the Health Belief Model to understand pesticide use decisions. *Pak Dev Rev.*
398 2010;49: 941–956. doi:10.30541/v49i4iipp.941-956
- 399 13. Harirar Bhawan L. Study on national pesticide consumption statistics in Nepal. Ministry of
400 Agriculture, Government of Nepal. 2014; 1–84.
- 401 14. Weigel R. *Solutions for Living: Personal Protective Equipment for Agriculture.* 2012.
402 Available: <http://www.wyomingextension.org/agpubs/pubs/B1233.pdf>
- 403 15. Karmacharya S. Pesticide Use In Agriculture And Its Socio- Economic Contexts, A Case
404 Study of Panchkhal Area, Kavre, Nepal. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology*
405 *Research.* 2012;1: 17–20.

- 406 16. Shrestha P, Koirala P, Tamrakar AS. Knowledge, Practice and Use of Pesticides among
407 Commercial Vegetable Growers of Dhading District, Nepal. *Journal of Agriculture and*
408 *Environment*. 2010;11: 95–100. doi:10.3126/aej.v11i0.3656
- 409 17. Sapbamrer R, Thammachai A. Factors affecting use of personal protective equipment and
410 pesticide safety practices: A systematic review. *Environ Res*. 2020;185: 109444.
411 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.109444
- 412 18. Thapa S, Thapa B, Bhandari R, Jamkatel D, Acharya P, Rawal S, et al. Knowledge on Pesticide
413 Handling Practices and Factors Affecting Adoption of Personal Protective Equipment: A
414 Case of Farmers from Nepal. *Advances in Agriculture*. 2021;2021.
415 doi:10.1155/2021/5569835
- 416 19. Anas M. Which Predisposing Factors Influence The Farmers in Compliance of Personal
417 Protective Equipment (PPE)? *Indian Journal of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology*. 2021.
418 doi:10.37506/ijfmt.v15i2.14889
- 419 20. Khanal, Gayatri S. Patterns of Pesticide Use and Associated Factors Among the Commercial
420 Farmers of Chitwan, Nepal. doi:10.1177/EHI.S40973
- 421 21. Basnet N, Chidi CL. Impact of Pesticide and Fertilizer on Human Health: A Case Study in
422 Godawari Area, Lalitpur, Nepal. *The Geographic Base*. 2019;6: 65–76.
423 doi:10.3126/tgb.v6i0.26168

- 424 22. Humagain N, Humagain N, Maharjan K, Sah AK, Neupane J. Knowledge and Practice of
425 Pesticides among the Farmer of Bhaktapur Municipality, Nepal. 2019; 1–10.
426 doi:10.21203/rs.2.18419/v1
- 427 23. Major insect pests and pesticide used practices among tomato growers in Kathmandu and
428 Bhaktapur districts.pdf. Available: [https://ppsnepal.com/sites/default/files/18_Tomato](https://ppsnepal.com/sites/default/files/18_Tomato_insectpest_and_pesticides%2C_J_Plant_Proct._Soc._Vol._6%2C_2020.pdf)
429 [insectpest and pesticides%2C J. Plant Proct. Soc. Vol. 6%2C 2020.pdf](https://ppsnepal.com/sites/default/files/18_Tomato_insectpest_and_pesticides%2C_J_Plant_Proct._Soc._Vol._6%2C_2020.pdf)
- 430 24. Thapa A, Tamrakar AS, Subedi IP. Pesticide Use Practices Among Tomato Growers in Kavre
431 District, Nepal. Nepalese Journal of Zoology. 2015;3: 17–23. doi:10.3126/njz.v3i1.30861
- 432 25. Siriwong S, Siripattanakul W, Robson S. Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) of Using
433 Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) for Chilli-Growing Farmers in Huarua Sub-district,
434 Mueang District. J Health Res. 2010;24: 93–100. Available:
435 [https://scholarship.libraries.rutgers.edu/discovery/delivery/01RUT_INST:ResearchReposi](https://scholarship.libraries.rutgers.edu/discovery/delivery/01RUT_INST:ResearchRepository/12643442910004646?l#13643539200004646Norkaew)
436 [tory/12643442910004646?l#13643539200004646Norkaew,](https://scholarship.libraries.rutgers.edu/discovery/delivery/01RUT_INST:ResearchRepository/12643442910004646?l#13643539200004646Norkaew)
- 437 26. Abdollahzadeh G, Sharifzadeh MS. Predicting farmers' intention to use PPE for prevent
438 pesticide adverse effects: An examination of the Health Belief Model (HBM). Journal of the
439 Saudi Society of Agricultural Sciences. 2021;20: 40–47. doi:10.1016/j.jssas.2020.11.001
- 440 27. Pasioni JO, Torres P, Silva JR, Diniz BZ, Caldas ED. Knowledge, attitudes, practices and
441 biomonitoring of farmers and residents exposed to pesticides in Brazil. Int J Environ Res
442 Public Health. 2012;9: 3051–3068. doi:10.3390/ijerph9093051

- 443 28. Negatu B, Kromhout H, Mekonnen Y, Vermeulen R. Use of chemical pesticides in Ethiopia:
444 A cross-sectional comparative study Onknowledge, attitude and practice of farmers and
445 farm workers in three farming systems. *Annals of Occupational Hygiene*. 2016;60: 551–
446 566. doi:10.1093/annhyg/mew004
- 447 29. Hayati A. Safety behavior of agricultural workers around face mask-wearing during the
448 COVID-19 pandemic. *Work*. 2022;74: 371–379. doi:10.3233/WOR-220205
- 449 30. Öztaş D, Kurt B, Koç A, Akbaba M, Ilter H. Knowledge level, attitude, and behaviors of
450 farmers in çukurova region regarding the use of pesticides. *Biomed Res Int*. 2018;2018.
451 doi:10.1155/2018/6146509
- 452 31. Zyoud SH, Sawalha AF, Sweileh WM, Awang R, Al-Khalil SI, Al-Jabi SW, et al. Knowledge
453 and practices of pesticide use among farm workers in the West Bank, Palestine: Safety
454 implications. *Environ Health Prev Med*. 2010;15: 252–261. doi:10.1007/s12199-010-0136-
455 3
- 456 32. Gesesew HA, Woldemichael K, Massa D, Mwanri L. Farmers knowledge, attitudes,
457 practices and health problems associated with pesticide use in rural irrigation villages,
458 Southwest Ethiopia. *PLoS One*. 2016;11. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0162527
- 459 33. Migheli M. Income, wealth and use of personal protection equipment in the Mekong Delta.
460 doi:10.1007/s11356-021-13449-w/Published

- 461 34. Sookhtanlou M, Allahyari MS. Farmers' health risk and the use of personal protective
462 equipment (PPE) during pesticide application. *Environmental Science and Pollution*
463 *Research*. 2021;28: 28168–28178. doi:10.1007/s11356-021-12502-y
- 464 35. Franklin R, Levy I, Lisandro Signorini M, Mohammadrezaei M, Meredith D. Do social
465 influences, awareness, or experience matter? Toward a better understanding of Farm-
466 related Injury Risk Perception among agricultural science college students in Ireland.
- 467 36. Garrigou A, Laurent C, Berthet A, Colosio C, Jas N, Daubas-Letourneux V, et al. Critical
468 review of the role of PPE in the prevention of risks related to agricultural pesticide use.
469 *Safety Science*. Elsevier B.V.; 2020. doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2019.104527
- 470