

1 **OPEN LANDFILL BIOMEDICAL WASTES DISPOSAL SYSTEM AND IMPACT**  
2 **ON HEALTH AS PERCEIVED BY HEALTH WORKERS**  
3  
4  
5

6 **Abstract**

7 *This paper examined the influence of open land fill as a biomedical wastes disposal*  
8 *system and perceived impact on health among health workers in Calabar Education*  
9 *Zone of Cross River State, Nigeria. One hypothesis was formulated to guide the study.*  
10 *Literature review was carried out based on the variable under study. Ex-post facto*  
11 *research design was considered most suitable for the study. Purposive and simple*  
12 *random sampling techniques were adopted in selecting the 401 respondents sampled for*  
13 *the study. A validated 30 item four point modified likert scale questionnaire was the*  
14 *instrument utilized for data collection. The reliability estimate of the instrument ranged*  
15 *from 0.74- 0.91 using Cronbach Alpha method. To test the hypotheses formulated for the*  
16 *study simple linear regression statistical too was used at 0.05 level of significance. The*  
17 *findings revealed that there was a significant positive influence of open land fill of*  
18 *biomedical wastes on health as perceived by health workers in Calabar Education Zone*  
19 *of Cross River State. It was recommended among others that dumpsites should be*  
20 *properly located and managed to minimize its effects on residents and government and*  
21 *municipalities should revise laws regarding the locations of the dumpsites.*

22 **Key words: Open landfill, biomedical wastes, perceived impact, health workers**  
23

24 **Introduction**

25 Every day, relatively large amount of potentially infectious and hazardous wastes  
26 are generated in the health care hospitals and facilities around the world. An important  
27 issue of human health protection process is the waste disposal systems that include  
28 responsible planning of collecting, transporting, processing and disposing of hazardous  
29 and non-hazardous waste materials. A special concern focuses on effective disposal of  
30 biomedical waste incorporating an appropriate waste reduction and neutralization  
31 component. Along with this idea, a systemic approach of biomedical waste is  
32 compulsory, since without proper guidance, the hazardous medical waste management  
33 may compromise the quality of patient caretaking.

34 Medical care is vital for our life and health, but the waste generated from medical  
35 activities represents a real problem to nature and human health. World Health  
36 Organization (2011) stated that high-developed countries produce an average up to 0.5  
37 KG of hazardous waste per hospital bed per day while the figure for developing countries  
38 was only 0.2 KG per hospital bed per day. Eighty-five percent of generated waste from  
39 hospitals and other health care facilities were in fact non-hazardous while the remaining  
40 15% is considered to be hazardous materials that may be radioactive, toxic or infectious.

41 An increase and expansion in the number of hospitals and health care facilities  
42 cause an increase in the utilization of disposable medical materials, which further  
43 contributed in production of a large amount of biomedical wastes in these health care  
44 facilities. The introduction of more complicated equipment and overall medical  
45 advancement also results in increase in waste production per patient in health care  
46 facilities globally (Radha, Kalaivan, & Lavanya, 2009). The increased production rate of  
47 biomedical waste was combined by mishandling and poor disposal methods. The risk of  
48 disease transmission was raised among the health care workers and other environmental  
49 issues such as pollution. On the basis of these facts, incorporation of an integrated  
50 biomedical waste management system for hospitals and health care facilities was  
51 becoming a cross cutting issue.

52 Main purposes of waste management and disposal are to clean up the surrounding  
53 environment and to identify the appropriate systems for waste neutralization, recycling  
54 and disposal. Within waste disposal, the health care waste management (HCWM) is a  
55 process that helps to ensure proper hospital hygiene and safety of health care workers  
56 and communities. Health care workers and patients are concerned about planning and  
57 procurement, staff training and behaviour, proper use of tools, machines and  
58 pharmaceuticals, proper methods applied for segregation, reduction in volume, treatment

59 and disposal of biomedical waste. Studies have demonstrated that there is not a single  
60 method of biomedical waste treatment or disposal that completely eliminates all risks to  
61 humans or to environment. The first step of this approach focuses on the risks caused by  
62 an inappropriate biomedical waste management and disposal

63 Biomedical waste is produced in all conventional medical units where treatment  
64 of (human or animal) patients is provided, such as hospitals, clinics, dental offices,  
65 dialysis facilities, as well as analytical laboratories, blood banks, university laboratories.  
66 This form of wastes refer to all materials, biological or non-biological, that are discarded  
67 in any health care facility and are not intended for any other use Within a health care  
68 facility or hospital, the main groups submitted to risks are: - Doctors, medical nurses,  
69 healthcare unit workers and maintenance staff; -Patients; -Visitors; - Workers in ancillary  
70 services: laundry, medical supplies store, those charged with collecting and transporting  
71 waste; - Service workers dealing with waste treatment and disposal of health unit.

72 Regarding the health care workers, three infections are most commonly  
73 transmitted: hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), and human  
74 immunodeficiency (HIV) virus. Among the 35 million health care workers worldwide,  
75 the estimations show that each year about 3 million receive hard exposures to blood  
76 borne pathogens, 2 million of those to HBV, 0.9 million to HCV, and 170,000 to HIV  
77 (Cole, 2015; Kralj & Stamenkovic, 2006). Also, the workers involved in the collection  
78 and disposal of the biomedical waste are exposed to a certain risk and these risks have  
79 health implications such as cancers (especially lung and larynx cancer, leukemia,  
80 lymphoma, soft tissue sarcoma), respiratory symptoms and congenital malformations,  
81 low birth weight, birth defects, cholera, plague, tuberculosis, hepatitis B, diphtheria etc.,  
82 in either epidemic or even in endemic form and thus is a major problem for healthcare  
83 facilities, their employees, and the community at a large.

84 Waste disposal systems usually relate to all kinds of planned activities concerned  
85 with the proper handling and disposal of wastes from the point of generation to the point  
86 of final disposal. Wastes disposal systems are comprehensive, integrated, rational and  
87 systematic approach towards the achievement and maintenance of acceptable human  
88 health. Modern systems of wastes disposal have emerged in response to the recognition  
89 of health impact. Basically, there are various systems of wastes disposal among workers  
90 and patients in the health sector, these include but not limited to the following:  
91 incineration, open dumping, open landfill, disposal of wastes into water bodies and  
92 recycling etc.

93 The urban population of Calabar is growing at alarming rates. While generally  
94 Nigerian population is increasing by about 2.8% per annum, the rate of urban growth is  
95 as high as 5.5% per annum, and this has increased the number of patients in hospitals and  
96 the number of hospitals in the zone. As Nigeria aspires to improve her economic status  
97 by 2019, a healthier and wealthier population will generate more of all types of waste  
98 (domestic, commercial, industrial and hazardous). There is therefore need for urgent  
99 action based on a clear national strategy, plans and programmes to manage this trend  
100 (Thomas, Peng, Lezhong, Yaoliang, Emmanuel, Wang & UN-Habitat, 2006).

101 Waste from hospitals and clinics are an additional source of Municipal Solid  
102 waste (MSW). Most of the countries do not have any specific technique of managing  
103 hospital and clinical wastes. So, they are mixed with MSW and pose a threat to human  
104 population and surrounding environment. Unsuitable disposal of biomedical wastes  
105 causes all types of pollution: air, soil, and water. Indiscriminate open dumping of wastes  
106 contaminates surface and ground water supplies. In urban areas, MSW clogs drains,  
107 creating stagnant water for insect breeding and floods during rainy seasons. Open land  
108 filling of biomedical waste is a common waste disposal system and one of the cheapest

109 systems for organized waste management in many parts of the world. Landfill practice is  
110 the disposal of biomedical wastes by infilling depressions on land. The depressions into  
111 which wastes are often dumped include valleys (abandoned) sites of quarries,  
112 excavations, or sometimes a selected portion within the residential and commercial areas  
113 in many urban settlements where the capacity to collect, process, dispose of, or re-use  
114 solid waste in a cost-efficient, safe manner is often limited. The practice of landfill  
115 system as a system of waste disposal in many developing countries is usually far from  
116 standard recommendations (Mull, 2005; Adewole, 2009; Eludoyin & Oyeku, 2010).

117 According to the World Health Organization, 18 years ago it was estimated that  
118 injections with contaminated syringes caused 21 million hepatitis B virus (HBV)  
119 infection (32% of all new infections), two million hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection  
120 (40% of all new infection) in the world. When compared to the 2017 estimate of about  
121 34 million hepatitis B caused by contaminated syringes, four million hepatitis C virus  
122 infections, and more than 1.1million HIV infections in the world, it is important to note  
123 that the impacts are increasing on daily and perhaps yearly basis.

124 Studies have demonstrated that there is not a single method of biomedical waste  
125 treatment or disposal that completely eliminates all risks to humans or to environment,  
126 and the situation is everywhere in our country. The state of human health in Cross River  
127 is so poor and this is evident in the inadequate and poor health facilities (health centers,  
128 personnel, and medical equipment) in the state, especially in rural areas. While various  
129 reforms have been put forward by the Nigerian government to address the wide ranging  
130 issues in the health care system, they are yet to be implemented at the state and local  
131 government area levels and Nigeria is still ranked by World Health Organization at 187th  
132 position in its health system among 191 member states.

133 Wastes of different types, mostly medical wastes are the major input of  
134 dumpsites/landfills. With respect to the hydrological analysis of groundwater, it flows  
135 from areas of higher topography towards areas of lower topography, thereby bringing  
136 about the examination of the degradable material which form leachate and  
137 contaminate the groundwater of the study area. Landfill practice is the disposal of  
138 solid wastes by infilling depressions on land. The depressions into which solid wastes  
139 are often dumped include valleys (abandoned) sites of quarries, excavations, or  
140 sometimes a selected portion within the residential and commercial areas in many  
141 urban settlements where the capacity to collect, process, dispose of, or re-use solid  
142 waste in a cost-efficient, safe manner is often limited. The practice of landfill system  
143 as a method of waste disposal in many developing countries is usually far from  
144 standard recommendations (Mull, 2005; Adewole, 2009; Eludoyin & Oyeku, 2010).

145 A standardized landfill system involves carefully selected location, and is  
146 usually constructed and maintained by means of engineering techniques, ensuring  
147 minimized pollution of air, water and soil and risks to man and animals. It involves  
148 placing waste in lined pit or a mound (Sanitary landfills) with appropriate means of  
149 leachate and landfill gas control (Alloway & Ayres, 2007; Eludoyin & Oyeku 2010).  
150 Land filling of municipal solid waste is a common waste management practice and  
151 one of the cheapest methods for organized waste management in many parts of the  
152 world (El-Fadel, Findikakis & Leckie, 2007; Jhamanani & Singh, 2009; Longe &  
153 Balogun, 2010). Increasing urbanization results in an increased generation of waste  
154 materials and landfills become the most convenient way of disposal. Most of these  
155 landfills are mere 'holes in the ground' do not qualify as sanitary means of solid  
156 waste disposal. Most of the areas around the Solous dumpsites depend either on dug-  
157 up wells or boreholes, which may likely be affected by the generated leachate through

158 waste decomposition from the dumpsites despite the provision of pipe-borne water by  
159 government.

160 According Papadopoulou, Karatzas and Bougiouko (2007)., as the natural  
161 environment can no longer digest the produced wastes, the development of  
162 biomedical waste management has contributed to their automated collection,  
163 treatment and disposal. One of the most common waste disposal methods is  
164 landfilling, a controlled method of disposing biomedical wastes on land with the dual  
165 purpose of eliminating public health and environmental hazards and minimizing  
166 nuisances without contaminating surface or subsurface water resource.

167 In the study of Ifeoma (2014) on effects of landfill sites on groundwater  
168 quality in igando, alimosho local government area, Lagos state. With increasing  
169 population comes the concern for waste disposal. The absence of sanitary disposal  
170 methods has left most city residents with open landfills as their only source of waste  
171 disposal. The resulting leachate formed from the decomposition of these waste  
172 materials is highly polluting and finds its way to the underground water supply. The  
173 study investigated the effects of open landfill sites on the underground water quality  
174 by examining the physical and chemical properties of underground water in hand-dug  
175 wells around the Solous landfill sites in Igando, Alimosho Local Government Area of  
176 Lagos State. Solous landfill is the second largest landfill by landmass and volume of  
177 waste in Lagos State.

178 Systematic random sampling was used for data gathering. Eighteen hand-dug  
179 wells were sampled at increasing distances from the landfill site. Physical, chemical  
180 and microbiological parameters were analysed at the Lagos State Environmental  
181 Protection Agency (LASEPA). Soil samples were also taken from both the A (0 –  
182 30cm) and B (30 – 60cm) horizons of the water sampling points to determine the soil

183 texture (silt, clay and loamy composition) and to show the impact of soil texture on  
184 ground water quality within the sampled area. The level of contamination of  
185 groundwater was also determined using the Contamination Index method. The results  
186 showed high degree of conformance with WHO standard with respect to the  
187 microbiological properties of the sampled groundwater. However, coliform tests  
188 indicated the potential presence of pathogens. Of the seven (7) physical parameters  
189 tested, conductivity was higher in one sample. The study of chemical properties from  
190 the eighteen wells showed five (5) parameters (dissolved oxygen, total alkalinity, iron,  
191 lead, nitrates and copper) above WHO limits in some samples. The water may  
192 therefore not be safe for human consumption and there is a serious need to monitor  
193 the groundwater quality in the area. The level of contamination of groundwater was  
194 also determined using the Contamination Index method. Areas of high and medium  
195 contamination were discovered.

196 There was no area with low contamination level in the area sampled.  
197 Contamination levels were mapped to show the exact levels of contamination in the  
198 study area. The results of the soil analysis showed that the study area had soil that was  
199 mostly sandy in nature which may suggest an increase in parameters over time with  
200 significant health implications for the people who depend on surrounding wells for  
201 domestic use. The study also showed no significant variation in water quality with  
202 increasing distance from the dumpsite. Findings also indicated that the water around  
203 Solous 1 was of better quality for domestic use than groundwater around Solous 2 and  
204 3 due to temporal reduction of contaminant concentration. There is therefore a need  
205 for adequate and proper planning, design and construction, and strategic management  
206 disposal of waste, as well as the implementation of a better sustainable environmental  
207 sanitation practice.



208           The disposal of wastes in landfill sites has increasingly caused concern about  
209 possible adverse health effects for populations living nearby, particularly in relation to  
210 those sites where hazardous waste is dumped. Studies on the health effects of landfill  
211 sites have been carried out mainly in North America and existing reviews focus  
212 entirely on this literature (Upton, 2008; National Research Council, 2009). Recent  
213 publications of large studies both in and outside North America warrant an update of  
214 evidence presented in previous reviews. Up-to-date knowledge about epidemiologic  
215 evidence for potential human health effects of landfill sites is important for those  
216 deciding on regulation of sites, their siting and remediation, and for those whose task  
217 it is to respond to concerns from the public in a satisfactory way.

218           Martine (2010) examined health effects of residence near hazardous waste  
219 landfill sites: a review of epidemiologic literature. This review evaluates current  
220 epidemiologic literature on health effects in relation to residence near landfill sites.  
221 Increases in risk of adverse health effects (low birth weight, birth defects, certain  
222 types of cancers) have been reported near individual landfill sites and in some  
223 multisite studies, and although biases and confounding factors cannot be excluded as  
224 explanations for these findings, they may indicate real risks associated with residence  
225 near certain landfill sites. A general weakness in the reviewed studies is the lack of  
226 direct exposure measurement. An increased prevalence of self-reported health  
227 symptoms such as fatigue, sleepiness, and headaches among residents near waste sites  
228 has consistently been reported in more than 10 of the reviewed papers. It is difficult to  
229 conclude whether these symptoms are an effect of direct toxicological action of  
230 chemicals present in waste sites, an effect of stress and fears related to the waste site,  
231 or an effect of reporting bias.

232           Although a substantial number of studies have been conducted, risks to health  
233 from landfill sites are hard to quantify. There is insufficient exposure information and  
234 effects of low-level environmental exposure in the general population are by their  
235 nature difficult to establish. More interdisciplinary research can improve levels of  
236 knowledge on risks to human health of waste disposal in landfill sites. Research needs  
237 include epidemiologic and toxicological studies on individual chemicals and chemical  
238 mixtures, well-designed single- and multisite landfill studies, development of  
239 biomarkers, and research on risk perception and sociologic determinants of ill health.  
240 Key words: epidemiology, hazardous waste, health effects, landfill, residence, review.

241           Jeffrey (2013) investigated the management of biomedical pollutants in the  
242 Accra Metropolitan Area in Ghana, using a qualitative case study approach involving  
243 interviews, focus-group discussions, and observation techniques. A state of  
244 precariousness was found to characterize the management of biomedical pollutants in  
245 the study area, culminating in the magnification of risks to the environment and public  
246 health. There is neither a single sanitary landfill nor a properly functioning  
247 incineration system in the entire metropolis, and most of the healthcare facilities  
248 surveyed lack access to suitable treatment technologies. As a result, crude burning and  
249 indiscriminate dumping of infectious and toxic biomedical residues were found to be  
250 widespread. The crude burning of toxic biomedical pollutants was found to provide  
251 environmental pathways for carcinogenic substances. These include polynuclear  
252 aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDFs),  
253 polychlorinated dibenzopara-dioxins (PCDDs), polychlorinated  
254 biphenyls(PCBs),hydrogen,lead,mercury,cadmium,chlorobenzenes,particulatematter,  
255 and chlorophenols. The improper disposal of biomedical pollutants in open dumps  
256 and unsanitary landfills also carries a risk of providing environmental entry points for

257 volatile organic compounds (VOCs), inorganic macro components, heavy metals, and  
258 xenobiotic organic compounds.

259 Sharifah, Syed and Latifah (2013) examined the challenge of future landfill:  
260 A case study of Malaysia. Landfilling is the most frequent waste disposal method  
261 worldwide. It is recognised as being an important option both now and in the near  
262 future, especially in low- and middle-income countries, since it is the easiest and the  
263 cheapest technology available. Owing to financial constraints, landfills usually lack of  
264 environmental abatement measures, such as leachate collection systems and lining  
265 materials. As a result, a lot of contamination is inflicted upon the environment.  
266 Importantly, even with proper abatement measures in landfills, there is no guarantee  
267 that contamination will be prevented. Another major concern is the appropriate  
268 location for landfills to ensure the impact towards the environment are minimised.  
269 There is a tendency of landfill to be built on unsuitable area such as near to residential  
270 area or on agricultural land where most of the land are grading as high prospect value  
271 to be developed as business or industrial area that are more profitable.

272 More so, the rate of deaths and exposures to several diseases caused by  
273 biomedical wastes disposal has become one of the critical concerns even when there are  
274 well defined rules for handling such wastes. Unfortunately laxity and the quality and  
275 availability of disposal facilities are generally poor and inadequate. Considering the  
276 increasing rate of perceived impact of biomedical wastes disposal on health workers, the  
277 researcher sought to answer the question: what is the perceived influence of biomedical  
278 wastes disposal systems among health workers in Calabar Education Zone of Cross River  
279 State?

280

281 **Methodology**

282 The ex-post facto research design is considered most suitable. Ex-post facto  
283 literally means 'after the fact'. It basically studies phenomenon after they have  
284 occurred. The population of the study comprised registered laboratory scientists,  
285 pharmacists, nurses/midwives and cleaners in major public health care facilities. This  
286 study adopted the stratified random sampling technique. The instrument that was used  
287 for data collection was a questionnaire. Each item elicited information from  
288 respondents on a four point modified Likert scale, Strongly Agree (SA) 4 points,  
289 Agree (A) 3 points, Disagree (D) 2 points, and Strongly Disagree (SD) 1 point.  
290 Simple linear regression statistic was utilized for data analysis.

291

## 292 **Results and discussions**

293 The hypothesis states that open landfill disposal system has no significant  
294 influence on health as perceived by health workers. The independent variable in this  
295 hypothesis is open landfill while the dependent variable is influence on human health  
296 as perceived by health workers. Simple linear regression test statistic was employed in  
297 testing the data for this hypothesis. The results of the analysis are presented in table 1.

298 The result of analysis which is presented in Table 1 showed that the predictor  
299 or independent variable (Open landfill of biomedical wastes) significantly influence  
300 the predicted variable (influence on health as perceived by health workers) in Calabar  
301 Education Zone of Cross River State. The predictor variable accounted for 25.9% of  
302 the influence in health as perceived by health workers in the study area.

303 Again, the regression ANOVA revealed there was a significant influence of  
304 open land fill of biomedical wastes on health as perceived by health workers  $F(1,$   
305  $399) = 139.209; p < .05$ . This result indicated that there is a moderate positive  
306 contribution of open landfill of biomedical wastes on health as perceived by health  
307 workers in the study area. From this result it can be assumed that if the approach

308 adopted in open landfill disposal of biomedical waste is improved, there will be a  
 309 significant reduction in the influence on health as perceived by health workers in the  
 310 study area. Furthermore, if the approach adopted in open landfill disposal of  
 311 biomedical waste does not improve, there will be higher influence on health as  
 312 perceived by health workers.

313 The finding of analysis indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected. This  
 314 showed that there was a significant positive influence of open landfill of biomedical  
 315 wastes on health as perceived by health workers in Calabar Education Zone of Cross  
 316 River State. This finding could be as a result of the fact that land filling of municipal  
 317 solid waste is a common waste management practice and one of the cheapest methods  
 318 for organized waste management in many parts of the world. The finding of the study  
 319 agrees with the finding of Papadopoulou, Karatzas and Bougiouko (2007) which  
 320 asserts that one of the most common waste disposal methods is landfilling, a  
 321 controlled method of disposing biomedical wastes on land with the dual purpose of  
 322 eliminating public health and environmental hazards and minimizing nuisances  
 323 without contaminating surface or subsurface water resource. Martine (2010) also  
 324 supports this finding by stating that Increases in risk of adverse health effects (low  
 325 birth weight, birth defects, certain types of cancers) have been reported near  
 326 individual landfill sites and in some multisite studies, and although

327  
 328 TABLE 1

329 Simple linear regression analysis of the influence of open landfill of biomedical wastes on  
 330 health as perceived by health workers (N = 401)

	R= .509	R <sup>2</sup> =.259	Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =.257	St= .8053	
Source of variance	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig

Regression	90.283	1	90.289	139.209	.000
Residual	258.769	399	.649		
Total	349.051	400			

---

331

332

UNDER PEER REVIEW

333 biases and confounding factors cannot be excluded as explanations for these findings,  
334 they may indicate real risks associated with residence near certain landfill sites. An  
335 increased prevalence of self-reported health symptoms such as fatigue, sleepiness, and  
336 headaches among residents near waste sites has consistently been reported in more  
337 than 10 of the reviewed papers. It is difficult to conclude whether these symptoms are  
338 an effect of direct toxicological action of chemicals present in waste sites, an effect of  
339 stress and fears related to the waste site, or an effect of reporting bias. Although a  
340 substantial number of studies have been conducted, risks to health from landfill sites  
341 are hard to quantify. There is insufficient exposure information and effects of low-  
342 level environmental exposure in the general population are by their nature difficult to  
343 establish. More interdisciplinary research can improve levels of knowledge on risks to  
344 human health of waste disposal in landfill sites.

345

### 346 **Conclusion**

347 The purpose of this study was to investigate and present results on open land fill  
348 as a biomedical waste disposal system and perceived impact on health as perceived by  
349 health workers in Calabar Education Zone of Cross River State. In line with the statistical  
350 finding obtained from this study, it was therefore concluded that: there was a significant  
351 positive influence of open land fill of biomedical wastes on health as perceived by health  
352 workers in Calabar Education Zone of Cross River State.

353 Several health impacts have been found to be related to biomedical wastes  
354 disposal systems. The importance of health in the life of an individual cannot be over  
355 emphasized. A healthy person is able to carry out various functions that would  
356 contribute to the realization of organization objectives. In the health profession,  
357 healthy workforce is required to carry out the day-to-day functions required to

358 maintain a healthy population. The exposure of health personal to hazardous  
359 substances that impair their health is a risk and requires urgent attention.

360

### 361 **Recommendations**

362 Based on the finding obtained in the study, the following recommendations  
363 were made;

364 1. Dumpsites should be properly located and managed to minimize its effects on  
365 residents and government and municipalities should revise laws regarding the  
366 locations of the dumpsites.

367 2. Biomedical wastes should be burnt; or disposed off in approved dumpsites or  
368 recycled.

369

370

### **References**

371 Adewole, A. T. (2009). Waste management towards sustainable development in  
372 Nigeria: A case study of Lagos State. *International NGO Journal*, 4(4), 173-  
373 179

374 Alloway, J. C., Ayres, P. C. (2007). Comparative analysis of hospital waste  
375 management in calabar metropolis and developed countries. *International*  
376 *Journal of Structure & Civil Engineering Resources*, 2 (4), 154-167.

377 Cole, E. C. (2015). *Internal Medical Waste Management*, Durham, North Carolina.

378 El-Fadel, M., Findikakis, A. N. & Leckie, J. O. (2007). Environmental impacts of  
379 solid waste landfilling. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 50 (1), 1-25

380 Eludoyin, A. O. & Oyeku, O. T. (2010). Heavy metal contamination of groundwater  
381 resources in a Nigerian urban settlement. *African Journal of Environmental*  
382 *Science and Technology*, 4 (4), 201 – 214

383 Ifeoma, J. O. (2014). Effects of landfill sites on groundwater quality in igando,  
384 Alimosho local government area, lagos state. Submitted in accordance with the  
385 requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

386 Isangedighi, A. J., Joshua, M. T., Asim, A. E. & Ekuri, E. E. (2004). *Fundamentals of*  
387 *research and statistics in education and social sciences*. Calabar: university  
388 press.



- 389 Jeffrey, N. T. S quire (2013). Biomedical Pollutants in the Urban Environment and  
390 Implications for Public Health: *A Case Study*, 1-6.
- 391 Jhamnani, B. & Singh, S. K. (2009). Groundwater contamination due to Bhalaswa  
392 landfill site in New Dehli. *International Journal of Civil and Environmental*  
393 *Engineering, 1* (3), 121–125
- 394 Longe, E. O. & Balogun, M. R. (2010). Groundwater quality assessment near a  
395 municipal landfill, Lagos, Nigeria. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences,*  
396 *Engineering and Technology, 2*(1), 39-44
- 397 Martine, V. (2010). Health Effects of Residence Near Hazardous Waste Landfill Sites:  
398 A Review of Epidemiologic Literature. *Environ Health Perspect, 1* (8), 101-  
399 112. [http://ehpnetl.niehs.nih.gov/docs/2000/suppl-1/101-1](http://ehpnetl.niehs.nih.gov/docs/2000/suppl-1/101-112vrijheid/abstract.html)  
400 [12vrijheid/abstract.html](http://ehpnetl.niehs.nih.gov/docs/2000/suppl-1/101-112vrijheid/abstract.html)
- 401 Mull, E. J. (2005). *Approaches toward Sustainable Urban Solid Waste Management:*  
402 *Sahakaranagar Layout*. Thesis (M.Sc) - Lund University
- 403 National Research Council (2011). *Environmental Epidemiology, public Health and*  
404 *Hazardous Wastes*. Washington, DC:National Academy Press.
- 405 Papadopoulou, M. P., Karatzas, G. P. & Bougioukou, G. C. (2007). Numerical  
406 modelling of the environmental impact of landfill leachate leakage on  
407 groundwater quality – a field application. *Environmental Modelling &*  
408 *Assessment, 12* (1), 345-349.
- 409 Radha, K. V., Kalaivan, K., & Lavanya, R. (2009). A Case Study of Biomedical  
410 Waste Management in Hospitals. *Global Journal of Health Science, 1*, 82-88.
- 411 Thomas, S., Peng, W., Lezhong, X., Yaoliang, S., Emmanuel, A., Wang, Y. & UN-  
412 Habitat (2006). *The State of the World's Cities Report*, Earthscan.  
413
- 414 Upton, A. C. (2008). Public health aspects of toxic chemical disposal sites. *Annu Rev*  
415 *Public Health 10*, 1-25, 2.
- 416 World Health Organization. (2011). *Basic Steps in the Preparation of Health Care*  
417 *Waste Management Plans for Health care Establishments*. Geneva,  
418 Switzerland: WHO.

419