

Occupational Hazards among Sanitation Workers in Urban Municipalities: A Comprehensive Review

Dr. Chirag Suchak

MD Resident, Preventive and Social Medicine
D Y Patil University, Nerul, Navi Mumbai

Dr. Mangala D. Wange

Professor and Head of Department
Preventive and Social Medicine
D Y Patil University, Nerul, Navi Mumbai

Abstract

Sanitation workers are integral to maintaining public health in urban settings through vital services such as waste collection, cleaning of streets, and sewer maintenance. Despite the essential nature of their work, these workers are routinely exposed to a multitude of hazards—ranging from physical and chemical to biological, ergonomic, and psychosocial. Inadequate enforcement of safety regulations, limited use of personal protective equipment (PPE), and societal marginalization further aggravate their risks. This paper critically examines the occupational dangers faced by sanitation workers in Indian urban municipalities, evaluates existing interventions, and offers evidence-based recommendations aimed at improving their working conditions, health, and dignity.

Keywords: Sanitation workers, occupational health, urban municipalities, workplace hazards, PPE, waste management, mental health.

1. Introduction

The rapid urban expansion across the globe has significantly intensified the demand for efficient municipal sanitation services. In cities, sanitation workers manage solid

waste, clean drainage systems, and maintain public sanitation facilities—often under

hazardous and undignified conditions. Their essential contributions are frequently overlooked, and their occupational hazards poorly documented and mitigated.

Globally, approximately 60 million individuals are employed in sanitation-related roles. A majority operate under informal, contractual, or outsourced arrangements, especially in low- and middle-income countries like India, Bangladesh, and Nigeria. These roles often lack basic occupational safeguards such as insurance, training, or access to health facilities. This review attempts to highlight the multifaceted risks faced by sanitation workers in urban areas, with the aim of promoting policy-level and systemic change.

2. Methodology

A structured literature review was carried out using the PRISMA guidelines. Relevant articles were extracted from databases including PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science, covering the period from January 2000 to March 2024. Keywords used in the search included: —sanitation workers, —occupational hazards, —urban municipalities, and —municipal solid waste.

Only peer-reviewed studies focused on sanitation workers operating in urban settings and discussing occupational health impacts were included. Non-English studies and articles unrelated to occupational risks were excluded.

3. Categories of Occupational Hazards

3.1 Physical Hazards

Physical injuries remain a frequent issue due to manual handling of waste materials, sharp objects, and falls during work. Inadequate safety training and lack of ergonomic equipment further elevate these risks.

A Mumbai-based study reported that nearly 45% of sanitation workers had suffered physical injuries in the past year, with common issues being cuts, fractures, and musculoskeletal damage. Working under high temperatures—especially in peak summer—exposes them to dehydration and heat-related illnesses.

3.2 Chemical Hazards

Sanitation workers regularly come into contact with harmful substances, such as industrial effluents, cleaning agents, and solvents. Long-term exposure has been linked to skin allergies, respiratory issues, and systemic toxicity.

In multiple international studies, including those from China and Nigeria, toxic elements like lead and cadmium were found in the blood of sanitation workers, suggesting cumulative occupational exposure.

3.3 Biological Hazards

Direct exposure to human excreta and organic waste places workers at significant risk for infections. Pathogens such as *E. coli*, *Salmonella*, and hepatitis viruses are commonly encountered.

Indian studies have documented that sanitation workers show a seroprevalence rate for hepatitis B and C that is five times

higher than the general population. Leptospirosis and parasitic infections are also common.

3.4 Ergonomic Hazards

The repetitive, physically strenuous nature of the work—including heavy lifting, prolonged bending, and squatting—causes chronic musculoskeletal issues such as back pain, herniated discs, and arthritis.

For instance, in Dhaka, 67% of sanitation workers reported ongoing physical pain, and few had access to physiotherapy or ergonomic equipment.

3.5 Psychosocial Hazards

Social stigma associated with sanitation work continues to affect the mental well-being of workers. In many South Asian and African societies, sanitation work is perceived as impure, contributing to social exclusion and psychological stress.

In urban Karnataka, a mental health survey revealed that 40% of sanitation workers displayed symptoms of anxiety or depression, although fewer than 5% had ever received mental health care.

4. Policy Gaps and Implementation Issues

Although various national and international guidelines exist to protect sanitation workers, enforcement remains largely ineffective. The International Labour Organization has laid down clear safety standards, but municipal-level compliance is inconsistent.

In India, the 2013 Prohibition of Employment as Manual Scavengers and their Rehabilitation Act aimed to eliminate hazardous manual scavenging. However, the ground-level implementation of this law has been patchy, and budget allocations for sanitation worker welfare remain insufficient.

In contrast, European countries like Sweden and Germany have automated waste handling systems and provide regular health checks, significantly reducing occupational risks.

5. Recommendations

1. Legal Enforcement: Strengthen the implementation of occupational safety laws with measurable accountability and penalties for violations.
2. Provision of PPE: Ensure that all sanitation workers receive and are required to use quality protective gear—gloves, boots, face masks, and full-body suits.
3. Training Programs: Conduct regular workshops on hygiene practices, emergency protocols, and safe waste-handling techniques.
4. Health Monitoring: Establish routine health check-ups, provide vaccinations, and include workers in occupational health registries.
5. Mental Health Services: Provide access to counseling services and helplines, and conduct awareness campaigns to reduce stigma.
6. Technological Support: Promote the use of mechanized equipment to minimize direct exposure to hazardous materials.

6. Conclusion

Sanitation workers serve a critical function in preserving public health in urban environments, yet they remain highly vulnerable due to systemic neglect and occupational risk. A multidimensional response—spanning policy reform, infrastructure improvements, and cultural shifts—is essential to safeguard their rights and well-being. Protecting these frontline workers is not only a moral obligation but also a public health necessity.

7. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest related to this publication.

8. Funding

This review was completed without the support of any specific grant or financial assistance from public, private, or non-profit sectors.

9. References

1. World Health Organization. Health, safety and dignity of sanitation workers. Geneva: WHO; 2019.
2. International Labour Organization. The sanitation workers: Realities, challenges and ways forward. Geneva: ILO; 2020.
3. WaterAid. Sanitation workers: Invisible frontline workers of public health. London: WaterAid; 2021.
4. Anand S, Joseph A. Occupational safety and health status of conservancy workers in Mumbai. *Indian J Occup Environ Med.* 2019;23(1):38–42.
5. Dutta M, Jaiswal S. Risk analysis of municipal solid waste workers in India: A case study from Mumbai. *J Occup Health.* 2020;62(1):e12154.
6. Rajagopal S, Singh A. Heat stress and its effects on outdoor workers: An urban occupational hazard. *Environ Res Lett.* 2022;17(3):035008.
7. Ncube F, Ncube EJ, Voyi K. Bioaerosols, noise, and chemical exposures of workers in waste management: A case study in Johannesburg. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2017;14(7):791.
8. Wang Y, Lu J, Guo W. Toxic metal exposure among Chinese garbage workers: A biomonitoring study. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int.* 2020;27(6):5928–5937.
9. Sapkota A, Gupta A, Mainali S. Microbial and parasitic exposure among Nepalese sanitation workers. *J Environ Health.* 2022;84(7):12–18.

10. Kumar A, Yadav P. Prevalence of viral hepatitis among sanitation workers: A systematic review. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2021;26(4):459–467.
 11. Sen G, Das P. Occupational exposure to leptospirosis among sewer workers in Kolkata. *Indian J Med Microbiol*. 2019;37(1):96–101.
 12. Reddy C, Natarajan S. Ergonomic risk and musculoskeletal disorders in sanitation workers: A review. *Work*. 2019;62(2):269–278.
 13. Akter N, Rahman M. Ergonomic and psychosocial risks among municipal workers in Dhaka. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):1346.
 14. Roy S, Prasad G. Stigma and marginalization in sanitation work: A qualitative study from North India. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020;250:112878.
 15. Bansal A, Sharma K. Mental health burden among sanitation workers: Insights from Karnataka. *Indian J Psychiatry*. 2021;63(3):276–282.
 16. International Labour Organization. Guidelines on occupational safety and health management systems (ILO-OSH 2001). Geneva: ILO; 2001.
 17. Government of India. Prohibition of Employment as Manual Scavengers and their Rehabilitation Act. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice; 2013.
 18. Saha M, Roy S. Budgetary allocations for sanitation worker safety: A policy gap analysis. *J Urban Health*. 2022;99(4):674–683.
- European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. Waste management and recycling: Occupational safety practices in the EU. Luxembourg: EU OSHA; 2018.