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#### Abstract

Objective: To evaluate the knowledge levels of Ordu University Faculty of Dentistry students about Hepatitis B Virus (HBV), preventive measures, and compare differences between academic classes. Methods: Students from Ordu University Faculty of Dentistry (1th to 5th year from 2019-2020 academic year) were asked to respond a one-page questionnaire form measuring their knowledge about HBV. The questionnaire was created online and a total of 417 students were asked to respond. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, chi-square test and Fischer's exact test. Significance level was set at a $\mathrm{P}<0.05$. Results: In this study, 318 of 417 students participated. In total, $97.8 \%$ of 318 students knew that HBV can be transmitted through dental treatments. In addition, $85.2 \%$ of students stated that HBV can be transmitted through saliva. $94.7 \%$ of students who answered the questionnaire knew that HBV vaccination program consisted of 3 doses. In the question of standard universal precautions for HBV contagiousness, $28 \%$ of students selected the option 'I do not know', and there was a statistically significant difference between academic classes in this question ( $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ ). Conclusion: According to the results of this study, although students had better knowledge about HBV when compared to similar studies, it is recommended that knowledge of students, especially on standard universal measures, should be reviewed. In addition, the vaccination and immune status of the students should be followed regularly.
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## Introduction

Hepatitis B is a serious life-threatening liver infection caused by Hepatitis B virus (HBV), which is one of the DNA viruses (1). Hepatitis B is both highly contagious and can turn into a chronic infection that can cause fatal diseases such as cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (2).

HBV can be transmitted in many ways. Some of these include contact with infected blood and body fluids, mother to baby at birth, with parenteral route, and with sex with an infected partner (3). According to 2015 data, there are more than 2 billion infected
was calculated as 301 at the level of $95 \%$ confidence and $3 \%$ margin of error. While 318 of students participated in our survey, 99 did not.

The questionnaire form consisted of three parts. In the first part, demographic information of the participants such as age, gender, and classes were questioned. The second part questions aim to measure the students' knowledge about HBV, transmission routes and vaccination. There were 15 questions in this section and 13 of them were yes / no questions. There were four options in one question and participants were asked to choose their level of knowledge. In the third and last part, there were six questions and the protective measures against HBV and the vaccination status of participants were questioned.

## Statistical analysis

The database collected in the Google forms application were converted to Excel format (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA) for further analysis. The data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics Package (Version 22.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.).

Descriptive analysis, chi-square test and Fischer's exact test were used to analyze the data. Statistical significance level was set at $\mathrm{P}<0.05$.

## Ethics of the Study

This study was approved by Ordu University Clinical Research Ethics Committee with the 2020/35 numbered decision. All participants were informed in detail about the objective of the study and gave written consent. The study was performed in accordance with the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

## Results

Demographic data were obtained in the first part of the questionnaire. Table 1 presents the distribution of demographic data of participants. In this study, $35.5 \%$ of participants were male and $64.5 \%$ were female. While $17 \%$ of students were in the 16-20 age range, $56.6 \%$ were in the 20-22 age range and $26.4 \%$ were over 22 years old. The distribution of participating students according to the years was as follows (Table 1): 65 students in the 1st year ( $20.4 \%$ ), 59 students in the 2nd year ( $18.6 \%$ ), 75 students in the 3rd year ( $23.6 \%$ ), 62 students in the 4th year ( $19.5 \%$ ), 57 students in the 5 th year ( $17.9 \%$ ). Table 2 presents the distribution of gender according to years. Male participating students (113) according to the years were as follows (Table 2): 22 students in the 1st year ( $19.5 \%$ ), 22 students in the 2 nd year ( $19.5 \%$ ), 31
students in the 3 rd year ( $27.4 \%$ ), 22 students in the 4th year (19.5\%), 16 students in the 5th year (14.2\%). Female participating students (205) according to the years were as follows (Table 2): 43 students in the 1th year ( $21 \%$ ), 37 students in the 2 nd year ( $18 \%$ ), 44 students in the 3 rd year ( $21.5 \%$ ), 40 students in the 4th year ( $19.5 \%$ ), 41 students in the 5th year ( $20 \%$ ).

Table 1. The distribution of demographic data of the participants

| Age | $16-20$ | $54(17 \%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $20-22$ | $180(56.6 \%)$ |
| Gender | $>22$ | $84(26.4 \%)$ |
|  | Male | $113(35.5 \%)$ |
|  | Female | $205(64.5 \%)$ |
|  | 1 | $65(20.4 \%)$ |
| Year | 2 | $59(18.6 \%)$ |
|  | 3 | $75(23.6 \%)$ |
|  | 4 | $62(19.5 \%)$ |
|  | 5 | $57(17.9 \%)$ |

Table 2. The distribution gender of the participants acording to year

| Year | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $22(19.5 \%)$ | $43(21 \%)$ | $65(20.4 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $22(19.5 \%)$ | $37(18 \%)$ | $59(18.6 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $31(27.4 \%)$ | $44(21.5 \%)$ | $75(23.6 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $22(19.5 \%)$ | $40(19.5 \%)$ | $62(19.5 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $16(14.2 \%)$ | $41(20 \%)$ | $57(17.9 \%)$ |
| Total | $113(\% 100)$ | $205(\% 100)$ | $318(\% 100)$ |

In the second part of the questionnaire, students' knowledge about HBV was tested with 15 questions. According to the data of the first question, $85.2 \%$ of students knew that HBV could be transmitted by saliva. In the second question, 301 students ( $94.7 \%$ ) knew that HBV could be transmitted from the dentist to the patient. In addition, students correctly answered that HBV could be transmitted from patient to patient and from patient to dentist with $98.4 \%$ and $97.8 \%$, respectively. The answers and statistical information of the questions in the second part according to the years were shown in Table 3. In the second part of the questionnaire, the 7 th question was 'A considerable proportion of dentists experience needlestick injuries frequently' and $86.8 \%$ of participating students marked 'yes'. There was a statistically significant difference between the preferences of 1st and 5th year students ( $\mathrm{P}=0.001$ ).

Another important question of the second part was 'Level of knowledge about standard universal precautions'. While $26.1 \%$ of students stated that they were educated, $28 \%$ of students stated that they did not have information about standard universal measures. In the comparison between years, the answers of the 4th and 5th years were significantly
different from the 1st and 2nd years separately ( $\mathrm{P}<0.005$ ).

In the first question of the third part, $83 \%$ of students stated that they always wore gloves as protective equipment. This rate was determined to be $53.8 \%$ for 1st year students and a statistically significant difference was found when compared to other years ( $\mathrm{P}<0.005$ ). Preferences for the use of protective equipment were shown in Table 4.

In the second question of the third part, 214 students stated that they were always recapping the needles after they used it ( $67.3 \%$ ). The answers of the 4th and 5th years were significantly different from the 1 st and 2 nd years separately ( $\mathrm{P}=0,001$ ) (Table 5). Regarding the approach to patients with HBV infection, 42 students (13.2\%) stated that they did not treat HBV-infected patients, 236 students (74.2\%) stated that there was no difference between HBV infected patients and other patients, 40 students $(12.6 \%)$ stated that infected patients delayed their treatment (Figure 1). In the comparison between years, it was seen that 5th year students' preferences showed a statistically significant difference compared to 1st year and 2nd year students' preferences ( P <0.005).

On the other hand, $94.7 \%$ of the students participating in the questionnaire knew that the HBV vaccine consisted of 3 doses and 195 students (61.3\%) had 3 doses of vaccine. In terms of administered vaccination dose, a statistically significant difference was found between the 2nd year students and the other years, and the 1st year students and the 4 th and 5 th years separately ( $\mathrm{P}<0.005$ ). Only $157(80.5 \%)$ of the students who completed 3 doses of vaccine stated that they controlled their immunity. While $76.4 \%$ of these students had antibody titers of 100 and above, $15.9 \%$ of them were between 10 and 100 , and $7.6 \%$ were between 0 and 10 (Table 6).

When the answers were compared according to gender, a statistically significant differences were found in some questions. In the first question of the second part (HBV can be transmitted through saliva), $79.6 \%$ of male participants marked yes, while $88.3 \%$ of female participants marked yes, and this was a statistically significant difference $(\mathrm{P}=0.038)$. The questions with a statistically significant difference when compared according to gender, were shown in Table 7.

Table 3: Students' knowledge of HBV infection-related topics, by year and total

| Question (Q) | Answers | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 1th Year } \\ & \mathrm{N} \% \end{aligned}$ | 2nd Year N\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3th Year } \\ & \mathbf{N} \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4th Year } \\ & \mathbf{N} \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5th Year } \\ & \text { N\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Total } \\ & \mathbf{N} \% \end{aligned}$ | PValue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q1-HBV can be | Yes | 56 (86.2\%) | 45 (76.3\%) | 66 (88\%) | 53 (85.5\%) | 51 (89.5\%) | 271 | . 281 |
| transmitted through | No | 9 (13.8\%) | 14 (23.7\%) | 9 (12\%) | 9 (14.5\%) | 6 (10.5\%) | (85.2\%) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ (14.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Q2-HBV can be | Yes | 59 (90.8\%) | 55 (93.2\%) | 71 (94.7\%) | 59 (95.2\%) | 57 (100\%) | 301 | . 248 |
| transmitted from | No | 6 (9.2\%) | 4 (6.8\%) | 4 (5.3\%) | 3 (4.8\%) | 0 | (94.7\%) |  |
| dentist to patient |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 (5.3\%) |  |
| Q3-HBV can be | Yes | 64 (98.5\%) | 57 (96.6\%) | 74 (98.7\%) | 61 (98.4\%) | 57 (100\%) | 313 | . 701 |
| transmitted from | No | 1 (1.5\%) | 2 (3.4\%) | 1 (1.3\%) | 1 (1.6\%) | 0 | (98.4\%) |  |
| patient to patient |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 (1.6\%) |  |
| Q4-HBV can be | Yes | 61 (93.8\%) | 58 (98.3\%) | 74 (98.7\%) | 61 (98.4\%) | 57 (100\%) | 311 | . 170 |
| transmitted from | No | 4 (6.2\%) | 1 (1.7\%) | 1 (1.3\%) | 1 (1.6\%) | 0 | (97.8\%) |  |
| patient to dentist |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 (2.2\%) |  |
| Q5-There is a | Yes | 62 (95.4\%) | 57 (96.6\%) | 74 (98.7\%) | 61 (98.4\%) | 57 (100\%) | 311 | . 437 |
| confirmed risk of | No | 3 (4.6\%) | 2 (3.4\%) | 1 (1.3\%) | 1 (1.6\%) | 0 | (97.8\%) |  |
| HBV transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 (2.2\%) |  |
| through dental treatments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q6-Dentists are at | Yes | 53 (81.5\%) | 53 (89.8\%) | 70 (93.3\%) | 59 (95.2\%) | 55 (96.5\%) | 290 | .024* |
| higher risk of HBV | No | 12 (18.5\%) | 6 (10.2\%) | 5 (6.7\%) | 3 (4.8\%) | 2 (3.5\%) | (91.2\%) |  |
| infection than the general population |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 (8.8\%) |  |
| Q7-A considerable | Yes | 47 (72.3\%) | 50 (84.7\%) | 68 (90.7\%) | 56 (90.3\%) | 55 (96.5\%) | 276 | .001* |
| proportion of dentists | No | 18 (27.7\%) | 9 (15.3\%) | 7 (9.3\%) | 6 (9.7\%) | 2 (3.5\%) | (86.8\%) |  |
| experience |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42 |  |
| needlestick injuries |  |  |  |  |  |  | (13.2\%) |  |
| frequently |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q8-There is a higher | Yes | 44 (67.6\%) | 47 (79.6\%) | 64 (85.3\%) | 55 (88.7\%) | 50 (87.7\%) | 260 | .012* |
| risk of HBV than | No | 21 (32.3\%) | 12 (20.3\%) | 11 (14.6\%) | 7 (11.2\%) | 7 (12.2\%) | (81.8\%) |  |
| HIV transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58 |  |
| through needlestick |  |  |  |  |  |  | (18.2\%) |  |
| injury |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q9-There is a higher | Yes | 45 (69.2\%) | 45 (76.2\%) | 63 (84\%) | 50 (80.6\%) | 42 (73.6\%) | 245 | . 275 |
| risk of HBV than | No | 20 (30.7) | 14 (23.7) | 12 (16\%) | 12 (19.3\%) | 15 (26.3\%) | (77\%) |  |
| HCV transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  | 73 |  |
| through needlestick |  |  |  |  |  |  | (24.2\%) |  |
| injury |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q10-HBV can persist | Yes | 55 (84.6\%) | 50 (84.7\%) | 62 (82.6\%) | 46 (74.1\%) | 32 (56.1\%) | 245 | .001* |
| in plastery casts for | No | 10 (15.3\%) | 9 (15.2\%) | 13 (17.3) | 16 (25.8\%) | 25 (43.8\%) | (77\%) |  |
| up to 7 days |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 73 \\ (24.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Q11-HBV | Yes | 58 (89.2\%) | 46 (79.3\%) | 63 (84\%) | 51 (82.2\%) | 50 (87.7\%) | 269 | . 557 |
| transmission from | No | 7 (10.7\%) | 12 (20.6\%) | 12 (16\%) | 11 (17.7\%) | 7 (12.2\%) | (84.5\%) |  |
| dentist to patient can |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49 |  |
| be prevented with the |  |  |  |  |  |  | (15.4\%) |  |
| use of gloves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q12-HBV | Yes | 57 (87.6\%) | 49 (83\%) | 65 (86.6\%) | 53 (85.4\%) | 53 (92.9\%) | 277 | . 594 |
| transmission from | No | 8 (12.3\%) | 10 (16.9\%) | 10 (13.3\%) | 9 (14.5\%) | 4 (7\%) | (87.1\%) |  |
| patient to dentist can |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41 |  |
| be prevented with the |  |  |  |  |  |  | (12.8\%) |  |
| use of gloves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Don't know | 30 (46.1\%) | 21(35.5\%) | 16 (21.3\%) | 11 (17.7\%) | 11 (19.2\%) | 89 |  |
| Q13-Level of | Have heard | 32 (49.2\%) | 37 (62.7\%) | 40 (53.3\%) | 16 (25.8\%) | 8 (14\%) | (27.9\%) | .000* |
| knowledge about | something | 3 (4.6\%) | 1 (1.6\%) | 19 (25.3\%) | 29 (46.7\%) | 31 (54.3\%) | 133 |  |
| standard universal | Being educated |  |  |  |  |  | (41.8\%) |  |
| precautions | Following an | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 (9.6\%) | 7 (12.2\%) | 83 |  |
|  | educatable protocol |  |  |  |  |  | (26.1\%) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 (4\%) |  |
| Q14-What is the risk | 0.1 | 6 (9.2\%) | 18 (30.5\%) | 6 (8\%) | 9 (14.5\%) | 16 (28\%) | 55 |  |
| of HBV transmission | 3 | 22 (33.8\%) | 17 (28.8\%) | 36 (48\%) | 27 (43.5\%) | 29 (50.8\%) | (17.2\%) | .000* |
| to a healthy person | 30 | 37 (56.9\%) | 24 (40.6\%) | 33 (44\%) | 26 (41.9\%) | 12 (21\%) | 131 |  |
| when a HBV infected |  |  |  |  |  |  | (41.1\%) |  |
| needle is sank? (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 132 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (41.5\%) |  |
| Q15-Hepatitis B | Yes | 56 (86.1\%) | 55 (93.2\%) | 72 (96\%) | 62 (100\%) | 56 (98.2\%) | 301 |  |
| vaccination program | No | 9 (13.8\%) | 4 (6.7\%) | 3 (4\%) | 0 | 1 (1.7\%) | (94.6\%) | .005* |
| consists of 3 doses |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 (5.3\%) |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Year | Always | Mostly | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | P -value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 35(53.8\%) | 9(13.8\%) | 9(13.8\%) | 11(16.9\%) | 1(1.5\%) | .000* |
|  | 2 | 47(79.6\%) | 11(18.6\%) | 1(1.6\%) | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | 3 | 65(86.6\%) | 10(13.3\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | 4 | 61(98.3\%) | 1(1.6\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | 5 | 56(98.2\%) | 1(1.7\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Total | 264 (83\%) | 32(10.1\%) | 10(3.1\%) | 11(3.5\%) | 1(0.3\%) |  |
|  | Year | Always | Mostly | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | P-value |
|  | 1 | 29(44.6\%) | 15(23\%) | 11(16.9\%) | 9(13.8\%) | 1(1.5\%) |  |
|  | 2 | 41(69.4\%) | 14(23.7\%) | 1(1.6\%) | 3(5\%) | 0 |  |
|  | 3 | 61(81.3\%) | 12(16\%) | 2(2.6\%) | 0 | 0 | .000* |
|  | 4 | 58(93.5\%) | 2(3.2\%) | 0 | 1(1.6\%) | 1(1.6\%) |  |
|  | 5 | 53(92.9\%) | 4(7\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Total | 242(76.1\%) | 47(14.7\%) | 14(4.4\%) | 13(4\%) | 2(0.6\%) |  |
|  | Year | Always | Mostly | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | P -value |
|  | 1st | 21(32.3\%) | 13(20\%) | 10(15.3\%) | 15(23\%) | 6(9.2\%) |  |
|  | 2nd | 23(38.9\%) | 13(22\%) | 15(25.4\%) | 5(8.4\%) | 3(5\%) |  |
|  | 3th | 27(36\%) | 13(17.3\%) | 27(36\%) | 5(6.6\%) | 3(4\%) | .004* |
|  | 4th | 21(33.8\%) | 31(50\%) | 8(12.9\%) | 2(3.2\%) | 0 |  |
|  | 5th | 17(29.8\%) | 27(47.3\%) | 13(22.8\%) | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Total | 109(34.2\%) | 97(30.5\%) | 73(22.9\%) | 27(8.4\%) | 12(3.7\%) |  |
|  | Year | Always | Mostly | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | P-value |
|  | 1st | 18(27.6\%) | 10(15.3\%) | 16(24.6\%) | 16(24.6\%) | 5(7.6\%) | .041* |
|  | 2nd | 32(54.2\%) | 16(27.1\%) | 8(13.5\%) | 3(5\%) | 0 |  |
|  | 3th | 27(36\%) | 12(16\%) | 23(30.6\%) | 11(14.6\%) | 2(2.6\%) |  |
|  | 4th | 15(24.1\%) | 20(32.2\%) | 16(25.8\%) | 8(12.9\%) | 3(4.8\%) |  |
|  | 5th | 10(17.5\%) | 21(36.8\%) | 18(31.5\%) | 7(12.2\%) | 1(1.7\%) |  |
|  | Total | 102(32\%) | 79(24.8\%) | 81(25.4\%) | 45(14.1\%) | 11(3.4\%) |  |

Table 5: Students' practice of recapping needles, by year

| Year | Rarely | Mostly | Always |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $11(16.9 \%)$ | $20(30.7 \%)$ | $34(52.3 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $9(15.2 \%)$ | $20(33.8 \%)$ | $30(50.8 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $5(6.6 \%)$ | $20(26.6 \%)$ | $50(66.6 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $1(1.6 \%)$ | $9(14.5 \%)$ | $52(83.8 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $1(1.7 \%)$ | $8(14 \%)$ | $48(84.2 \%)$ |
| Total | $27(8.4 \%)$ | $77(24.2 \%)$ | $214(67.2 \%)$ |

The answers of the 4th and 5th years were significantly different from the 1st and 2nd years separately ( $\mathrm{P}=0.001$ )

## Discussion

HBV is one of the leading infectious diseases. Although has a long history and has been effectively tackled by both vaccines and preventive measures, HBV is still an important issue for dentistry (9). As mentioned in previous studies, percutaneous injuries are more common in dental students than in other healthcare fields. In addition, dental students are among the riskiest occupational group in terms of transmission risk of HBV infections $(5,10)$. When we looked at the literature, we saw that this issue was not studied much, especially for dental students in Turkey. Therefore, in this study, we aimed to measure the knowledge of our school's dental students about HBV and preventive measures.

Considering the findings of our study, we can say that students of Ordu University Faculty of Dentistry have satisfactory knowledge about HBV and preventive measures. It was observed that most of the questions in the second part of the questionnaire were given correct answers to a large extent. However, our students, who gave highly correct answers to most questions, gave contradictory answers to some questions.

As it is known, saliva, which is one of the transmission routes of HBV , has a moderate level of infectiousness (7). In our questionnaire, $85.2 \%$ of the students stated that HBV could be transmitted by saliva. In a similar study conducted with Iranian students, the same rate was found to be $81.7 \%$ (8). Our students gave a high rate of the correct answer
than half of our students do not know the HBV transmission rates through needlestick injuries.

On the other hand, $67.3 \%$ of our students answered the question 'Would you recap the needle tips again after use?' as 'always'. In a study conducted with Egyptian health care workers, it is stated that $40 \%$ of the reported needlestick injury cases were related with behaviour of manipulation of the needle after injection15. It is clear that our students should refresh their knowledge on this subject. The risk of Hepatitis C Virus (HCV) and Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) contamination after percutaneous contact is $1.8 \%$ and $0.3 \%$, respectively $(15,16)$. In related questions, we can see that $77 \%$ of our students knew that HBV can be transmitted at a higher rate than HCV , and $81.8 \%$ of the students knew that HBV can be transmitted at a higher rate than HIV. The correct answer rates of Iranian students to the same questions were $95.8 \%$ and $72.5 \%$, respectively (8). Therefore, we can say that the rates are satisfactorily correct in these questions.

Vaccination is the most effective and easiest method of protection against HBV. The vaccine is usually given as 3 or 4 injections in 6 months. With vaccination, protection is provided against HBV as well as from diseases such as liver cancer and cirrhosis caused by HBV (6). Our students knew that HBV vaccine consisted of 3 doses (\%94.7). In the study conducted with Brazilian students, $87.9 \%$ of the students chose the 3 dose option, and our results were almost similar to this study (17). In addition, 61,3\% of our students had completed 3 doses of vaccine, and these results were similar to the study conducted with Brazilian students (62.2\%) (17). In a study conducted with Turkish dentists, $87.9 \%$ of the participating clinicians stated that they were completely vaccinated according to the schedule (18). If an anti-HBs antibody level of $10 \mathrm{mIU} / \mathrm{ml}$ is achieved after three doses of vaccine, there is no need for booster doses or monitoring of antibody titers (19). Antibody titers of $92.3 \%$ of the students participating in our survey who completed 3 doses of vaccines were found to be 10 $\mathrm{mIU} / \mathrm{ml}$ or more.

In the first question about the use of protective equipment, $83 \%$ of our students stated that they always wore gloves as a protective measure. It is thought provoking that the options such as 'never', 'rarely', 'sometimes' were marked, even if there were a small number of participants. Rates of the glove use was $89.4 \%$ in Iranian students, $90.9 \%$ in Canadian students, and $95 \%$ in Turkish dentists $(8,18,20)$. In the question of face mask use, $76.1 \%$ of our students selected the 'always' option and it was observed that
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