

1 **Etiological Factors of *Risk for Occupational Illness* in Nursing**

2 **Professionals: Etiology and Risk Review Protocol**

3

4 Cyntia Leenara Bezerra da Silva¹, Ana Clara Dantas¹, Bárbara Ebilizarda
5 Coutinho Borges¹, Leandro Melo de Carvalho¹, Heloise Rosália de Carvalho
6 Nascimento¹, Maria Clara Regis de Souza¹, Allyne Fortes Vitor^{1*}

7

8 ¹ Department of Nursing, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, Rio
9 Grande do Norte, Brazil.

10

11 * Corresponding author
12 allynefortes@gmail.com (AFV)

13

14 **Abstract**

15 **Aim:** To describe the protocol for a systematic review of etiology and risk to
16 identify the etiological factors of *Risk for Occupational Illness* in nursing
17 professionals.

18 **Design:** Etiology and risk review protocol, conducted according to JBI guidelines.

19 **Methods:** This is an etiology and risk review protocol to be carried out following
20 the JBI guidelines in the following data sources: CINAHL, MEDLINE/PubMed,
21 Cochrane Library, Scopus, EMBASE, Latin American and Caribbean Literature
22 in Health Sciences, National Institute of Security and Health at Work and National
23 Institute of Health at Work. The inclusion criteria are studies that address workers
24 aged 18 years until retirement, demonstrate etiological factors that condition the
25 susceptibility of the ND in question and address analyses regarding the
26 identification, definition and association of factors with the Risk of Occupational
27 Illness. The exclusion criteria are studies that did not address the topic, opinion
28 articles, letters to the editor and editorials.

29 **Expected Results:** The results of this review will be publicly disclosed in
30 scientific journals in the health area and will contribute to increasing the level of

31 evidence of the Nursing Diagnosis *Risk for Occupational Illness*, so that they
32 remain in future editions of NANDA International and that the diagnosis is
33 updated and revised based on the current scientific literature.

34 **Conclusion:** It is expected identify the possible uses of the concept; determine
35 the essential critical attributes; identify the antecedents and consequences of the
36 concept; and define the empirical references and to highlight the etiological
37 factors that are consistent with susceptibility to occupational illness.

38 **Keywords:** Occupational stress; Occupational diseases; etiology; Nursing
39 diagnosis; Nursing professionals.

40

41 **Strengths and limitations of this study:**

- 42 • This study will review the scientific literature on the etiological factors of *Risk*
43 *for Occupational Illness* in nursing professionals, providing an increase in the
44 level of evidence for this Diagnosis;
- 45 • The steps of this review will be followed strictly in accordance with the criteria
46 of the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis;
- 47 • To avoid selection bias, data collection will occur independently with active
48 blinding of researchers, who will use software to export and select data.

49

50 **Introduction**

51 Workers' health encompasses the interactions between work and the
52 health-disease process, with activities regulated by the Organic Health Law, Law
53 nº. 8080/90. This law shows that the State must provide favorable conditions for
54 the full exercise of the work process. [1]

55 Therefore, economic and social policies are needed that propose the
56 reduction of risks of diseases and other harm to professionals. In this context, the
57 standard provides for the conditions for the execution of healthcare through
58 health surveillance, the promotion, protection and recovery of workers' health. [1]

59 Nursing professionals continuously provide health care 24 hours a day,
60 sometimes due to a shortage of supplies and in precarious working conditions.
61 Workers work 30-40 hours a week and, in some situations, have more than one
62 employment relationship. [2] These facts, combined with the on-call regime,
63 increase the tiring routine and interpersonal-professional conflicts that have
64 repercussions on the biological and psychological dimensions, corroborating
65 occupational illnesses that are largely neglected by the professionals themselves.

66 In general, healthcare professionals naturally present risk factors that are
67 intensified depending on the conditions they are offered during the execution of
68 care. For example, many healthcare institutions are considered unhealthy
69 because they admit patients with a wide range of illnesses and require
70 procedures that pose risks of accidents and illnesses to the worker. [2]

71 In Brazil, from 2018 to 2022, 329,176 work accidents related to exposure
72 to biological material were recorded, of which 54.4% were nursing professionals.
73 [3] Another important event to mention is the increasing number of accident
74 benefits granted to workers, as a result of serious injuries, musculoskeletal
75 diseases and mental disorders. [4]

76 Data from the International Labor Organization (2021) indicate that
77 monetary expenses related to work-related accidents can account for up to 4%
78 of the world's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This has the potential to be

79 minimized or even eradicated, as many of these events are preventable as long
80 as efficient risk management methods are implemented. [4]

81 Professional practice activities can potentially cause injury to workers and
82 their occurrence is influenced and intensified by probability and severity.
83 Awareness that occupational exposure to risks occurs in the face of professional-
84 work environment interaction will allow nurses to develop and adopt a preventive
85 mindset conducive to implementing strategies to minimize the possible risks of
86 Occupational Illness. [2,4]

87 In order to develop a care plan that is appropriate for implementing nursing
88 interventions and achieving expected results, nurses must rely on the Nursing
89 Process (NP). The NP allows the identification, understanding, measurement and
90 prediction of the individual's health problems so that an effective and applicable
91 care plan can be developed. Organized in five interrelated, interdependent,
92 recurring and cyclical stages: assessment, diagnosis, outcome/planning,
93 implementation, and evaluation. [5-6]

94 In the NANDA-International (NANDA-I) taxonomy, the Nursing Diagnosis
95 (ND) *Risk for Occupational Illness* (00404) approved in 2023, belonging to
96 Domain 11. Safety/protection and Class 4. Environmental risks, presents 29 risk
97 factors, classified as individual: (1) Difficulty with decision-making, (2) Excessive
98 stress, (3) Improper use of personal protective equipment, (4) Inaccurate follow-
99 through of employee health protocol, (5) Inaccurate follow-through to safety
100 protocol, (6) Inadequate action to address modifiable factors, (7) Inadequate
101 communication skills, (8) Inadequate knowledge of modifiable factors, (9)
102 Inadequate social support, (10) Inadequate understanding of the importance of

103 personal protective equipment, (11) Inadequate vaccination, (12) Inattentive to
104 ergonomic principles, (13) Ineffective weight management. [7]

105 As well as, environmental factors: (1) Conflicted labor relationships, (2)
106 Excessive workload, (3) Exposure to chemical agents, (4) Exposure to biological
107 agents, (5) Exposure to intermittent impacts, (6) Exposure to psychosocial
108 agents, (7) Exposure to repetitive motion activities, (8) Inadequate access to
109 personal protective equipment, (9) Inadequate adoption of the ergonomic
110 principle, (10) Inadequate biological monitoring, (11) Inadequate dosimetry
111 monitoring, (12) Inadequate employee health protocol, (13) Inadequate
112 placement of collective protective equipment, (14) Inadequate safety protocol,
113 (15) Ineffective workload management, (16) Pathogen exposure. [7]

114 Highlighting at risk population: (1) Chestfeeding individuals, (2) Individuals
115 whose work is comprised of monotonous activities, (3) Individuals with history of
116 physical trauma, (4) Individuals with history of traumatic professional exposure,
117 (5) Individuals with history of work-related accidents, (6) Individuals with limited
118 access to healthcare services, (7) Individuals with multiple employment contracts,
119 (8) Individuals with responsibilities beyond own work ability, (9) Individuals with
120 work-life imbalance, (10) Pregnant individuals, (11) Rotating shift workers. [7]

121 This ND has the definition: susceptibility to work-related condition or
122 disorder resulting from a non-instantaneous event or exposure, and presents
123 level of evidence 2.1, the initial level of a diagnosis approved to compose the
124 taxonomy. [7]

125 Although NANDA-I presents itself as an estimated classification system,
126 proposing through diagnostic classifications, the standardization of language
127 among nursing professionals, it requires that constant theoretical, clinical and

128 content studies be carried out to update the evidence and validity of diagnoses,
129 to allow the expansion of the use of taxonomy in the most diverse scenarios and
130 populations. [8]

131 The Nursing Diagnosis validation process is divided into three phases:
132 concept analysis, content analysis by experts and clinical validation. The Etiology
133 and Risk review will be necessary for the development of the concept analysis,
134 the first stage of validation. [9]

135

136 **Aims**

137 From this perspective, the following research question was raised: What
138 are the etiological factors of the *Risk for Occupational Illness* in nursing
139 professionals?

140

141 **Method**

142 **Study**

143 This is an Etiology and Risk Review protocol developed according to the
144 recommendations of the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis, Chapter 7, and the
145 PRISMA-ScR (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-
146 Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews), registered in the International
147 prospective register of systematic reviews with the respective registration:
148 CRD4202549181. [10-11] The following steps will be adopted: definition of the
149 research question, identification of relevant studies, assessment of
150 methodological quality, data extraction and synthesis of results. [12]

151 This systematic literature review will be carried out with the aim of
152 operationalizing the development of a concept analysis for the Nursing Diagnosis

153 *Risk for Occupational Illness*. The review will be based on the acronym PEO,
154 which are: P (population); E (etiology); and O (outcome). [10] Thus, the elements
155 to be admitted will be P (nursing professionals); E (etiological factors); and O
156 (*Risk for Occupational Illness*). To be adopted as the research question: “What
157 are the etiological factors related to the Nursing Diagnosis *Risk for Occupational*
158 *Illness* in nursing professionals?”

159

160 **Information sources**

161 Searches in the literary collection will be carried out through the CAPES
162 Periodicals Portal, through the Federated Academic Community (CAFe) platform
163 of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN) in the respective data
164 sources: CINAHL (EBSCO), MEDLINE/PubMed (via National Library of
165 Medicine), Cochrane Library, Scopus (Elsevier), EMBASE and Latin American
166 and Caribbean Literature in Health Sciences (LILACS). As well as in the National
167 Institute of Security and Health at Work (INSST) and National Institute of Health
168 at Work (INST) for comparison between the Brazilian and Spanish scenarios,
169 since Spain has intense discussion and visibility on the subject. It is worth noting
170 that no restrictions on language or year of publication will be applied.

171

172 **Search strategy**

173 The selection of descriptors used in the search strategy was done by
174 consulting the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and the Health Sciences
175 Descriptors (DeCS). Seven descriptors and one keyword related to the
176 phenomenon were defined, in order to contribute to the findings of the available
177 literature, according to Table 1.

178 **Table 1. Description and characterization of the PEO mnemonic used in the**
 179 **research.**

MNEMONIC STRATEGY PEO	DESCRIPTORS DeCS	DESCRIPTORS MESH	KEYWORD
P: Nursing Professionals	“Nursing Professionals”	“Nursing professionals” “Nursing Team”	-
E: Etiological Factors	“Etiology”	“Causality”“Etiology”	-
O: Risk for occupational illness	“Nursing diagnosis” “Occupational risks” “Occupational exposure” “Occupational stress” “Occupational diseases”	“Nursing diagnosis” “Occupational risks” “Occupational exposure” “Occupational stress” “Occupational diseases”	“Risk for occupational illness”

180

181 The Boolean operators “AND” and “OR” were applied for the purpose of
 182 crossing the elements referenced by the acronym PEO. [13] The result of
 183 crossing the components of the acronym PEO with the Boolean operators was:
 184 “Nursing professionals” OR “Nursing Team” AND “Causality” OR “Etiology” AND

185 “Nursing diagnosis” OR “Occupational risks” OR “Occupational Exposure” OR
186 “Occupational stress” OR “Occupational diseases” OR “Risk for occupational
187 illness”.

188 Considering the particularity of each data source, aiming at the greatest
189 location of scientific evidence, cross-referencing of descriptors was strategically
190 generated, resulting in product syntaxes (Appendix A).

191

192 **Inclusion criteria**

193 As eligibility criteria, studies that address workers from 18 years of age
194 until retirement, demonstrate etiological factors consistent with the susceptibility
195 of the ND in question, and address analyses regarding the identification, definition
196 and association of factors with the *Risk of Occupational Illness* will be considered.
197 Studies that exclusively present etiological factors related to nursing
198 professionals and that do not answer the research question will be excluded.
199 Duplicate studies will be counted only once.

200

201 **Selection of sources of evidence**

202 In order to ensure methodological quality and avoid selection bias, the
203 selection of studies will be carried out independently and under active blinding of
204 the two researchers using the Rayyan – Intelligent Systematic Review software
205 (<https://rayyan.ai/>).

206 During the search process, all studies will be evaluated and their inclusion
207 in the sample will occur after an initial reading of the title and abstract. In case of
208 disagreement, a third reviewer will be consulted. The entire process follow the

209 PRISMA-ScR flowchart, and will be properly documented detailing of the
210 selection process.

211 The methodological content of the studies found will be assessed by
212 applying the checklists for studies available in the JBI manual for each type of
213 study to be found in the review. [14] In the absence of a cut-off score established
214 by the JBI, the decision on whether to include or remove a study from the sample
215 will follow the cut-off score established by the researchers as ≥ 6 . It should be
216 noted that the score for each type of study will be measured based on the
217 arithmetic mean of the number of items in each list.

218

219 **Data extraction**

220 Data mapping will be performed using a structured data extraction tool in
221 Microsoft Excel 2019. It will present variables related to the characterization of
222 the studies, essential attributes, associated conditions and at risk population for
223 the Nursing Diagnosis Risk for occupational illness. In addition, the identification
224 of which etiological factors and at risk populations evidenced in the studies are
225 not present in NANDA-I (Appendix B).

226

227 **Summary of results**

228 In the summary of results, the findings identified by repeated reading of
229 the studies will be grouped into categories developed by the researchers
230 according to similarity of concepts. They will be presented in a descriptive
231 manner, with the possibility of summarizing in tables, charts and other graphic
232 resources in addition to the discursive text.

233

234 **Analysis of evidence**

235 The studies that will make up the sample will undergo an analysis of the
236 level of evidence, following the guidelines of the JBI approach classification:
237 levels of evidence, where the following will be evaluated: level 1 – experimental
238 studies; level 2 – quasi-experimental studies; level 3 – analytical observational
239 studies; level 4 – descriptive observational studies; level 5 – expert opinion and
240 bench research. [14] This analysis will fairly discuss the results of the studies
241 according to the level of evidence presented.

242

243 **Ethical Aspects**

244 Considering the nature of the theoretical research and the non-
245 incorporation of human beings, submission to the Research Ethics Committee
246 will not be necessary, since the scientific evidence to be used is available in the
247 public domain.

248

249 **Results**

250 The results will include the characterization of the studies in the sample,
251 highlighting the etiological factors of the ND Risk for Occupational Illness in
252 nursing professionals.

253 To this end, the results will be presented descriptively using tables and
254 charts, in order to answer the research question. The studies in the sample will
255 be organized by figure according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
256 Reviews and Meta-Analyses.

257

258 **Discussion**

259 The motivation for developing this review is based on the need to
260 contemplate steps 3, 4, 7 and 8 of the concept analysis for the diagnosis of *Risk*
261 *of Occupational Illness*, which are named as: identification of possible uses of the
262 concept; determination of essential critical attributes; identification of antecedents
263 and consequences of the concept; and definition of empirical references. [15] To
264 clarify a theoretical gradient with the potential to revise the Nursing Diagnosis in
265 NANDA-I, understanding the risks likely to threaten the safety and health of the
266 worker, to attribute visibility to an individual beyond the patient and companion,
267 the nursing professional.

268 Over the years, nursing has prospered, increasingly expanding the
269 possibilities of professional practice and increasingly establishing itself as one of
270 the main health sciences. The growing number of professionals reinforces the
271 need for standardization of language among members of the nursing team, a fact
272 made possible through the use of taxonomies, for example, NANDA-I.

273 However, for taxonomies to corroborate evidence-based practice, new
274 research on *Risk of Occupational Illness* is required, impacting advances in
275 knowledge regarding the state of the art of the object under study associated with
276 the validation of the ND in NANDA-I so that its level of evidence is high. [7]

277 The process of validating nursing diagnoses is divided into the following
278 phases: concept analysis, content analysis by experts, and clinical validation.
279 Initially, the essential attributes, antecedents, and consequences of a Nursing
280 Diagnosis are identified. After the concept analysis, the content will be evaluated
281 by experts, proving its relevance, coherence, clarity, and relevance, so that it can
282 be validated in clinical scenarios in the future. [9]

283 The definition and knowledge about indicators may result in greater health
284 care coverage in terms of identifying responses and interventions in a timely
285 manner with coherent and effective activities. [7,9,16] It is also evident that the
286 identification of risk factors will enable the establishment of interventions that are
287 consistent and targeted at the vulnerability presented by the worker, since, given
288 the probability of prevention, any and all circumstances that make the
289 professional susceptible to occupational illness will be recognized.

290 The results of this review will be publicly published in scientific journals in
291 the health field and will contribute to increasing the level of evidence for the
292 Nursing Diagnosis *Risk of Occupational Illness*, so that they remain in future
293 editions of NANDA International and that the diagnosis is updated and revised
294 based on current scientific literature.

295

296 **Conclusion**

297 By identifying the possible uses of the concept; determining essential
298 critical attributes; identifying antecedents and consequences of the concept; and
299 defining empirical references, it will be possible to highlight the etiological factors
300 (associated conditions, at risk population, and risk factors) consistent with
301 susceptibility to occupational illness.

302 Identifying risk factors will enable the establishment of interventions that
303 are consistent and targeted to the vulnerability presented by the worker, since,
304 given the probability of prevention, any and all circumstances that make the
305 professional susceptible to occupational illness will be recognized. Beneficially
306 impacting the health of the worker and, consequently, optimizing care, reflecting
307 in a more well-founded care process and in the safety of those involved.

308

309 **References**

- 310 1. BRASIL. Presidência da República. LEI Nº 8.080, DE 19 DE
311 SETEMBRO DE 1990. Brasília, DF, 1990. Available from:
312 https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l8080.htm
- 313 2. ALVES NS, OLIVEIRA BA, CARVALHO TA, CARVALHO TA, SAMPAIO
314 LS, ALMEIDA RO, et al. Riscos Ocupacionais e seus Agravos aos
315 Profissionais de Enfermagem: Revisão Integrativa da Literatura. Revista
316 de Casos e Consultoria. 2021;12(1)e25687. Available from:
317 <https://periodicos.ufrn.br/casoseconsultoria/article/view/25687/14523>
- 318 3. BRASIL. Ministério da Saúde. 17º Boletim epidemiológico – Acidentes
319 de trabalho com exposição a material biológico em profissionais de
320 enfermagem, 2018-2022. Brasília, DF: Secretaria de Vigilância em
321 Saúde e Ambiente, 2023. Available from: <https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/publicacoes/boletins/epidemiologicos/edicoes/2023/boletim-epidemiologico-volume-54-no-17#:~:text=No%20Brasil%2C%20entre%202018%20e%202022%2C%20foi%20registrado%20um%20total,rela%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20a%20-%20profissionais%20da%20enfermagem.>
- 322
323
324
325
326
327
- 328 4. BERMUDES WL. Proposta de uma matriz de risco para programa de
329 gerenciamento de risco em atividades rotineiras. Vértices.
330 2021;23(2)580-589. doi: 10.19180/1809-2667.v23n22021p580-589
- 331 5. SANTOS JAS, MACHADO APA, LEITÃO FNC, RAMOS JLS, DABOIN
332 BEG, COSSON ICO, et al. Nursing assistance systematization:
333 understanding the care implementation process. J Hum Growth Dev.
334 2023; 33(2):231- 240. doi: 10.36311/jhgd.v33.14756
- 335 6. ANA. American Nurses Association. The Nursing Process. Estados
336 Unidos. Available from: <https://www.nursingworld.org/practice-policy/workforce/what-is-nursing/the-nursing-process/>.
- 337
338 7. NANDA. Diagnósticos de Enfermagem da NANDA-I: Definições e
339 Classificação 2024-2026 / [NANDA International]. In: Herdman TH,
340 Kamitsuru S, Lopes CT, editors. Diagnósticos de Enfermagem da

- 341 NANDA-I: Definições e Classificação, 13a ed. New York, NY: Thieme
342 Medical Publishers, Inc. (2024). 684 p.
- 343 8. BEZERRA DC, FERREIRA CRS, PENA FPS, PEREIRA CS, VIEITAS
344 DRI, PENA JLC, et al. Systematization of Nursing Assistance:
345 Perspectives of the Applicability in the Care of the Person with Diabetes
346 and Hypertension. American Journal of Nursing Science. 2019;8(4):174-
347 180. doi: 10.1016/10.11648/j.ajns.20190804.19
- 348 9. LOPES MVO, SILVA VM, ARAÚJO TL. Métodos de pesquisa para
349 validação clínica de conceitos diagnósticos. In: NANDA International,
350 Inc.; Herdman TH, organizadora. PRONANDA. Porto Alegre: Artmed
351 Panamericana, 2022. doi: 10.1186/s12877-022-03010-w
- 352 10. MOOLA S, et al. Chapter 7: Systematic reviews of etiology and risk. In:
353 Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis,
354 2020. Available from: [https://jbi-global-
355 wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687372/Chapter+7%3A+Systematic+r
356 eviews+of+etiology+and+risk](https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687372/Chapter+7%3A+Systematic+reviews+of+etiology+and+risk).
- 357 11. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al.
358 PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and
359 explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018 Oct 2;169(7):467–73. doi:
360 10.7326/M18-0850
- 361 12. KHAN KS, KUNZ R, KLEIJNEN J, ANTES G. Five steps to conducting a
362 systematic review. J R Soc Med. 2003;96(3):118-21. doi:
363 10.1177/014107680309600304
- 364 13. CAVALCANTE YA. Validação de conteúdo do diagnóstico de
365 enfermagem “Síndrome Pós-Trauma” no contexto da violência contra a
366 mulher. 2022. 236f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Enfermagem) - Programa
367 de Pós-Graduação em Enfermagem, Universidade Federal do Ceará,
368 Fortaleza, 2022.
- 369 14. JBI. The JBI approach: Levels of evidence. 2013; Available from:
370 [https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2019-05/JBI-Levels-of-
371 evidence_2014_0.pdf](https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2019-05/JBI-Levels-of-evidence_2014_0.pdf)
- 372 15. WALKER LO, AVANT KC. Strategies for Theory Construction in Nursing.
373 Pearson Education; 2019.

374 16. PAANS W. et al. Do knowledge, knowledge sources and reasoning skills
375 affect the accuracy of nursing diagnoses? a randomised study. **BMC**
376 **Nurs.** 2012;11. Doi: 10.1186/1472-6955-11-1
377

378 **Conflict of interest**

379 None

380

381 **Supporting information**

382 S1 Table. Table 1. Description and characterization of the PEO mnemonic used
383 in the research.

384 S1 File. Appendix for Search strategies for each database and extraction
385 instrument.

386

387 **FUNDING/ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

388 Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel -
389 doctoral scholarship for Dantas AC, Borges BEC and Carvalho LM and master's
390 scholarship for Silva CLB; the National Council for Scientific Technological
391 Development for Vitor AF under funding code 3061062022-1; and by the
392 Universal CNPq project no. 408730/2023-4.