

## ORIGINAL ARTICLE

## KNOWLEDGE ON POST-EXPOSURE PROPHYLAXIS OF HEPATITIS B AMONG UNDERGRADUATE NURSING STUDENTS

Reena Mandal<sup>1</sup>  , Shusma Acharya<sup>1</sup> , Aayushma Karki<sup>1</sup>,<sup>1</sup>Department of Nursing, Manmohan Memorial Institute of Health Sciences, Soaltemode Kathmandu

Received: October 17, 2025

Accepted: October 30, 2025

Published: December 15, 2025

✉ Reena Mandal,  
Lecturer, Department of Nursing, Manmohan Memorial Institute of Health  
Sciences, Soaltemode, Kathmandu  
Email: [reenamandal901@gmail.com](mailto:reenamandal901@gmail.com)

<https://doi.org/10.3126/jmmihs.v10i2.86793>

## How to Cite

Mandal, R., Acharya, S., & Karki, A. Knowledge on Post-Exposure Prophylaxis of Hepatitis B Among Undergraduate Nursing Students in a College. Journal of Manmohan Memorial Institute of Health Sciences, 2025, 10(2), 12-16. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jmmihs.v10i2.86793>



## ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** Post exposure prophylaxis (PEP) is a treatment that can be used after possible exposure to the hepatitis B virus through sex, drug injecting equipment or injury such as needle stick injury. Post-exposure prophylaxis can help prevent hepatitis B to many health care workers after being exposed to hepatitis B virus. Due to the frequent contact with patients' blood, bodily fluids, needles, nurses are more susceptible to contact with HBV infection. The overall objective of the research was to assess the knowledge on post exposure prophylaxis of hepatitis B among undergraduate nursing students.

**Method:** A descriptive cross-sectional study was carried out among 148 nursing students in Manmohan Memorial Institute of Health Sciences using probability proportionate stratified random sampling technique. Ethical approval was taken from the Institutional Review Committee (IRC) of Manmohan Memorial Institute of Health Sciences, MIMIHS. Informed consent was taken from the study participants. Data was collected using self-developed structured questionnaire from Jestha 20 to 32, 2081 (2024 June 2 to 2024 June 14). The collected data was analyzed in SPSS version 23.0 using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics chi-square test was done to explore the association between variables and interpretation was done.

**Result:** Out of 148 respondents, more than half (52.7%) had adequate level of knowledge on meaning of PEP (85.85%), common constituents of Hepatitis B PEP (77.7%), indication of PEP (72.3%), meaning of Hepatitis B Immunoglobulin (HBIG) (68.2%), route of HBIG (71.6%). But there was inadequate level of knowledge on efficacy of PEP (23.0%), types of exposure (12.2%), adequate value of HBsAg titre (10.8%), standard PEP for positive source patient and vaccinated exposed person with inadequate HBsAg titre (9.5%). There was statistically significant association between academic year ( $p=0.001$ ), vaccination status ( $p=0.025$ ) with level of knowledge on PEP.

**Conclusion:** About half of the respondents have inadequate knowledge on PEP of Hepatitis B, there is gap in knowledge on standard protocol of PEP. Therefore, nursing students should be updated on PEP by revising curriculum.

**Key words:** Hepatitis B; nursing students; post-exposure; prophylaxis

## INTRODUCTION

Hepatitis B is a liver infection caused by a Hepatitis B virus that can be acute or chronic, with chronic, the risk of cirrhosis and liver cancer is increased. The virus can be transmitted through contact with infected body fluids but it can be prevented with a highly effective vaccine and post exposure prophylaxis. WHO estimates that 296 million people were living with chronic hepatitis B infection in 2019, with 1.5 million new infections each year, hepatitis B resulted in an estimated 8,20,000 deaths, mostly from cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma. Post exposure prophylaxis (PEP) is a preventive measure to hepatitis B after being exposed to the hepatitis B virus through unsafe sex, drug injecting equipment or injury such as needle stick injury<sup>1</sup>.

Health care personnel are at more risk to hepatitis B virus infection due to the frequent contact with patients' blood, bodily fluids and needles but can be prevented by using post-exposure prophylaxis. Vaccination is the best course of action for post-exposure prophylaxis in some cases, additional hepatitis B immune globulin is also administered. Nepal has lowest burden of hepatitis B (0.9%) although health care workers are at higher risk<sup>2</sup>.

Despite evidence of the burden of hepatitis B infection, awareness of the disease and uptake of prevention services such as screening and vaccination remain neglected some what among HCPs. In order to prevent hepatitis B, the World Health Organization (WHO) advises immunizing high-risk populations, such as HCPs, both before and after vaccination. When administered correctly and on time, post-exposure prophylaxis can effectively prevent hepatitis B and the subsequent development of serious consequences. The prevention of prenatal and early childhood hepatitis infection, drug injectors, men who have intercourse with males, sex workers, and healthcare

providers are all included in the hepatitis B PEP. One dose of hepatitis B immunoglobulin (HBIG) is given to unvaccinated exposed individuals after 24 hours of exposure as part of the preventive strategy. Three doses of the hepatitis B vaccination are then administered over a six-month period<sup>3</sup>. The most often contracted blood-borne infection is hepatitis B. A nurse has a 100 times higher risk of when exposed to HBV than HIV if she comes into contact with the blood of an HIV/HBV infected patient. Due to needle stick injuries, approximately 66,000 cases of Hepatitis B virus infections are documented annually. Nurses are more vulnerable among health care professionals. From the beginning of the academic careers, nurses are at risk<sup>4</sup>.

Only regimens including HBIG and immune globulin (IG) have been investigated for unintentional percutaneous exposure. In this situation, a treatment consisting of two doses of HBIG, administered one month apart and one following exposure, is approximately 75% effective in preventing hepatitis B. If given within two weeks of the last sexual encounter with an individual who has acute hepatitis B, a single dosage of HBIG is 75% effective<sup>5</sup>.

A cross-sectional study done in India among 297 nursing students showed that only 57.1% nursing students took post exposure prophylaxis after exposure to hepatitis B which shows that only half of the students were aware about post exposure prophylaxis<sup>6</sup>.

A cross sectional study done in Chitwan found that 56% of nurses have poor knowledge of PEP of hepatitis B and more than quarter (38.8%) nurses knew that both HBIG and vaccine series are recommended for un-vaccinated nurses if source is HBsAg positive<sup>7</sup>.

A cross sectional study done in Pokhara found that only 20% nursing students know the correct immediate measures

after needle stick injury and correct dose of post exposure prophylaxis<sup>8</sup>.

Hence, only less knowledge regarding PEP of hepatitis B among nursing students was found, mainly nurses are less aware than other health personnel about PEP so there must be adequate knowledge about post exposure prophylaxis of hepatitis B among nursing students as they are the future nurses who are high risks groups for getting frequent contact with HBsAg positive patient and educator for public.

## METHODS

A descriptive cross-sectional study design was used to assess knowledge of post - exposure prophylaxis of Hepatitis- B among undergraduate nursing students of Manmohan Memorial Institute of Health Sciences, Kathmandu. A total of 148 (BNS and B Sc.) nurses were selected using stratified proportionate random sampling technique. A Self-developed Structured and Self administered Questionnaire was distributed to selected nursing students and collected right after completion. The set of questionnaires consisted of 2 parts:

**Part I:** Questions related to socio-demographic variables includes age, religion, marital status, permanent address, programme of study, academic level, vaccination status and exposure of Hepatitis B related variables include work experience, in- service education, availability of PPE (Post Exposure Prophylaxis), availability of standard protocol, PEP related content, previous experience with exposure.

**Part II:** Questions related to knowledge on post exposure prophylaxis of Hepatitis B. A total of 23 questions were used to assess the level of knowledge which included all Multiple Choice Questions (MCQ). Ethical Considerations was maintained before, during and after data collection. Data was collected by the researcher using a self-administered structured questionnaire among undergraduate nursing students from 2081/2/20 to 2081/2/32 i.e. 2024 June (2-14). Data was interpreted by using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, median and inter-quartile range) and inferential statistics (Chi- square test, Fisher's Exact test)

## RESULTS

**Table 1: Socio-demographic Variables of the Respondents**

| Variables                               | Number | Percent |
|---|--------|---------|
| <b>Age (in completed years)</b>         |        |         |
| <22 years                               | 76     | 51.4    |
| ≥22 years                               | 72     | 48.6    |
| Median±IQR=22±4Q1=20,Q3=24              |        |         |
| <b>Religion</b>                         |        |         |
| Hindu                                   | 138    | 93.2    |
| Buddhist                                | 5      | 3.4     |
| Christian                               | 2      | 1.4     |
| Kirat                                   | 2      | 1.4     |
| Muslim                                  | 1      | 0.7     |
| <b>Permanent address</b>                |        |         |
| Urban                                   | 89     | 60.1    |
| Rural                                   | 59     | 39.9    |
| <b>Vaccination status of HepatitisB</b> |        |         |
| Never vaccinated                        | 59     | 39.9    |
| Complete doses                          | 52     | 35.1    |
| Not known                               | 23     | 15.5    |
| Incomplete doses                        | 14     | 9.5     |

| Variables                 | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------|--------|---------|
| <b>Marital status</b>     |        |         |
| Never married             | 128    | 86.5    |
| Married/Living together   | 20     | 13.5    |
| <b>Programme of study</b> |        |         |
| BSc. Nursing              | 88     | 59.5    |
| BNS                       | 60     | 40.5    |
| <b>Academic level</b>     |        |         |
| BSc <sup>1st</sup> year   | 28     | 18.9    |
| BSc <sup>2nd</sup> year   | 28     | 18.9    |
| BSc <sup>4th</sup> year   | 28     | 18.9    |
| BNS <sup>3rd</sup> year   | 25     | 14.2    |
| BNS <sup>2nd</sup> year   | 21     | 9.5     |
| BNS <sup>1st</sup> year   | 14     | 6.5     |
| BSc <sup>3rd</sup> year   | 4      | 2.7     |

Table no 1 represents the socio- demographic variables of the respondents. The median age of the respondents was 22±4 with more than half (51.4%) of the respondents belong to age group of <22 years, almost all (93.2%) of the respondents belong to Hindu religion. Likewise, majority (60.1%) of the respondents belong to urban permanent residence, more than quarter (39.9%) of the respondents have never been vaccinated. Similarly, most (86.5%) of the respondents have never been married. More than half (59.5%) of the respondents are BSc. Nursing students.

**Table 2: Respondents' Knowledge on Post- Exposure Prophylaxis of Hepatitis B**

| n=148   |        |         |
|---|--------|---------|
| Variables   | Number | Percent |
| <b>Meaning of Post-exposure Prophylaxis (PEP)</b>                                     |        |         |
| Preventive medical treatment started immediately after exposure to prevent infection# | 127    | 85.8    |
| Refers to increase immunity after the exposure to risk factor                         | 10     | 6.8     |
| Method of washing the site with antiseptic solution that is Exposed                   | 2      | 1.4     |
| Condition of using anti-viral medicines after the exposure                            | 9      | 6.1     |
| <b>Common constituents of Hepatitis B PEP</b>   |        |         |
| Antiviral medications   | 29     | 19.6    |
| Immunoglobulin and vaccination #  | 115    | 77.7    |
| Antibiotic medications  | 4      | 2.7     |
| Corticosteroids   | -      | -       |
| <b>Indication of PEP in occupational settings for Hepatitis B</b>                     |        |         |
| Person exposed to any body fluids of HBsAg positive patient#                          | 107    | 72.3    |
| Person involved in care of HBsAg positive patient without contact to risk factors     | 30     | 20.3    |
| Person came in contact to skin of HBsAg positive patient with gloved hands            | 7      | 4.7     |
| Person who had complete HepatitisB vaccination  | 4      | 2.7     |
| <b>Efficacy of PEP</b>  |        |         |
| 75%#  | 34     | 23.0    |
| 85%   | 47     | 31.8    |
| 95%   | 39     | 26.4    |
| More than 95%   | 28     | 18.9    |
| <b>Initiation time of PEP</b>   |        |         |
| Within 42 hours after exposure  | 24     | 16.2    |
| Within 24 hours after exposure #  | 67     | 45.3    |
| Any time after exposure   | 9      | 6.1     |

| Variables   | Number | Percent |
|---|--------|---------|
| Within 72 hours after exposure                        | 48     | 32.4    |
| <b>Types of exposure for healthcare professionals</b> |        |         |
| Percutaneous and mucocutaneous#                       | 18     | 12.2    |
| Occupational and non-occupational exposure            | 45     | 30.4    |
| Intact skin and non-intact skin exposure              | 29     | 19.6    |
| Invasive and non-invasive exposure                    | 56     | 37.8    |
| <b>#correct response</b>                              |        |         |

Table 2 shows that the most (85.8%) of the respondents correctly answered the meaning of PEP. And the most (77.7%) of the respondents answered common constituents of PEP of hepatitis B. Similarly, majority (72.3%) of the respondents correctly answered indication of PEP in occupational settings for hepatitis B as person exposed to any body fluids of HBsAg positive patient. Less than quarter (23.0%) of the respondents know the efficacy of PEP correctly as 75%. Less than half (45.3%) of the respondents correctly answered the initiation time of PEP as within 24 hours after exposure. Only (12.2%) of the respondents answered correctly types of exposure as percutaneous and mucocutaneous exposure.

**Table 3: Respondents' Knowledge on Hepatitis B Immunoglobulin (HBIG) and HBsAg titre**

n=148

| Variables  | Number | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| <b>Meaning of HBIG</b>   |        |         |
| Is an immuno globulin that is used to prevent the development      | 101    | 68.2    |
| Of hepatitis B after a cute exposure#                              | 32     | 21.6    |
| Is an immuno globulin to reduce potent of virus after exposure     | 6      | 4.1     |
| Isan antibiotic to prevent further ingestion after exposure to     | 9      | 6.1     |
| <b>Route of HBIG</b>   |        |         |
| Oral route   | 5      | 3.4     |
| Intra muscular route#  | 106    | 71.6    |
| Intra venous route   | 21     | 14.2    |
| Sub cutaneous route  | 16     | 10.8    |
| <b>Adult dose</b>  |        |         |
| 0.04ml/kg/5mlforadults   | 33     | 22.3    |
| 0.06ml/kg/5mlforadults#  | 76     | 51.4    |
| 0.08ml/kg/5mlforadults   | 22     | 14.9    |
| 0.10ml/kg/5mlforadults   | 17     | 11.5    |
| <b>Common side effects</b>   |        |         |
| Hairloss, weight loss, bleeding, bluish at the injection site      | 31     | 20.9    |
| Nausea, tremor, vision problem, erythema, a cheat injection site#  | 112    | 75.7    |
| Weight gain, anxiety   | 1      | 0.7     |
| Tinnitus, hypotension  | 4      | 2.7     |
| <b>Meaning of HBsAg titre</b>                                      |        |         |
| Test that detect sand measures antibodies of hepatitis B in blood# | 82     | 55.4    |
| Test that detects antigen of any viruses in the blood              | 51     | 34.5    |
| Test that determine immunity of an individual                      | 11     | 7.4     |
| Test that measures the action of virus in the body                 | 4      | 2.7     |
| <b>Adequate value of HBs Attire</b>                                |        |         |
| 100mIu/ml  | 14     | 9.5     |
| 50mIu/ml   | 55     | 37.2    |
| ≤ 10mIu/ml   | 63     | 42.6    |

| Variables   | Number | Percent |
|---|--------|---------|
| ≥ 10mIu/ml#   | 16     | 10.8    |
| <b>Risk percentage after per cutaneous exposure</b> |        |         |
| 5-10%   | 16     | 10.8    |
| 6-30%#  | 65     | 43.9    |
| 7-20%   | 48     | 32.4    |
| 8-15%   | 19     | 12.8    |
| <b>#correct response</b>                            |        |         |

Table 3 states that majority (68.2%) of the respondents correctly answered meaning of HBIG. Majority (71.6%) of the respondents correctly answered the route of HBIG as intramuscular route. Similarly, more than half (51.4%) of the respondents correctly answered the adult dose as 0.06ml/kg/5ml for adults. Likewise, most (75.7%) of the respondents correctly answered the common side effects of HBIG as nausea, tremor, vision problem, erythema, ache at injection site. More than half (55.4%) of the respondents answered correctly the meaning of HBsAg titre as test that detects and measures antibodies of hepatitis B in the blood. Similarly, only (10.8%) of the respondents answered correctly adequate value of HBsAg titre as >/equal to 10mIu/ml. Likewise, less than half (43.9%) of the respondents answered correctly risk percentage after percutaneous exposure as 6-30%.

**Table 4: Level of Knowledge on PEP of Hepatitis B among the Respondents**

| Level of knowledge         | Number | Percent |
|----------------------------|--------|---------|
| Inadequate(<12)            | 70     | 47.3    |
| Adequate(≥12)              | 78     | 52.7    |
| Median±IQR=12±4Q1=10,Q3=14 |        |         |
| Total                      | 148    | 100.0   |

Table 4 shows respondents knowledge on PEP of Hepatitis B. The respondents level of knowledge was categorized on the basis of median score (12±4). Among 148 respondents, more than half (52.7%) of the respondents have adequate knowledge on PEP of Hepatitis B while less than half(47.3%) of the respondents have adequate knowledge on PEP of Hepatitis B.

**Table 5: Association between Level of Knowledge with Socio-demographic Variables of the Respondents**

| Variables                           | Level of Knowledge |             | χ <sup>2</sup> | p-value |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------|---------|
|                                     | Inadquate (%)      | Adequate(%) |                |         |
| <b>Age (In completed years)</b>     |                    |             |                |         |
| <22years                            | 41(53.9)           | 35(46.1)    | 2.772          | 0.096   |
| ≥22 years                           | 29(40.3)           | 43(59.7)    |                |         |
| <b>Religion</b>                     |                    |             |                |         |
| Hindu                               | 63(45.7)           | 75(54.3)    | 1.498          | 0.306#  |
| Others***                           | 6(6.7)             | 3(3.3)      |                |         |
| <b>Address</b>                      |                    |             |                |         |
| Rural                               | 32(54.2)           | 27(45.8)    | 1.896          | 0.169   |
| Urban                               | 38(42.7)           | 51(57.3)    |                |         |
| <b>Programme of study</b>           |                    |             |                |         |
| Bachelor of nursing in science(BNS) | 24(40.0)           | 36(60.0)    | 2.156          | 0.097   |
| Bachelor in scienceof Nursing(BSc.) | 46(52.3)           | 42(47.7)    |                |         |

| Variables                 | Level of Knowledge |             | $\chi^2$ | p-value |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
|                           | Inadequate (%)     | Adequate(%) |          |         |
| BNS First Year            | 7(50.0)            | 7(50.0)     | 23.38    | 0.001*  |
| BNS Second Year           | 10(47.6)           | 11(52.4)    |          |         |
| BNS Third Year            | 7(28.0)            | 18(72.0)    |          |         |
| BSc. Nursing First Year   | 24(85.7)           | 4(14.3)     |          |         |
| BSc. Nursing Second Year  | 10(35.7)           | 18(64.3)    |          |         |
| BSc. Nursing Third Year   | 2(50.0)            | 2(50.0)     |          |         |
| BSc. Nursing Fourth Year  | 10(35.7)           | 18(64.3)    |          |         |
| <b>Vaccination status</b> |                    |             | 9.385    | 0.025*  |
| Never vaccinated          | 34(57.6)           | 25(42.4)    |          |         |
| Complete doses            | 22(42.3)           | 30(57.7)    |          |         |
| Incomplete doses          | 2(14.3)            | 12(85.7)    |          |         |
| Not known                 | 12(52.2)           | 11(47.8)    |          |         |

\*Significant Note: P value is obtained from t-test and Anova analysis; denotes P significant at  $\leq 0.05$

Table 5 shows that the association between academic level with level of knowledge was ( $p=0.001$ ). Likewise, the association between vaccinated status with level of knowledge was ( $p=0.025$ ).

**Table 6: Association between Level of Knowledge with Exposure of Hepatitis B related Variables of the Respondents**

| Variables  | Level of Knowledge |             | $\chi^2$ | p-value |
|--|--------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
|  | Inadequate (%)     | Adequate(%) |          |         |
| <b>Work experience(n=60)</b>   |                    |             | 0.179    | 1.000   |
| Yes  | 22(39.3)           | 34(60.7)    |          |         |
| No   | 2(50.0)            | 2(50.0)     |          |         |
| <b>In-service education of PEP(n=60)</b>                                       |                    |             | 0.179    | 1.000   |
| Yes  | 2(50.0)            | 2(50.0)     |          |         |
| No   | 22(39.3)           | 34(60.7)    |          |         |
| <b>Standard protocol regarding PEP in your clinical exposure</b>               |                    |             | 1.896    | 0.169   |
| Yes  | 21(46.7)           | 24(53.3)    |          |         |
| No   | 26(42.6)           | 35(57.4)    |          |         |
| Do not remember  | 23(54.8)           | 19(45.2)    |          |         |
| <b>Content of PEP in curriculum</b>  |                    |             | 1.481    | 0.477   |
| Yes  | 17(41.5)           | 24(58.5)    |          |         |
| No   | 31(46.3)           | 36(53.7)    |          |         |
| Do not remember  | 22(55.0)           | 18(45.0)    |          |         |
| <b>Vaccination status</b>  |                    |             | 1.540    | 0.463   |
| Never vaccinated   | 34(57.6)           | 25(42.4)    |          |         |
| Complete doses   | 22(42.3)           | 30(57.7)    |          |         |
| Incomplete doses   | 2(14.3)            | 12(85.7)    |          |         |
| Not known  | 12(52.2)           | 11(47.8)    |          |         |
| <b>Content of PEP in curriculum</b>  |                    |             | 1.540    | 0.463   |
| Yes  | 17(41.5)           | 24(58.5)    |          |         |
| No   | 31(46.3)           | 36(53.7)    |          |         |
| Do not remember  | 22(55.0)           | 18(45.0)    |          |         |
| <b>Exposed with HBsAg positive patient</b>                                     |                    |             | 1.696    | 0.193   |
| Yes  | 19(39.6)           | 29(60.4)    |          |         |
| No   | 51(51.0)           | 49(49.0)    |          |         |
| <b>Frequency of standard precaution to follow in your clinical institution</b> |                    |             | 0.010    | 0.919   |
| Always   | 57(47.5)           | 63(52.5)    |          |         |
| Sometimes  | 13(46.4)           | 15(53.6)    |          |         |

| Variables   | Level of Knowledge |             | $\chi^2$ | p-value |
|---|--------------------|-------------|----------|---------|
|   | Inadequate (%)     | Adequate(%) |          |         |
| <b>Frequency of institution providing personal protective barrier</b> |                    |             | 0.663    | 0.415   |
| Always  | 33(44.0)           | 42(56)      |          |         |
| Sometimes   | 37(50.7)           | 36(49.3)    |          |         |

\*Significant Note: P value is obtained from t-test and Anova analysis; denotes P significant at  $\leq 0.05$

Table 6 illustrates that there was no association found between exposure related variables and level of knowledge

## DISCUSSION

In this study respondents studying in BNS third year had significantly higher knowledge levels (72.0%) compared to nursing students studying in other years with lowest knowledge level in 1st year (26.2%). This difference was statistically significant ( $p<0.001$ ). In the current study, finding shows that respondents who have incomplete doses have significantly higher knowledge levels (85.7%) compared to students who have never been vaccinated (42.4%). This difference was statistically significant ( $p<0.025$ ). In the current study the finding revealed that among 148 respondents, more than half (52.7%) of the respondents have adequate knowledge on PEP while less than half (47.3%) of the respondents have inadequate knowledge on PEP whereas a study done among undergraduate dental students in India found majority (60.2%) of the respondents have adequate knowledge on PEP<sup>8</sup>.

In regard of general information on PEP of Hepatitis B in this study the majority (85.8%) of the respondents correctly answered the meaning of PEP. A study done among nurses in Chitwan Medical College found that 33.6% of the respondents answered correctly regarding meaning of PEP<sup>2</sup>.

In this study the majority (77.7%) of the respondents answered common constituents of PEP of hepatitis B. A study done among nurses in Chitwan Medical College where nearly one third (28.9%) nurses knew HBIG and Hepatitis B vaccine as the constituents of PEP for HBV<sup>2</sup>.

In this study less than quartile (23.0%) of the respondents knew the efficacy of PEP correctly. One third of the respondents (30.4%) answered correctly about it in a study done among dental and nursing students in N.K.P. Salve Institute of Medical Sciences (NKPSIMS) and dental & nursing colleges, Hingna Road, Nagpur<sup>9</sup>.

In this study less than half (45.3%) of the respondents correctly answered the initiation time of PEP. A study done in Chitwan Medical College where half of the respondents (50%) answered correctly<sup>2</sup>. A study done in N.K.P. Salve Institute of Medical Sciences (NKPSIMS) and dental & nursing colleges, Nagpur found that 49.3% students answered this question correctly<sup>9</sup>.

Only (10.8%) of the nursing students answered correctly adequate value of HBsAg titre. A study done among nurses in Chitwan Medical College revealed that correct answer was given by less than half (43.1%) of the respondents<sup>2</sup>.

In this study less than half (43.9%) of the respondents answered correctly risk percentage. A study done among nurses in Chitwan Medical College found that correct answer to percentage of getting HBV infection after needle stick injuries with known HBV infected person was 30%<sup>2</sup>. In this study less than half (42.6%) of the respondents correctly answered first contact person after exposure for risk assessment. A study done among nurses in Chitwan Medical College which revealed that only one third (33.6%) of the nurses knew about first contact person for risk assessment<sup>2</sup>.



Similarly, the current study shows that more than half (56.8%) of the respondents answered baseline investigation after exposure. A study done among nurses in Chitwan Medical College where more than two third (68.1%) nurses had knowledge about it<sup>2</sup>.

Likewise, more than half (59.5%) of the respondents answered correctly first-aid management after needle prick. A study conducted among respondents at a high education institution in the Western Cape Province, Africa has a finding where more than half (63.5%) of the respondents answered correctly about it<sup>10</sup>.

Regarding standard protocol of PEP of Hepatitis B the findings revealed that more than half (51.4%) of the respondents answered correctly when source patient is positive and exposed person is unvaccinated. A study done in Chitwan Medical College found that more than quarter (38.8%) nurses knew that both HBIG and vaccine series are recommended for un-vaccinated nurses if source is HBsAg positive. In regards to follow up timing after taking PEP majority of the respondents (82.4%) answered correctly. Only 19.4% of the respondents correctly answered about it in a study done among dental and nursing students in N.K.P. Salve Institute of Medical Sciences (NKPSIMS) and dental & nursing colleges, Nagpur<sup>9</sup>.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, more than half of the nursing respondents have adequate level of knowledge on PEP of Hepatitis B. Although the findings show inadequate level of knowledge regarding the efficacy of PEP, types of exposure, adequate value of HBsAg titre, standard protocol of PEP for Hepatitis B. This study shows statistically significant association between level of knowledge with academic level and vaccination status.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study can be used as a basis for informing the concerned authorities that curriculum need to be revised and PEP related content can be highlighted. The related content can be more focused to first year students.

## REFERENCES

1. [WHO] World Health Organization.(2023).Hepatitis B Vaccine. Author. Retrieved March 18 ,2024 from <https://www.who.int>Newsroom>Fact-Sheets/Detail/HepatitisB>
2. Sharma, K., & Adhikari, S. (2019). Nurses Knowledge on Post Exposure Prophylaxis for Hepatitis B Virus Infection in Tertiary Care Hospital. Journal of Chitwan Medical College, 9(2), 72-78. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jcmc.v9i2.24559>
3. Queensland Government. (2017). Health and Wellbeing. Author. Retrieved March4,2024 from <https://hdl.handle.net/20765/2653>
4. [CDC]CentersforDiseaseControl andPrevention.(2022). HepatitisB Vaccine. Author. Retrieved March 18,2024 from<https://www.cdc.gov.hepatitisB>
5. Potdar, P.A., Potdar, A.B., & Raikar, V.R. (2019). HepatitisB Infection among Nursing Staff of Tertiary Care Hospital in South India. Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development , 10(10), 32-36
6. Anand, K., Jain, S., Garg, S.K., Kumar, A., & Mittal, C. (2020). India Assessment of Knowledge, Attitude and Practices regarding Hepatitis-B among nursing students. Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences 19(4) 30- 35.[www.iosrjournals.orgDOI:10.9790/0853-1904013](http://www.iosrjournals.orgDOI:10.9790/0853-1904013)
7. Thapa, A., & Kaphle, H. P. (2021). Knowledge and Factors Associated with Compliance of Standard Precautions in Clinical Exposure among Proficiency Certificate

Level Nursing Students of Pokhara, Nepal. Journal of Health and Allied Sciences, 11(1), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.37107/jhas.228>

8. Fatima, A., Alam, S., Iftikhar, H., Tewari, R., Nisar Andrabi, S.-U., & Faraz, A (2021). Knowledge, practice, and awareness of dental undergraduate and postgraduate students toward post exposure prophylaxis and needle stick injuries: A descriptive cross-sectional institutional dental hospital study. Journal of Oral Research and Review, 13(2), 106. [https://doi.org/10.4103/jorr.jorr\\_4\\_20](https://doi.org/10.4103/jorr.jorr_4_20)
9. Pande D. Effect Of Training On Awareness About Pep Against Hiv, Hbv & Hcv, Among Dental And Nursing Students. Journal Of Medical Science And Clinical Research. 2020;8(1).
10. Amer RK. Nursing students' knowledge and practices related to sharp object injury and management at a university in the Western Cape Province. Cape Peninsula University of Technology; 2019

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Author would like to acknowledge Professor Dr. Dharma Prasad Khanal and Prof. Mandira Onta. Thanks to the MMIHS faculties, Statistician Sudip Khanal, and library, computer lab, and administrative staff. Appreciation to administration of Manmohan Memorial Institute of Health Sciences, and heartfelt thanks to the participants.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Reena Mandal took the overall responsibility for the study, including conceptualization, methodology development, analysis, and finalization of the manuscript. Sushma Acharya contributed to methodology design and tool preparation, while Aayusma Karki led the preparation of the theoretical framework, methodology, data collection and analysis, and report preparation.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

All the authors declare no competing