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BACKGROUND: VBD, such as Chagas disease, dengue, or malaria, are transmitted from humans to insects or other organisms and can be difficult to control. VBD transmission involves a combination of factors including many factors. Objectives: The objective of this work was to describe infectious disease transmission processes are amenable to a situation when infection and interaction of ≥1 species, as is the case of VBD. The purpose of transmission is to describe the contact between humans and mosquito populations. The model consists of a mosquito population and mosquito-human contact. The human population include susceptible, exposed but not infected, and infected individuals. The study sample was semi-critical endoscopes flexible (digestive, respiratory and cystoscopy), the few studies on the theme indicate the reactions by OP in cystoscopy. There is lack of published data on damage caused to endoscopes by alternative disinfectants to GLU available in the Brazilian market. The study sample was semi-critical endoscopes flexible (digestive, respiratory and cystoscopy), the few studies on the theme indicate the reactions by OP in cystoscopy. There is lack of published data on damage caused to endoscopes by alternative disinfectants to GLU available in the Brazilian market.
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The publications show superiority of the PA and OP for efficacy in HLD. Only the OP clearly had adverse event related to their use. There is insufficient evidence in literature to assert the inferiority of some disinfectants for damage to equipment.
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