JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND RISK COMMUNICATION RESEARCH
ISSN: 2576-0017
2024, VOL 7, NO S3

Laboratory Biosafety and Biosecurity during Infectious Disease Outbreaks

Ayid Saad Nahs[1]
Mohmmad Safaq Humaydi Alshammri[2]
Gomah Ali Majrahi[3]
Buthynah Alrqebah[4]
Amal Hadi Sameer Alenazi[5]
Waad Alsaleh[6]
Fahdah Ateeq Alboanen[7]
Fatimah Mohammed Alfaraj[8]

12345678. King soud medical city, Laboratory, Riyadh

Abstract
Effective patient care and the advancement of public health heavily depend on timely and accurate laboratory testing. These tests provide critical information for diagnosing, monitoring, and treating diseases, as well as for guiding public health interventions. However, one of the significant challenges faced by clinical laboratory professionals is the inherent uncertainty about the infectious nature of the patient specimens they handle. Since laboratory personnel often do not know if a sample contains harmful pathogens, maintaining stringent biosafety standards becomes a complex yet essential task. This uncertainty necessitates the implementation of rigorous protocols to minimize the risk of exposure to infectious agents, ensuring both the safety of the laboratory staff and the integrity of the testing process. Laboratory biosafety and biosecurity are essential to minimize the risk of pathogen release, prevent laboratory-acquired infections, and ensure the safe handling of infectious agents. This review examines the principles, and advancements in biosafety and biosecurity practices during infectious disease outbreaks, focusing on emerging and re-emerging pathogens.

Introduction

Infectious disease outbreaks pose significant public health challenges, exacerbated by the potential for laboratory-acquired infections and unintended releases of pathogens. Laboratory biosafety refers to practices, equipment, and facility design to prevent unintentional exposure to pathogens, while biosecurity involves measures to prevent the deliberate misuse of biological agents **(Salerno & Gaudioso, 2015)**. The increasing frequency of zoonotic spillovers, globalization, and bioterrorism threats underscores the need for robust biosafety and biosecurity protocols **(Sharan et al., 2023)**. The expansion of laboratory capacities is imperative to address the growing threat of infectious diseases. However, this expansion must be matched with comprehensive measures to mitigate biosafety and biosecurity risks. Strengthened infrastructure, rigorous training, and international collaboration are essential to safeguarding laboratory personnel, the public, and the environment. By prioritizing biosafety and biosecurity, laboratories can fulfill their critical role in global health security **(Inbanathan et al., 2024)**.

Laboratory biosafety and biosecurity are critical for managing infectious disease outbreaks. These practices aim to prevent accidental or intentional release of pathogens while ensuring the safety of laboratory personnel and the surrounding environment**(Cornish et al., 2021).** The history of laboratory biosafety and biosecurity dates back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when laboratory-acquired infections (LAIs) began to be formally recognized. An early documented case involved the transmission of *Corynebacterium diphtheriae* through mouth pipetting in 1898, underscoring the need for safer laboratory practices. Over time, the growing awareness of the risks posed by laboratory work with infectious agents led to the development of basic containment protocols, such as personal protective equipment and proper waste disposal practices **(Qasmi & Khan, 2019).** The era of high-containment laboratories marked a pivotal advancement in the ability to safely study and manage highly infectious pathogens. The establishment of high-containment facilities, such as Biosafety Level (BSL) laboratories, marked a significant milestone in laboratory biosafety. In the mid-20th century, facilities with stringent containment measures were constructed to handle highly pathogenic agents, particularly during the Cold War when biological weapons programs increased the need for secure environments. Early designs included sealed rooms, HEPA-filtered ventilation, and strict access controls to protect both personnel and the environment **(Yeh et al., 2019)**. In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, infectious disease outbreaks such as SARS (2003), H5N1 avian influenza, and Ebola (2014–2016) highlighted gaps in biosafety and biosecurity practices **(Mphande-Nyasulu et al., 2024)**. These events drove advancements in laboratory safety protocols, including the development of risk-based approaches and the updating of the WHO Laboratory Biosafety Manual. However, resource disparities in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) presented challenges in implementing consistent standards globally **(Cornish et al., 2021).**

The assignment of a BSL is not static and can vary based on the specific procedures and agents used. For example, certain SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic tests can be conducted under BSL-2 conditions with additional precautions typically seen at BSL-3. This flexibility allows laboratories to balance safety and operational needs while responding to emerging pathogens **(Sherin, 2024)**.The BSL framework ensures that laboratories operate safely and effectively while minimizing risks to personnel and the environment. By adhering to these levels, laboratories can conduct research and diagnostic activities that are crucial for public health and scientific advancement.

The objectives of this literature review focus on understanding and enhancing laboratory biosafety and biosecurity during infectious disease outbreaks through exploring the protocols and strategies implemented to safeguard laboratory personnel and ensure the secure handling of infectious agents. The review also aims to analyze historical incidents of laboratory-acquired infections and unintended pathogen releases.

1. **Expanding laboratory capacities amidst emerging infectious diseases**

The rise of infectious diseases such as Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) and avian influenza has placed immense pressure on global healthcare and research systems to bolster their laboratory capacities **(Lippi & Plebani, 2020)**. Advanced laboratory infrastructure is essential for the detection, containment, and study of these pathogens. However, as laboratories expand to meet these demands, new challenges arise, particularly in biosafety and biosecurity **(Brass et al., 2017)**. These challenges necessitate robust frameworks to minimize the risks of accidental or intentional pathogen release. Case studies underscore the critical role of biosafety measures in preventing laboratory incidents and ensuring the safe handling of hazardous pathogens. During the 2014-2016 Ebola outbreaks, laboratories played a crucial role in diagnosing cases. However, delays in establishing adequate biosafety protocols in LMIC laboratories hampered response efforts **(Cornish et al., 2021)**. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the value of preparedness, as laboratories worldwide scrambled to meet testing demands. Biosafety lapses in some facilities highlighted the ongoing need for stringent controls **(Lin et al., 2020)**. The expansion of laboratory capacities is driven by multiple factors, including the rise of emerging infectious diseases, global health security initiatives, and the need for biological threat preparedness. The frequency of emerging infectious diseases has escalated due to globalization, climate change, and increased human-animal interactions. Pathogens such as avian influenza and MERS-CoV have underscored the necessity of advanced diagnostic and research capabilities. Enhanced laboratories play a pivotal role in identifying pathogens, understanding their transmission dynamics, and developing countermeasures such as vaccines and therapeutics **(Brass et al., 2017)**. Organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO) and Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA) emphasize the importance of laboratory networks to strengthen disease surveillance. Countries are encouraged to establish or upgrade biosafety level (BSL)-3 and BSL-4 laboratories to enhance their capacity to handle highly infectious agents safely **(Maehira & Spencer, 2019)**. Additionally, concerns over bioterrorism have spurred investments in laboratory infrastructure to mitigate risks from deliberate pathogen releases, such as anthrax, ensuring preparedness against biological threats **(Zaki, 2010).**

The expansion of laboratory capacities brings significant risks, including accidental pathogen releases, laboratory-acquired infections (LAIs), biosecurity threats, and resource gaps. As laboratory activities increase, so do the chances of accidental releases. Historical incidents, such as the 2007 Foot-and-Mouth Disease outbreak in the UK, exemplify the catastrophic consequences of biosafety lapses **(Rhodes, 2009)**. Expansion increases personnel exposure to hazardous pathogens, raising the risk of LAIs. Common agents associated with LAIs include Brucella spp., Mycobacterium tuberculosis, and hepatitis viruses, often due to inadequate training or non-compliance with safety protocols **(Peng et al., 2018)**. Additionally, expanded capacities may inadvertently become targets for bioterrorism or malicious activities. Weak access controls and insufficient inventory management of dangerous pathogens can exacerbate these risks **(Puro et al., 2012)**. In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), laboratory expansion often outpaces the development of skilled personnel and resources. This imbalance creates vulnerabilities in biosafety and biosecurity measures **(Orelle et al., 2021)**.

Mitigating biosafety and biosecurity risks requires a multifaceted approach that includes comprehensive risk assessments, enhanced training, infrastructure upgrades, policy harmonization, advanced security measures, and global collaboration. Comprehensive Risk Assessment Effective laboratory management begins with risk assessments that evaluate the pathogenicity of agents, transmission routes, and laboratory design. Tools such as the Biosafety and Biosecurity Laboratory Assessment Tool (BSS LAT) provide standardized methods to identify vulnerabilities and implement mitigation strategies **(Orelle et al., 2022)**. Regular and rigorous training programs for laboratory staff are essential to minimize human errors. Topics should include proper microbiological practices, use of personal protective equipment (PPE), and emergency response protocols **(Peng et al., 2018)**. Laboratory facilities should be designed to accommodate modern safety measures, such as containment barriers, advanced ventilation systems, and waste decontamination units. Upgrades to these systems ensure compliance with global biosafety standards **(Jia et al., 2020)**. Harmonizing policies across borders, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, promotes consistent safety practices, supported by international collaboration through initiatives like the Global Health Security Agenda **(Maehira & Spencer, 2019)**. Strengthened access controls, inventory tracking systems, and surveillance mechanisms reduce the risk of unauthorized access to pathogens. Facilities managing high-risk agents should employ electronic key systems, closed-circuit television (CCTV), and biometric access controls **(Puro et al., 2012)**. International organizations can provide financial and technical assistance to under-resourced regions. Programs such as the Global Health Security Agenda foster partnerships to address gaps in laboratory capacity and biosafety **(Brass et al., 2017)**.

2. **Principles of Laboratory Biosafety**

Laboratory biosafety principles ensure safe handling of pathogens and hazardous biological materials, emphasizing a structured approach to mitigate risks. A cornerstone of these principles is the establishment of Biosafety Levels (BSLs), which categorize laboratories based on the pathogenicity of the agents handled and the risks they pose. The levels range from BSL-1 to BSL-4, with each level prescribing specific laboratory practices, safety equipment, and facility design to protect personnel and the public. These levels are internationally recognized and provide a standardized framework to ensure laboratory safety and security **(Gallandat & Lantagne, 2017)**. BSL-1 represents the lowest level, suitable for agents not known to cause disease in healthy humans, while BSL-4 is the highest, dealing with life-threatening pathogens with no known treatment, such as the Ebola virus. These levels guide the implementation of containment measures, including facility design, safety equipment, and procedural safeguards to minimize exposure and accidental release **(Brass et al., 2017)**. BSL-1 applies to laboratories working with agents that pose minimal risk to healthy individuals. Examples include non-pathogenic strains of E. coli and Bacillus subtilis. Standard microbiological practices are sufficient, such as proper handwashing, prohibition of eating and drinking in the lab, and safe handling of waste. The facilities typically include a sink for handwashing and work surfaces that are easily decontaminated. No specialized containment equipment is required, and the focus is on ensuring good laboratory practices **(Roy, 2009)**. BSL-2 laboratories handle pathogens that pose a moderate risk and are associated with diseases of varying severity, such as Staphylococcus aureus, Salmonella spp., and hepatitis B virus. This level requires the use of biological safety cabinets (BSCs) for procedures that may produce aerosols and emphasizes the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), such as gloves, lab coats, and eye protection. Access to BSL-2 labs is restricted, and personnel must be trained in handling pathogenic agents. Decontamination protocols for surfaces and waste are stricter than at BSL-1, and sharps handling is minimized to reduce the risk of needlestick injuries **(Barkham, 2004)**. BSL-3 is designed for work with agents that can cause severe or potentially lethal diseases via inhalation, such as Mycobacterium tuberculosis, SARS-CoV-2, and anthrax. Laboratories are engineered to prevent the release of pathogens, featuring specialized ventilation systems with HEPA filtration, sealed windows, and controlled airflow to maintain negative pressure. Personnel must wear respiratory protection and use PPE appropriate for the pathogen. Procedures generating aerosols are conducted within certified BSCs. Entry is restricted to authorized personnel, and labs must include an anteroom for donning and doffing PPE. Risk assessments are conducted regularly to ensure adherence to safety protocols **(Caskey et al., 2010)**. BSL-4 is the highest biosafety level and is reserved for research on agents that pose a high risk of aerosol-transmitted infections with no known treatment, such as the Ebola and Marburg viruses. These laboratories are often isolated facilities with strict access controls and rigorous safety protocols. Personnel must wear fully encapsulated, positive-pressure suits and work within Class III biosafety cabinets or specially designed laboratories with high-containment features. All air and waste are decontaminated before release, and laboratories are equipped with airlocks, chemical showers, and secure waste disposal systems. Training and supervision are critical for personnel working at this level to ensure complete adherence to protocols **(Bressler & Hawley, 2006).**

The role of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) is critical in laboratory biosafety. PPE creates a physical barrier between laboratory personnel and hazardous agents, significantly reducing exposure risks. Common PPE includes gloves, lab coats, face shields, and respiratory protection, tailored to the specific biosafety level and laboratory procedures. For instance, BSL-3 facilities often require HEPA-filtered respirators and fully sealed protective suits (Roy, 2009), while standard lab coats and gloves may suffice in BSL-1 environments. Proper use and maintenance of PPE are emphasized to ensure its effectiveness, as improper handling can negate its protective benefits **(Noble, 2011)**. Respiratory protection is particularly critical in high-containment laboratories (BSL-3 and BSL-4) where aerosols may carry infectious agents. At these levels, personnel often use powered air-purifying respirators (PAPRs) or positive-pressure suits to prevent inhalation of pathogens. This equipment is vital for working with agents like Mycobacterium tuberculosis or Ebola virus, which can cause severe or fatal diseases upon inhalation **(Bressler & Hawley, 2006).** Gloves are the most commonly used PPE and provide a barrier against direct contact with infectious agents. They are particularly important when handling sharp objects, as accidental punctures can introduce pathogens into the body. Double-gloving is recommended in high-risk situations to provide an additional layer of protection. However, gloves must be used in conjunction with other measures, such as hand hygiene, to ensure their effectiveness **(Noble, 2011)**. Face shields and goggles protect against splashes or aerosols that can harm the eyes or mucous membranes. These are essential when working with liquid cultures or during procedures like centrifugation that can generate droplets. Properly fitted goggles and shields significantly reduce the risk of exposure to hazardous fluids and are a standard requirement in most laboratories handling biohazardous materials **(Barkham, 2004).**PPE must be used as part of a broader biosafety strategy that includes administrative controls, engineering controls, and good laboratory practices. For PPE to be effective, laboratory personnel must be trained in its proper use, including donning, doffing, and disposal. Incorrect handling of PPE can negate its protective benefits, increasing the risk of contamination. Furthermore, the availability of appropriate PPE, especially in resource-limited settings, remains a challenge that must be addressed to ensure global laboratory safety standards **(SA & Ikram, 2020)**.

Finally, administrative controls play a pivotal role in maintaining a culture of safety in laboratories. These controls include developing and enforcing standard operating procedures (SOPs), conducting regular risk assessments, and ensuring comprehensive staff training. Administrative measures also encompass the appointment of biosafety officers, the establishment of emergency response protocols, and maintaining incident reporting systems. Training is particularly vital, equipping staff with knowledge about biosafety principles, proper use of PPE, and emergency preparedness. These controls create a framework for sustainable safety practices, ensuring that laboratory activities are performed consistently and responsibly **(Caskey et al., 2010)**.Together, BSLs, PPE, and administrative controls form an integrated biosafety framework. Each component complements the others, providing multiple layers of protection against biological risks. This multifaceted approach is essential in both preventing laboratory-acquired infections and ensuring that laboratory activities do not pose a threat to the surrounding environment or communities **(Barkham, 2004)**. By adhering to these principles, laboratories can safely conduct their work while contributing to global public health initiatives.

3. **Ensuring Biosecurity Measures**

Biosecurity encompasses the measures and protocols implemented to prevent the introduction, proliferation, and release of pathogens in both natural and controlled environments. During infectious disease outbreaks, biosecurity plays a critical role in mitigating the risks of pathogen transmission and ensuring public health safety **(Renault et al., 2021)**. The COVID-19 pandemic and prior global health crises have underscored the importance of biosecurity frameworks in response planning, policy implementation, and international collaboration. Collaborative international efforts have sought to address these challenges by harmonizing biosafety and biosecurity standards, with a focus on occupational safety for healthcare workers and laboratory personnel handling high-risk pathogens **(Maehira & Spencer, 2019)**. Medical laboratories are at the forefront of diagnosing and controlling infectious disease outbreaks. During such crises, biosecurity measures are vital to protect laboratory personnel, prevent cross-contamination, and mitigate the risk of accidental or intentional pathogen release **(WHO, 2006).**

One critical aspect of biosecurity in medical laboratories is the management of laboratory-acquired infections (LAIs). Historical analyses have shown that pathogens such as Brucella spp., Mycobacterium tuberculosis, and Salmonella spp. are leading causes of LAIs. To address this, laboratories are required to implement a combination of engineering controls, administrative measures, and personal protective equipment (PPE). Comprehensive staff training on handling infectious materials and adopting proper containment protocols has proven effective in reducing LAI risks **(Peng et al., 2018)**. During outbreaks, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, hierarchical prevention and control measures in clinical laboratories have been widely adopted. These include conducting risk assessments at all phases of laboratory processes—preanalytical, analytical, and post-analytical. Key protocols involve the use of biosafety cabinets (BSCs) for sample processing, proper waste management practices, and stringent decontamination methods, including the use of ethanol or sodium hypochlorite for surface disinfection **(Bhat et al., 2020).**

High-containment laboratories, especially those designated for handling dangerous pathogens, emphasize the harmonization of biosafety and biosecurity standards. Such facilities, often in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), face unique challenges due to limited resources and infrastructure. Efforts to align practices with international standards, such as the ISO 35001:2019, aim to address gaps in leadership, support, and performance evaluation, ensuring a safer working environment for laboratory staff **(Maehira & Spencer, 2019)**. The COVID-19 pandemic has also led to the development of standardized assessment tools like the Biosafety and Biosecurity Laboratory Assessment Tool (BSS LAT). This tool evaluates core laboratory biosafety requirements across various modules and has been used in multiple countries to improve biosafety capacities. By identifying weaknesses and developing targeted improvement plans, laboratories have enhanced their readiness for future outbreaks **(Orelle et al., 2022)**.

Another critical biosecurity challenge is waste management. Studies have identified deficiencies in disposing of biological waste, particularly in developing countries. Lack of proper waste segregation, autoclaving facilities, and disposal procedures can lead to increased biohazard risks. Addressing these gaps through staff training and investment in waste management infrastructure is essential **(Ben Ashur et al., 2020)**. Finally, training programs and the availability of resources like biosafety cabinets and PPE are fundamental to maintaining biosecurity in medical laboratories. Research shows that public laboratories often have better PPE compliance but face challenges in infrastructure and training compared to private laboratories. Regular audits, updated protocols, and enhanced training initiatives have been recommended to close these gaps **(Ogaro et al., 2018)**.

4. **Advancements in Biosafety and Biosecurity in Medical Laboratories**

Recent advancements in biosafety and biosecurity in medical laboratories have focused on improving safety protocols, regulatory frameworks, and international collaboration to mitigate risks associated with laboratory-acquired infections and the handling of hazardous biological materials **(Astuto-Gribble & Caskey, 2014)**. Advancements in biosafety protocols have focused on improving laboratory practices to mitigate risks associated with hazardous biological materials. For example, the development of ISO 35001:2019, a comprehensive biorisk management standard, provides laboratories with a systematic framework to manage risks effectively. This standard emphasizes organizational leadership, risk assessments, and continuous improvement to enhance operational safety **(Lestari et al., 2021).** Additionally, the WHO Laboratory Biosafety Manual has shifted to a risk-based approach, encouraging laboratories to adopt tailored safety practices rather than relying solely on prescriptive measures **(Ficociello et al., 2022)**.

a. **Technological Innovations**

The integration of automation and robotics has significantly transformed biosafety in medical laboratories, reducing human interaction with infectious agents. Automated systems streamline workflows, enhance precision, and minimize the risk of contamination, especially during processes such as sample handling and diagnostic testing. Robotics also play a crucial role in high-risk environments, mitigating the exposure of laboratory personnel to pathogens **(Deo & Anjankar, 2023)**. Portable high-containment labs, including mobile BSL-3 and BSL-4 units, provide rapid deployment capabilities in outbreak zones, enabling real-time diagnostics and containment efforts on-site **(WHO, 2018)**. These advancements not only improve response times but also ensure biosafety in resource-limited or remote areas during emergencies **(Gillum et al., 2024)**.

b. **Digital Monitoring and Virtual Training**

Digital solutions, such as Internet-of-Things (IoT)-based systems, have enhanced the monitoring of laboratory environments. IoT-enabled sensors track critical variables like temperature, humidity, and airflow in real time, ensuring optimal conditions for biosafety compliance. Alarms and notifications linked to mobile devices further streamline oversight and immediate action during potential breaches **(Samonte et al., 2021)**.In education, virtual reality (VR) has emerged as a transformative tool for biosafety training. VR allows laboratory personnel to simulate high-risk scenarios, such as operating within a BSL-3 environment, without exposure to actual pathogens. Studies have shown that VR training enhances competency and confidence while eliminating the risks associated with conventional hands-on training methods **(Kaltsidis et al., 2021)**. Immersive learning modules further reinforce infection control measures and universal precautions, creating a safer learning and working environment **(Cardoso et al., 2021)**.

c. **Global Collaborative Efforts**

International collaboration has significantly contributed to the standardization and implementation of biosafety protocols. Initiatives like the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA) and updated editions of the WHO Laboratory Biosafety Manual emphasize capacity building and harmonization of biosafety and biosecurity measures worldwide. These programs have been especially critical in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where resource constraints often limit the establishment of high-containment facilities **(Maehira & Spencer, 2019)**. Collaborative frameworks encourage knowledge sharing, workforce development, and the creation of localized action plans tailored to regional risks and needs **(Safdar et al., 2023)**.The creation of unified regulatory systems has been pivotal in ensuring biosafety compliance. The establishment of a National Biosafety and Biosecurity Agency (NBBA) in the United States has been proposed to streamline regulations and address complexities in modern biological research, particularly concerning dual-use research and pathogens with pandemic potential **(Gillum et al., 2024)**. Regulatory frameworks in regions such as East Africa have adopted international protocols, including the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, to harmonize policies and strengthen national capacities **(Niyonzima, 2024).**Harmonization of biosafety standards, technical assistance, and knowledge exchange are key strategies for building resilient laboratory systems in resource-limited settings **(Maehira & Spencer, 2019).**

In conclusion, a comprehensive and harmonized approach to biosafety and biosecurity is essential for mitigating risks, protecting public health, and supporting global health security. As emerging infectious diseases continue to pose significant threats, prioritizing these measures is critical to ensuring safe and effective laboratory operations. This review emphasizes the indispensable role of biosafety and biosecurity in laboratories, particularly during infectious disease outbreaks. It highlights the need for stringent safety protocols to prevent accidental or intentional pathogen release, noting lessons learned from historical incidents and recent outbreaks such as COVID-19 and Ebola.The analysis underscores the importance of harmonizing standards globally, addressing resource disparities, and enhancing laboratory infrastructure, especially in low- and middle-income countries. International collaboration and capacity-building initiatives, such as those led by the WHO and the Global Health Security Agenda, are pivotal to achieving these goals. The integration of advanced technologies, including automation, portable containment labs, and digital monitoring systems, is transforming laboratory practices, while innovative training methods, such as virtual reality, enhance personnel preparedness.

References

Astuto-Gribble, L.M. and Caskey, S.A., 2014. Laboratory Biosafety and Biosecurity Risk Assessment Technical Guidance Document (No. SAND2014-15939R). Sandia National Lab.(SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States).

Barkham, T.M.S., 2004. Laboratory safety aspects of SARS at Biosafety Level 2. ANNALS-ACADEMY OF MEDICINE SINGAPORE, 33(2), pp.252-256.

Ben Ashur A1, Abdulwahed E1, Magrahi H1, Elyounsi N1, Annajar B2 (2017) “Assessment of Biosafety and Biosecurity Aspects in Diagnostic Clinical Laboratories in Tripoli, Libya”, AlQalam Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences, 1(1), pp. 64–69. Available at: https://journal.utripoli.edu.ly/index.php/Alqalam/article/view/116 (Accessed: 5 December 2024).

Bhat, V., Chavan, P., Biswas, S., Gupta, S., Khattry, N. and Thakkar, P., 2020. Laboratory biosafety issues related to coronavirus disease 2019. Indian Journal of Medical and Paediatric Oncology, 41(04), pp.450-453.

Brass, V.H., Astuto-Gribble, L. and Finley, M.R., 2017. Biosafety and biosecurity in veterinary laboratories. Revue Scientifique ET Technique (International Office of Epizootics), 36(2), pp.701-709.

Bressler, D.S. and Hawley, R.J., 2017. Safety Considerations in the Biosafety Level 4 Maximum-Containment Laboratory. Biological safety: principles and practices, pp.695-717.

Cardoso, K., Zaro, M.A., Magalhães, A.M.M.D. and Tarouco, L.M.R., 2021. Immersive learning laboratory in health and nursing: learning biosafety in a virtual world. Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem, 74, p.e20200385.

Caskey, S.A., Gaudioso, J.M., Salerno, R.M., Wagner, S.M., Shigematsu, M., Risi, G., Kozlovac, J., Halkjaer-Knudsen, V. and Prat, E., 2010. Biosafety risk assessment methodology (No. SAND2010-6487). Sandia National Lab.(SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States).

Cornish, N.E., Anderson, N.L., Arambula, D.G., Arduino, M.J., Bryan, A., Burton, N.C., Chen, B., Dickson, B.A., Giri, J.G., Griffith, N.K. and Pentella, M.A., 2021. Clinical laboratory biosafety gaps: lessons learned from past outbreaks reveal a path to a safer future. Clinical microbiology reviews, 34(3), pp.10-1128.

Deo, N. and Anjankar, A., 2023. Artificial intelligence with robotics in healthcare: a narrative review of its viability in India. Cureus, 15(5).

Ficociello, B., Giordano, D., Incoronato, F., Farinella, A. and Pietrangeli, B., 2023. WHO laboratory biosafety manual: A new approach to security. Annals of Work Exposures and Health, 67(4), pp.425-429.

Gallandat, K. and Lantagne, D., 2017. Selection of a Biosafety Level 1 (BSL-1) surrogate to evaluate surface disinfection efficacy in Ebola outbreaks: Comparison of four bacteriophages. PLoS One, 12(5), p.e0177943.

Gillum, D.R., Moritz, R. and Koblentz, G.D., 2024. Establishing a national biosafety and biosecurity agency for the United States. Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, 12, p.1474120.

Gillum, D.R., Moritz, R. and Koblentz, G.D., 2024. Establishing a national biosafety and biosecurity agency for the United States. Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, 12, p.1474120.

Inbanathan, F.Y., Wijesinghe, P.R., Naidoo, D., Buddha, N., Salvador, E.C., Le, K.K., Dhawan, S. and Blacksell, S.D., 2024. Assessment of public health laboratory preparedness and response in WHO South-East Asia region during the COVID-19 pandemic: lessons learned and future directions. The Lancet Regional Health-Southeast Asia, 31.

Jia Yanfang, Zheng Jian, and Gao Yingtang. "Management and prospects of biosafety laboratories for emerging infectious diseases." World Chinese Journal of Digestion 28, no. 21 (2020): 1059-1067.

Kaltsidis, C., Kedraka, K. and Grigoriou, M.E., 2021. Training higher education bioscience students with virtual reality simulator. European Journal of Alternative Education Studies, 6(1).

Lestari, F., Kadir, A., Miswary, T., Maharani, C.F., Bowolaksono, A. and Paramitasari, D., 2021. Implementation of bio-risk management system in a national clinical and medical referral centre laboratories. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(5), p.2308.

Lippi, G. and Plebani, M., 2020. The critical role of laboratory medicine during coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and other viral outbreaks. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM), 58(7), pp.1063-1069.

Maehira, Y. and Spencer, R.C., 2019. Harmonization of biosafety and biosecurity standards for high-containment facilities in low-and middle-income countries: an approach from the perspective of occupational safety and health. Frontiers in Public Health, 7, p.249.

Mphande-Nyasulu, F.A., Yap, N.J., Teo, C.H., Chang, L.Y. and Tay, S.T., 2024. Outbreak Preparedness and Response Strategies in ASEAN Member states-A Scoping Review. IJID regions, p.100430.

Niyonzima Kanyana, B., Regulatory Frameworks and Policies in Synthetic Biology: Biosafety and Biosecurity in East Africa.

Noble, M.A., 2011. Prevention and Control of Laboratory-Acquired Infections. Manual of Clinical Microbiology, pp.132-142.

Ogaro, H.M., Kiiyukia, C., Mbatha, S. and Ngayo, M.O., 2018. Biorisk status: a comparative assessment of private and public medical diagnostic laboratories in Western Kenya. Applied Biosafety, 23(1), pp.47-54.

Orelle, A., Nikiema, A., Zakaryan, A., Albetkova, A.A., Keita, M.S., Rayfield, M.A., Peruski, L.F. and Pierson, A., 2022. A Multilingual Tool for Standardized Laboratory Biosafety and Biosecurity Assessment and Monitoring. Health security, 20(6), pp.488-496.

Orelle, A., Nikiema, A., Zakaryan, A., Albetkova, A.A., Rayfield, M.A., Peruski, L.F., Pierson, A. and Kachuwaire, O., 2021. National biosafety management system: a combined framework approach based on 15 key elements. Frontiers in Public Health, 9, p.609107.

Peng, H., Bilal, M. and Iqbal, H.M., 2018. Improved biosafety and biosecurity measures and/or strategies to tackle laboratory-acquired infections and related risks. International journal of environmental research and public health, 15(12), p.2697.

Puro, V., Fusco, F.M., Schilling, S., Thomson, G., De Iaco, G., Brouqui, P., Maltezou, H.C., Bannister, B., Gottschalk, R., Brodt, H.R. and Ippolito for the European Network for Highly Infectious Diseases, G., 2012. Biosecurity measures in 48 isolation facilities managing highly infectious diseases. Biosecurity and bioterrorism: biodefense strategy, practice, and science, 10(2), pp.208-214.

Qasmi, S.A. and Khan, B.A., 2019. Survey of suspected laboratory-acquired infections and biosafety practices in research, clinical, and veterinary laboratories in Karachi, Pakistan. Health security, 17(5), pp.372-383.

Renault, V., Humblet, M.F. and Saegerman, C., 2021. Biosecurity concept: Origins, evolution and perspectives. Animals, 12(1), p.63.

Rhodes, C., 2009. Consequences of failure to apply international standards for laboratory biosafety and biosecurity: The 2007 foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in the UK. Applied biosafety, 14(3), pp.144-149.

Roy, K., 2009. Biosafety: Getting the Bugs Out. The Science Teacher, 76(4), p.12.

SA, H.G. and Ikram, A., 2020. Application of Biosafety Principles in Laboratory Analysis of Clinical Samples from Patients with COVID-19. JPMA. The Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association, 70(5), pp.S48-S51.

Safdar, M., Ullah, M., Bibi, A., Khan, M.A., Rehman, M., Fatima, Z., Hussain, M., Awan, U.A. and Naeem, M., 2023. The Evolving Landscape of Biosafety and Biosecurity: A Review of International Guidelines and Best Practices. Journal of Women Medical and Dental College, 2(2).

Salerno, R.M. and Gaudioso, J. eds., 2015. Laboratory biorisk management: biosafety and biosecurity. CRC Press.

Samonte, M.J.C., Mendoza, F.A.G., Pablo, R. and Villa, S.M.P., 2021, April. Internet-of-Things Based Smart Laboratory Environment Monitoring System. In 2021 IEEE 8th International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Applications (ICIEA) (pp. 497-502). IEEE.

Sharan, M., Vijay, D., Yadav, J.P., Bedi, J.S. and Dhaka, P., 2023. Surveillance and response strategies for zoonotic diseases: A comprehensive review. Science in One Health, p.100050.

Sherin, A., 2024. Biosafety challenges and the future landscape in Pakistan. Khyber Medical University Journal, 16(2), pp.83-4.

WHO (World Health Organization), 2006. Biorisk management: Laboratory biosecurity guidance (No. WHO/CDS/EPR/2006.6). World Health Organization.

WHO (World Health Organization), 2018. WHO consultative meeting high/maximum containment (biosafety level 4) laboratories networking: venue: International Agency on Research on Cancer (IARC), Lyon, France, 13-15 December 2017: meeting report (No. WHO/WHE/CPI/2018.40). World Health Organization.

Yeh, K.B., Tabynov, K., Parekh, F.K., Mombo, I., Parker, K., Tabynov, K., Bradrick, S.S., Tseng, A.S., Yang, J.R., Gardiner, L. and Olinger, G., 2021. Significance of high-containment biological laboratories performing work during the COVID-19 pandemic: Biosafety level-3 and-4 labs. Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology, 9, p.720315.

Zaki, A.N., 2010. Biosafety and biosecurity measures: management of biosafety level 3 facilities. International journal of antimicrobial agents, 36, pp.S70-S74.