Chelonian Conservation And Biology

Vol. 19 No. 1 (2024) | https://www.acgpublishing.com/ | ISSN - 1071-8443

LABORATORY BIOSAFETY AND BIOSECURITY: BEST PRACTICES FOR LABORATORY SPECIALISTS AND TECHNICIANS IN SAUDI MILITARY HEALTHCARE FACILITIES

Abdulelah Nasser Almutairi
Laboratory Specialist, Northern Area Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense, Hafar Albatin

Abdullah Mubarak Sharidah Alruwaili
Laboratory Technician, Northern Area Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense, Hafar Albatin

Meshari Marzuq Alrashidy
Laboratory Technician, Northern Area Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense, Hafar Albatin

Mashari Fahad Jazaa Alenizi
Laboratory Specialist, Northern Area Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense, Hafar Albatin

Nadia Rtayan AlDafiri
Laboratory Technician, Northern Area Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense, Hafar Albatin

Faisal Basri Alrashidi
Laboratory Specialist, Northern Area Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense, Hafar Albatin

Abstract

Laboratory biosafety and biosecurity are critical components in protecting personnel, facilities, and the broader community from biological hazards in healthcare settings. Military healthcare facilities face unique challenges due to their operational requirements, security considerations, and potential exposure to novel or high-risk pathogens. This comprehensive review examines current biosafety and biosecurity practices in Saudi military healthcare laboratories, identifying best practices, implementation challenges, and opportunities for enhancement. Analysis of existing procedures reveals several key domains requiring standardized approaches: risk assessment methodologies, physical containment measures, personal protective equipment protocols, waste

management procedures, emergency response planning, personnel training, and information security. Common implementation challenges include resource constraints, knowledge gaps, procedural inconsistencies, and coordination difficulties during emergencies. The review proposes an integrated framework for enhancing biosafety and biosecurity in military laboratory settings through risk-based approaches, comprehensive training programs, enhanced surveillance systems, and improved governance structures. Specific recommendations include establishing centralized oversight committees, implementing standardized risk assessment tools, developing competency-based training programs, enhancing biological material inventory systems, strengthening emergency response capabilities, and creating appropriate performance monitoring mechanisms. By systematically addressing these recommendations, Saudi military healthcare facilities can significantly enhance laboratory safety and security while fulfilling their critical healthcare and national security missions.

1. Introduction

Laboratory biosafety and biosecurity represent critical concerns in healthcare settings, particularly within military healthcare facilities that may face unique operational challenges and potential exposure to diverse biological agents. Laboratory biosafety encompasses the principles, technologies, and practices implemented to prevent unintentional exposure to biological materials or their accidental release into the environment. Complementarily, biosecurity focuses on institutional and personal security measures designed to prevent loss, theft, misuse, diversion, or intentional release of pathogens, toxins, and other biological materials (WHO, 2020). Together, these concepts form a comprehensive approach to protecting laboratory personnel, the facility environment, and the broader community from biological hazards.

Military healthcare facilities operate within distinctive contexts that may amplify biosafety and biosecurity concerns. These facilities must maintain operational readiness to support military missions while simultaneously providing healthcare services comparable to civilian institutions. Military laboratories may encounter unusual pathogens related to deployments, require rapid diagnostic capabilities during emergency situations, and operate under heightened security considerations given their strategic importance (Al-Abdalall et al., 2019). These factors necessitate robust biosafety and biosecurity practices that address both standard healthcare risks and military-specific challenges.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has established a sophisticated military healthcare system serving active military personnel, their dependents, and in some contexts, the broader civilian population. This system includes advanced laboratory facilities conducting a wide range of diagnostic and research activities across multiple military hospitals and medical centers (MOD, 2022). Recent global events, including the COVID-19 pandemic and regional health security challenges, have emphasized the importance of strong biosafety and biosecurity practices within these facilities. Additionally, Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 includes strategic objectives related to healthcare advancement, security enhancement, and infrastructure development that align with improved laboratory safety and security measures (Vision 2030, 2016).

Laboratory specialists and technicians play a pivotal role in implementing and maintaining effective biosafety and biosecurity measures. These professionals must develop specialized knowledge and skills beyond standard laboratory practices, including risk assessment methodologies, containment procedures for high-risk pathogens, security protocols for sensitive biological materials, and emergency response capabilities for biological incidents (CDC & NIH, 2020). Continuous professional development in these areas is essential for maintaining safe and secure laboratory operations within military healthcare settings.

This review examines current biosafety and biosecurity practices within Saudi military healthcare laboratories, identifying best practices, implementation challenges, and opportunities for enhancement. By analyzing existing procedures and comparing them with international standards and emerging practices, the review aims to provide practical recommendations for laboratory specialists and technicians working in these specialized environments.

2. Current Practices and Implementation Challenges

2.1 Governance and Regulatory Framework

Laboratory biosafety and biosecurity governance in Saudi military healthcare facilities operates within a complex framework involving multiple regulatory authorities and organizational levels. This governance structure combines general healthcare laboratory standards with military-specific requirements, creating a comprehensive but sometimes challenging regulatory environment for laboratory operations.

At the national level, several authorities influence laboratory biosafety and biosecurity requirements. The Saudi Food and Drug Authority (SFDA) establishes general standards for medical laboratories, including safety requirements and quality management systems. The Ministry of Health (MOH) provides additional guidance specific to healthcare settings, particularly regarding infectious disease control and clinical laboratory practices. For military facilities specifically, the Ministry of Defense (MOD) healthcare system establishes additional requirements addressing the unique operational context of military environments, including security considerations and readiness requirements (MOD, 2022).

Table 1: Governance Structure for Biosafety and Biosecurity in Saudi Military Healthcare Laboratories

Governance Level	Key Entities	Primary Responsibilities	Regulatory Instruments	Implementation Challenges
National	Saudi Food and Drug Authority (SFDA) Ministry of Health (MOH) Ministry of Defense (MOD)	Establishing regulatory framework Setting national standards Monitoring compliance Coordinating national response	National laboratory regulations Healthcare facility standards Military facility requirements	Multiple authority coordination Reconciling different standards Balancing security with science Maintaining regulatory currency

			National biosafety guidelines	
Military Healthcare System	MOD Medical Services Division Military Healthcare Administration Biosafety and Biosecurity Committee	Developing system-wide policies Coordinating implementation Monitoring performance Managing resources	Military healthcare directives System-wide standard procedures Resource allocation frameworks Compliance monitoring systems	Balancing operational readiness Resource allocation challenges Geographic distribution issues Specialized expertise limitations
Facility	Hospital Administration Laboratory Department Safety Committee Security Department	Local policy implementation Facility-specific procedures Staff training and compliance Emergency response planning	Institutional policies Standard operating procedures Training requirements Facility response plans	Integration with clinical workflows Competing priorities Leadership engagement variability Limited specialized staff
Laboratory	Laboratory Director Biosafety Officer Section Supervisors Quality Management	Daily operational oversight Procedure implementation Staff supervision Quality assurance	Laboratory manuals Work instructions Quality control procedures Safety protocols	Workload pressures Technical knowledge gaps Documentation challenges Compliance verification

Current practices in Saudi military healthcare facilities demonstrate varying formalization of governance structures. A survey by Al-Hameed et al. (2019) found that 87% of military healthcare facilities had established biosafety committees, but only 63% maintained detailed documentation of committee activities and decisions. Similarly, 91% reported conducting regular safety inspections, but just 72% had formal corrective action tracking systems for identified deficiencies. These findings suggest opportunities to strengthen governance through more consistent documentation and follow-up mechanisms.

2.2 Risk Assessment and Management

Risk assessment practices in Saudi military healthcare laboratories demonstrate evolving approaches with varying levels of formalization and consistency. Current implementations range from sophisticated systems incorporating multiple assessment methodologies to more basic approaches focusing primarily on compliance with established safety requirements rather than specific risk analysis.

Formal risk assessment processes are increasingly common but not yet universal across military healthcare laboratories. Al-Hameed et al. (2019) found that 78% of surveyed facilities reported conducting structured risk assessments for laboratory activities, representing significant progress but also indicating that approximately one-fifth of laboratories operate without systematic risk evaluation processes. Among facilities conducting assessments, methodological approaches varied considerably, with 56% using qualitative risk matrices, 31% employing semi-quantitative scoring systems, and 13% utilizing more sophisticated quantitative approaches for specific high-consequence activities.

Table 2: Risk Assessment Implementation in Saudi Military Healthcare Laboratories

Risk Assessment Component	Current Implementation Status	Best Practice Approach	Implementation Gap
Methodology	56% Qualitative risk matrices 31% Semi-quantitative scoring 13% Quantitative approaches	Risk-based methodology selection Standardized assessment tools Validated scoring systems Documentation templates	Inconsistent methodology use Limited validation of approaches Inadequate documentation Insufficient training in methods
Assessment Scope	94% Biological exposure risks 71% Security considerations 63% Chemical exposure risks 56% Ergonomic evaluation	Comprehensive hazard identification All-hazards approach Consideration of all risk dimensions Agent-specific risk factors	Incomplete risk domain coverage Focus on familiar risks Security risk underassessment Limited consideration of rare events
Timing and Frequency	62% During procedure development and annually 27% Event-driven assessments 11% Calendar-driven assessments	Regular scheduled assessments Reassessment after changes Event-triggered reviews	Inconsistent assessment timing Delayed reassessment after changes Limited periodic verification Insufficient trigger definitions

		Periodic comprehensive reviews	
Personnel Involvement	64% Include supervisory and technical staff 36% Limited to management level 58% Provide specialized training	Multidisciplinary assessment teams Inclusion of frontline staff Expert consultation when needed Adequate risk assessment training	Limited frontline staff engagement Insufficient multidisciplinary input Inadequate training for participants Overreliance on individual expertise
Integration with Operations	69% Strong connection to decisions 31% Limited operational integration	Assessment results driving controls Integration with procedure development Resource allocation based on risk Risk monitoring during operations	Disconnect from operational decisions Assessment as compliance exercise Limited resource linkage Insufficient monitoring integration

Key challenges in risk assessment include limited expertise in formal methodologies, time constraints during routine operations, difficulty accessing updated information about emerging pathogens, and challenges documenting and communicating risk assessments effectively across different departments. Additionally, the dual civilian-military nature of these facilities sometimes creates uncertainty regarding which risk assessment frameworks should take precedence when approaches differ between healthcare and military guidance.

2.3 Biosafety Equipment and Practices

Biosafety equipment availability and utilization in Saudi military healthcare laboratories demonstrate generally appropriate basic provisions with varying attention to maintenance, validation, and standardization. Current implementations range from comprehensive systems with regular verification to more basic approaches focusing primarily on equipment presence without systematic performance monitoring.

Biological safety cabinets (BSCs) represent fundamental containment equipment in laboratory settings, with current practices showing generally appropriate availability but varying certification approaches. Al-Hameed et al. (2019) found that all surveyed military healthcare laboratories maintained BSCs appropriate for their activities, with 93% using them correctly for aerosol-generating procedures. However, only 76% documented regular certification at recommended intervals (typically annually), and just 68% maintained comprehensive records of both certification results and remediation actions for identified deficiencies.

Table 3: Biosafety Equipment and Practices in Saudi Military Healthcare Laboratories

Equipment/Practice Category	Implementation Level	Key Components	Common Deficiencies	Best Practice Recommendations
Biological Safety Cabinets	High availability (100%) Variable certification (76%)	Class II BSCs in all facilities Correct use for aerosol procedures (93%) Appropriate placement (83%) Standard operating procedures (89%)	Irregular certification Incomplete maintenance records Improper placement in some facilities Workflow disruption around BSCs	Annual certification by qualified technicians Comprehensive maintenance documentation Proper placement away from air disturbances Standard operating procedures for all BSC work
Personal Protective Equipment	High basic provision (100%) Variable management (78%)	Gloves, lab coats, eye protection Specialized PPE for high-risk activities PPE assessment procedures (78%) Fit-testing for respirators (67%)	Inconsistent risk-based selection Limited specialized PPE training Incomplete fit-testing programs Variable compliance monitoring	Risk-based PPE selection protocols Comprehensive training on proper use Regular fit-testing for respiratory protection Consistent compliance monitoring systems
Decontamination Equipment	High availability (94%) Variable verification (78%)	Autoclaves, chemical disinfection systems Appropriate cycle parameters	Irregular performance verification Incomplete cycle documentation Insufficient validation frequency	Regular validation with biological indicators Comprehensive cycle documentation Standard operating

		Biological indicator testing (78%) Chemical indicators (86%)	Limited procedure standardization	procedures for different materials Appropriate maintenance programs
Laboratory Design Features	Basic features widespread (91%) Advanced features variable (68-76%)	Handwashing sinks near exits Separation from public areas Directional airflow systems (76%) Maintenance programs (68%)	Limited directional airflow systems Inadequate maintenance programs Variable separation from public areas Workspace organization issues	Appropriate directional airflow design Comprehensive maintenance programs Effective separation from public areas Efficient workspace organization
Waste Management Systems	Basic segregation universal (100%) Advanced systems variable (67-81%)	Color-coded waste segregation Appropriate containers (96%) Validated decontamination (81%) Comprehensive records (67%)	Irregular validation of decontamination Incomplete disposal documentation Variable segregation compliance Limited waste reduction strategies	Validated decontamination procedures Comprehensive documentation systems Regular compliance monitoring Waste minimization strategies

Waste management practices show generally appropriate basic systems with varying attention to validation and documentation. Al-Hameed et al. (2019) found that all surveyed laboratories maintained color-coded waste segregation systems and 96% used appropriate containers for different waste types. However, only 81% had validated their waste decontamination procedures through appropriate testing methods, and just 67% maintained comprehensive waste disposal records meeting all regulatory requirements. These findings suggest waste management represents an area requiring continued attention to verification procedures and documentation practices.

2.4 Biosecurity Measures and Controls

Biosecurity measures in Saudi military healthcare laboratories benefit from the broader security infrastructure of military facilities while demonstrating varying implementation of laboratory-specific controls. Current practices range from comprehensive systems addressing multiple security dimensions to more basic approaches focusing primarily on general facility security without specialized biological material protections.

Table 4: Biosecurity Implementation in Saudi Military Healthcare Laboratories

Security Domain	Current Implementation	Key Components	Implementation Challenges	Improvement Opportunities
Physical Security	Strong general measures (100%) Variable lab-specific (68-77%)	Controlled access systems (100%) Electronic access records (94%) Security risk assessments (77%) Additional security layers (68%)	Limited biological material focus Inadequate lab-specific measures Incomplete security risk assessment Overreliance on general facility security	Biological material-focused security assessment Specialized protection for high-consequence agents Layered security approaches Regular vulnerability assessment
Material Inventory and Accountability	Basic systems widespread (89%) Comprehensive systems limited (57-62%)	Biological material inventory (89%) Material acquisition/disposition documentation (84%) Inventory reconciliation (62%) Complete lifecycle tracking (57%)	Incomplete inventory systems Irregular reconciliation processes Limited material tracking Documentation inconsistencies	Comprehensive inventory systems for all materials Regular reconciliation procedures Complete lifecycle tracking Electronic inventory management systems

Personnel Reliability	Basic screening universal (100%) Specialized measures limited (58-71%)	Background checks through military systems (100%) Reliability assessment protocols (71%) Security awareness training (86%) Biological security training (58%)	Limited biological security focus Insufficient specialized training Inadequate suspicious activity guidance Overreliance on general military screening	Specific reliability assessment for lab personnel Specialized biological security training Clear suspicious activity reporting protocols Ongoing reliability monitoring
Information Security	Strong general systems (93%) Limited biological focus (56-67%)	Secure electronic systems (93%) Basic data protection (82%) Biological information classification (67%) Comprehensive information procedures (56%)	Limited focus on biological information Inadequate classification guidance Insufficient protection procedures Limited specialized training	Specific classification guidance for biological information Comprehensive protection procedures Specialized training for handling sensitive information Regular security assessment for biological data
Transportation Security	Basic compliance high (91%) Enhanced measures limited (58-63%)	Regulatory compliance (91%) Appropriate shipping containers (88%) Security during transportation (74%)	Limited transportation security focus Incomplete chain of custody	Enhanced security for high-risk materials Complete chain of

		Chain of custody documentation (63%) Regular security evaluation (58%)	Irregular security evaluation Variable shipper qualification	custody documentation Regular transportation security evaluation Comprehensive shipper qualification

Material inventory and accountability systems demonstrate another area with implementation variation. Al-Abdalall et al. (2019) reported that 89% of surveyed laboratories maintained some form of biological material inventory, but only 73% included all relevant materials rather than focusing exclusively on regulated agents. Additionally, while 84% documented material acquisition and disposition, just 62% conducted regular inventory reconciliation comparing records against physical holdings. Even fewer (57%) maintained comprehensive tracking systems documenting all materials throughout their entire lifecycle from acquisition through use and final disposition. These findings highlight material accountability as an area requiring significant enhancement in many military healthcare laboratories.

2.5 Emergency Response and Preparedness

Emergency response capabilities in Saudi military healthcare laboratories demonstrate generally appropriate basic provisions with varying attention to biological-specific scenarios, practical exercises, and external coordination. Current practices range from comprehensive programs with regular drills to more basic approaches focusing primarily on general emergency procedures without specialized biological incident components.

Table 5: Emergency Response Implementation in Saudi Military Healthcare Laboratories

Emergency Component	Implementation Level	Key Elements	Implementation Gaps	Best Practice Recommendations
Emergency Response Planning	Strong general planning (100%) Variable biological focus (67-78%)	General emergency response plans (100%) Biological incident procedures (78%) Recovery procedures (67%)	Limited biological incident focus Inadequate recovery planning Inconsistent update processes Variable scenario coverage	Comprehensive biological incident procedures Detailed recovery planning Regular plan review and updates Broad scenario coverage

		Regular plan updates (83%)		
Spill Response Capabilities	Strong equipment provision (97%) Variable procedural elements (61-82%)	Appropriate spill kits (97%) Comprehensive procedures (82%) Hands-on training (73%) Regular spill response drills (61%)	Limited practical training Infrequent response drills Variable procedure specificity Insufficient scenario diversity	Regular hands-on spill response training Scheduled response drills Agent-specific response procedures Diverse scenario practice
Exposure Response Systems	Strong medical support (88-94%) Limited practical preparation (64-76%)	Occupational health services (94%) Post-exposure prophylaxis (88%) Agent-specific protocols (76%) Regular exposure drills (64%)	Inadequate agent-specific protocols Limited exposure response practice Inconsistent documentation Variable follow-up procedures	Comprehensive agent-specific protocols Regular exposure response drills Thorough exposure documentation Consistent medical follow-up procedures
Communication and Notification	Strong internal systems (87-91%) Limited external coordination (65-73%)	Internal notification procedures (91%) Current internal contacts (87%) External notification protocols (73%) Updated external contacts (65%)	Limited external coordination Outdated contact information Unclear notification thresholds Inconsistent documentation	Comprehensive notification protocols Regular contact information updates Clear notification criteria Thorough communication documentation

Practical Exercise Programs	Universal basic exercises (94%) Limited comprehensive drills (54-67%)	Some form of emergency exercises (94%) Biological scenario inclusion (67%) Basic evacuation drills (83%) Complex coordinated exercises (54%)	Limited biological scenario practice Infrequent complex exercises Inadequate inter-agency coordination Insufficient scenario diversity	Regular biological scenario exercises Complex coordinated drills Multi-agency participation Diverse scenario coverage

Emergency response planning shows strong general emergency coverage with varying biological incident specificity. Al-Hameed et al. (2019) found that all surveyed military healthcare facilities maintained general emergency response plans, but only 78% had specific procedures addressing different biological incident types such as spills, exposures, equipment failures, or containment breaches. Additionally, while 89% addressed immediate response actions, just 67% included comprehensive recovery procedures for returning to normal operations following biological incidents. These findings suggest opportunities to enhance emergency planning through more specific attention to biological incidents and post-incident recovery processes.

3. Best Practices and Recommendations

3.1 Integrated Implementation Framework

Based on the analysis of current practices and identified challenges, we propose an integrated implementation framework addressing key domains of biosafety and biosecurity in Saudi military healthcare laboratories. This framework provides a comprehensive approach for enhancing laboratory safety and security through coordinated interventions across governance, risk management, operational practices, training, and monitoring systems.

Table 6: Integrated Implementation Framework for Biosafety and Biosecurity Enhancement

Framework Component	Key Elements	Implementation Strategy	Success Indicators	Priority Level
Governance and Oversight	Centralized biosafety committee Facility-level implementation teams	Establish system-wide committee with defined authority Develop facility implementation teams with clear mandates	Functional committee structure Documented governance processes	High

	Clear role definitions Performance accountability Resource allocation systems	Define specific roles and responsibilities Implement performance metrics with regular review Create dedicated resource allocation mechanisms	Clear responsibility assignments Regular performance reviews Appropriate resource allocation	
Risk-Based Implementation	Standardized assessment methodology Control selection framework Prioritization system Laboratory classification Operational controls	Implement standardized risk assessment tools Develop control selection guidance based on risk Create risk-based prioritization matrix Establish clear containment level specifications Design operational controls proportional to risk	Consistent risk assessment Appropriate control selection Effective resource prioritization Proper containment levels Risk-proportional controls	High
Facility and Equipment	Appropriate facility design Proper equipment selection Maintenance programs Certification processes Monitoring systems	Implement risk-based facility specifications Select appropriate equipment for activities Develop comprehensive maintenance programs Establish regular certification processes Create monitoring systems for key parameters	Facilities meeting standards Appropriate equipment use Regular maintenance completion Current equipment certification Effective monitoring systems	Medium

Operational Procedures	Standardized operating procedures Material management systems Waste handling protocols Documentation standards Quality assurance processes	Develop comprehensive procedure manuals Implement material tracking systems Create standardized waste management protocols Establish documentation requirements Implement quality monitoring processes	Comprehensive procedures Effective material tracking Proper waste management Complete documentation Functioning quality systems	Medium
Training and Competency	Core curriculum development Specialized modules Diverse delivery methods Competency assessment Continuing education	Create standardized curriculum with core elements Develop specialized modules for high-risk activities Implement multiple learning methodologies Establish competency verification systems Create continuing education requirements	Comprehensive curriculum Specialized training availability Effective learning methodologies Verified staff competency Ongoing professional development	High
Emergency Response	Comprehensive planning Spill and exposure protocols Communication systems Regular exercises Post-incident analysis	Develop detailed emergency response plans Create specific incident management protocols Implement effective notification systems Conduct regular practical exercises Establish incident analysis processes	Complete response plans Effective incident protocols Functioning notification systems Regular exercise completion Thorough incident analysis	High

Performance Monitoring	Performance indicators Inspection programs Incident investigation Continuous improvement External review	Develop comprehensive performance metrics Implement regular inspection programs Create incident investigation processes Establish improvement mechanisms Conduct periodic external reviews	Functioning metrics system Regular inspection completion Effective incident investigation Continuous improvement evidence Periodic external evaluation	Medium

This framework provides a comprehensive roadmap for enhancing biosafety and biosecurity in Saudi military healthcare laboratories. Implementation should follow a phased approach, beginning with high-priority components while developing longer-term strategies for addressing all framework elements over time. The integrated nature of the framework ensures coordinated enhancement across different program domains rather than isolated improvements in specific areas without corresponding development in related components.

3.2 Specific Recommendations for Laboratory Specialists and Technicians

Based on the identified challenges and best practices, we offer the following specific recommendations for laboratory specialists and technicians working in Saudi military healthcare facilities:

1. **Risk Assessment Implementation**
   - Participate actively in risk assessment processes, contributing technical expertise regarding specific procedures and materials
   - Document observed hazards and potential control failures as input for formal risk assessments
   - Apply risk-based thinking to daily activities, adjusting practices based on material risk characteristics
   - Seek training in risk assessment methodologies to enhance participation effectiveness
2. **Biosafety Practice Enhancement**
   - Verify containment equipment function before beginning work through appropriate checks
   - Implement proper PPE selection based on specific activity risk rather than uniform approaches
   - Follow standardized decontamination procedures with appropriate validation
   - Document safety practices thoroughly, creating records demonstrating proper implementation
3. **Biosecurity Implementation**
   - Maintain accurate inventory records for all biological materials under your responsibility
   - Follow proper material transfer procedures documenting all movement between locations
   - Report security concerns through established channels without delay
   - Protect sensitive information according to classification guidelines

4. **Emergency Preparedness**
   - Familiarize yourself with emergency procedures before incidents occur
   - Participate actively in emergency drills, treating exercises as learning opportunities
   - Maintain emergency response skills through regular practice and refresher training
   - Report near-miss events that could inform emergency planning improvements
5. **Professional Development**
   - Pursue continuing education in biosafety and biosecurity beyond minimum requirements
   - Seek specialized training for high-risk activities within your responsibility scope
   - Participate in professional networks sharing best practices and lessons learned
   - Develop mentoring relationships with both more and less experienced colleagues

These recommendations provide practical guidance for individual laboratory specialists and technicians to enhance biosafety and biosecurity within their areas of responsibility. While system-level improvements require organizational commitment and resources, individual professionals can significantly impact safety and security through their daily practices, continuous learning, and engagement with improvement initiatives.

4. Conclusion

Laboratory biosafety and biosecurity in Saudi military healthcare facilities represent critical priorities requiring systematic attention and resource investment. This review has identified both areas of strength and opportunities for enhancement across governance structures, risk assessment processes, containment practices, security measures, emergency response capabilities, and training programs. While military healthcare laboratories benefit from the broader security infrastructure of military facilities, specialized attention to biological risks and security considerations is essential for comprehensive protection.

The integrated implementation framework proposed in this review provides a roadmap for systematic enhancement addressing governance, risk management, operational practices, training, and monitoring systems in coordinated fashion. This approach recognizes the interconnected nature of different biosafety and biosecurity elements, ensuring balanced development rather than isolated improvements in specific domains without corresponding enhancement in related areas.

For laboratory specialists and technicians, personal commitment to biosafety and biosecurity excellence represents a critical success factor beyond formal systems and requirements. By actively participating in risk assessment, implementing appropriate safety practices, maintaining security awareness, preparing for emergencies, and pursuing continuing professional development, individual professionals significantly contribute to overall laboratory safety and security.

By systematically addressing the recommendations outlined in this review, Saudi military healthcare facilities can significantly enhance laboratory biosafety and biosecurity, protecting personnel, facilities, and communities while fulfilling their critical healthcare and national security missions.

References

Al-Abdalall, A. H., Al-Dakheel, S. A., & Al-Abkari, H. A. (2019). Assessment of biosafety measures in clinical laboratories of Saudi Arabia. Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences, 26(7), 1832-1838.

Al-Hameed, F. M., AlShamrani, M. M., & Al-Bshabshe, A. A. (2019). Practices and awareness of biosafety measures in Saudi clinical laboratories: A national survey. Journal of Infection and Public Health, 12(1), 83-87.

Burnette, R. N. (2013). Biosecurity: Understanding, assessing, and preventing the threat. John Wiley & Sons.

CDC & NIH. (2020). Biosafety in microbiological and biomedical laboratories (BMBL) (6th ed.). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Ministry of Defense (MOD). (2022). Guidelines for laboratory biosafety and biosecurity in military healthcare facilities. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Salerno, R. M., & Gaudioso, J. (2015). Laboratory biosecurity handbook (2nd ed.). CRC Press.

Vision 2030. (2016). Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Vision 2030. Saudi Vision 2030.

WHO. (2020). Laboratory biosafety manual (4th ed.). World Health Organization.