

## Title

Soap versus sanitiser for preventing the transmission of acute respiratory infections: a systematic review with meta-analysis and dose-response analysis

## Authors

Tammy Hoffmann<sup>1</sup> PhD, Mina Bakhit <sup>1</sup> PhD, Natalia Krzyzaniak <sup>1</sup> PhD, Chris Del Mar<sup>1</sup> MD, Anna Scott<sup>1</sup> PhD, Paul Glasziou<sup>1</sup> PhD

<sup>1</sup> Institute for Evidence-based Healthcare, Bond University, Queensland, Australia

Corresponding author:

[thoffmann@bond.edu.au](mailto:thoffmann@bond.edu.au)

Institute for Evidence-based Healthcare, University Drive, Bond University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia, 4226.

Tel: +61 7 5595 5522

## Abstract

**Objective:** To compare the effectiveness of hand hygiene using alcohol-based hand sanitiser to soap and water for preventing the transmission of acute respiratory infections (ARIs), and assess the relationship between the dose of hand hygiene and the number of ARI, influenza-like illness (ILI), or influenza events.

**Methods:** Systematic review of randomised trials that compared a community-based hand hygiene intervention (soap and water, or sanitiser) with a control, or trials that compared sanitiser with soap and water, and measured outcomes of ARI, ILI, or laboratory-confirmed influenza or related consequences. Searches were conducted in CENTRAL, PubMed, Embase, CINAHL and trial registries (April 2020) and data extraction completed by independent pairs of reviewers.

**Results:** Eighteen trials were included. When meta-analysed, three trials of soap and water versus control found a non-significant increase in ARI events (Risk Ratio (RR) 1.23, 95%CI 0.78-1.93); six trials of sanitiser versus control found a significant reduction in ARI events (RR 0.80, 95%CI 0.71-0.89). When hand hygiene dose was plotted against ARI relative risk, no clear dose-response relationship was observable. Four trials were head-to-head

comparisons of sanitiser and soap and water but too heterogeneous to pool. Two found a

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

significantly greater reduction in the sanitiser group compared to the soap group; two found no significant difference between the intervention arms.

**Conclusion:** Adequately performed hand hygiene, with either soap or sanitiser, reduces the risk of ARI virus transmission, however direct and indirect evidence suggest sanitiser might be more effective in practice.

**Key words:** Acute respiratory infections, Hand hygiene, Systematic review, dose-response analysis, Virus transmission.

## 1. Introduction

Acute respiratory infections (ARI) cause a substantial annual health burden, and much more so in the current COVID-19 pandemic. Hand hygiene is one effective and low-cost intervention which reduces the transmission of ARIs [1] and is applicable in all countries and all settings. However, important questions for policy and practice are the “dose-response” of hand hygiene, and relative effectiveness of different materials (alcohol-based hand sanitiser; soap and water). This systematic review aimed to address these questions.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Inclusion criteria and study source

Our recent systematic review and meta-analysis of physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses [2] (an update of the 2011 review [3]) aimed to synthesise all randomised controlled trials of several physical interventions (including hand hygiene) which measured outcomes of ARI, influenza-like illness (ILI), or laboratory-confirmed influenza (influenza) or related consequences (e.g. absenteeism). For the current systematic review, trials were eligible if they compared a hand hygiene intervention with a control, or compared hand sanitiser with soap and water. Trials in healthcare settings were excluded. We also screened a new Cochrane review of rinse-free handwashing in school and pre-school children for possible eligible studies [4].

### 2.2. Data extraction


Data were extracted by two authors (MB, NK) independently on: volume or weight of material (e.g. sanitiser or soap) used per person per day, and number of handwashes per person per day. When not reported directly, we estimated usage where possible (see Table 1). For estimation purposes, we used data on the average amount of material used per person per handwash as reported; if data were not reported, we assumed 0.035 grams of soap or 1.5ml of liquid used per handwash [5]. The following data were extracted from the parent systematic review [2]: 1) study characteristics; 2) risk of bias assessments; 3) type of handwashing intervention(s) (e.g. soap, sanitiser, gel); and 4) risk ratios (RR), log RR, and standard error values for ARI or ILI or influenza (including the outcome with most events from each study).

### 2.3. Data analysis

To assess the relationship between handwashes per person per day and the number of ARI or ILI or influenza events, we conducted the following analyses: 1) only studies whose number of handwashes could be estimated (regardless of the type of handwash material), subgrouped by the type of handwash material (soap vs sanitiser vs combination of sanitiser and soap) and 2) all studies (whether or not the number of handwashes could be estimated), subgrouped by the type of handwash material (soap vs sanitiser vs combination of sanitiser and soap). We used a  $\chi^2$  test to test for subgroup interactions. Meta-analyses were conducted using *Review Manager 5*.

## 3. Results

The PRISMA flowchart (Fig 1) shows the number of trials identified from the updated 2020 systematic review [2], the original 2011 review [3], and additional sources. Eighteen trials were assessed as eligible; four were head-to-head comparisons of hand sanitiser and soap and water [6-9] and 16 compared hand hygiene with a control [6, 8, 10-23]. Table 1 presents study characteristics.



\* Articles identified by screening the references of a newly published systematic review (Munn et al. 2020).

\*\* One of the identified additional studies (Lennell et al. 2008) was initially excluded, because no respiratory illness data could be extracted. However, it was included in this review as it reported head to head comparison between hand washing and hand sanitiser.

\*\*\* Two studies did not have sufficient data for meta-analysis, but were included in the head to head comparison between hand washing and hand sanitiser (Lennell et al. 2008 & Savolainen-Kopra et al. 2012)

\*\*\*\* Two studies (Azor-Martinez et al. 2018 & Pickering et al. 2013) had 2 intervention groups. 1 group used soap and water, and another used hand sanitiser. Therefore, the number of studies, split by type of hand hygiene intervention, adds up to 18 and not 16 studies.

**Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Chart**

[Coloured figure in print]

1 <sup>st</sup> author (country, year)	Study design	Setting	Study period in months	Population (Age range)	Number of participants	Type of Hand Hygiene intervention*				Duration of intervention	Number of handwashes / day	Calculations used for the number of handwashes / day (if applicable)	Amount of soap or alcohol used (ml or g) / person / day	Calculations used for the amount of alcohol or soap in ml or g / person / day (if applicable)
						Staff training / education	Classroom activities	Sanitiser	Soap					
Azor-Martinez (Spain, 2018)	C-RCT	CCCs	7	Ch (0 to 3 y)	911 Ch; 24 CCC	✓	✓	✓	✓	8 mo	7 (sanitiser)	Each child used sanitiser between 6-8 times /day	10.5 ml	assume mean 7 uses per day, 1.5 ml mean per use
Biswas (Bangladesh, 2019)	C-RCT	Sch	4	Ch (5 to 10 y)	10,855 Ch	✓	✓	✓		10 w	2.87	We calculated the percentage of handwashing practices by dividing the number of handwashing instances by the total number of handwashing opportunities. There were 921 handwashing opportunities in intervention group (page 5). 604 (66%) school children in the intervention group washed their hands [at end line] & 5077 students in the intervention group. 4.3mls / person / day & assumed 1.5ml of sanitiser use per wash gives 2.87 washes / day	4.3 ml	N/A
Correa (Colombia, 2012)	C-RCT	CCC	8	Ch (0 to 5 y)	42 CCC	✓		✓		8 mo	5.261	We assumed that 1 alcohol-based hand-sanitiser push = 1 instance of handwash, and took into account the proportion of community and preschools, as in the calc for ml / person / day, gives 5.261 pushes (or handwashes) per day	3.16 ml	32 community centres and 10 preschools included the trial, distributed among the intervention & control arms; assumed the 32 vs 10 ratio to estimate the increase in the number of pushes: 10/42 * 4.5 for preschools + 32/42*5.5 for community centres = 5.261 average number of pushes overall. 5.261 pushes at 1000 ml / 1666 pushes = 3.16 ml
Cowling (Hong Kong, 2008)	C-RCT	HH	7	A and Ch (NR)	198 HH	✓			✓	9 d	NR		NR	
Cowling (Hong Kong, 2009)	C-RCT	HH	8	A and Ch (NR)	407 HH	✓			✓	1 w	NR		NR	
Hubner (Germany, 2010)	RCT	O	12	A (NR)	1230 A	✓		✓		1y	3.84	0.19 * 6 (assumed > 5 handwashes means 6); 0.598 * 4 (average of 3 to 5); 0.205 * 1.5 (average of 1 to 2) + 0.007 * 0 to get the mean number of handwashes per day across the whole group = 3.84	11.52 ml	0.19 * 6 (assume > 5 handwashes means 6); 0.598 * 4 (average of 3 to 5); 0.205 * 1.5 (average of 1 to 2) + 0.007 * 0 to get the mean number of handwashes per day across the whole group = 3.84 mean handwashes / person * 3 ml per handwash = 11.52
Larson (USA, 2010)	C-RCT	HH	20	A and Ch (NR)	509 HH	✓		✓		19 mo	1.77	44.2% in the Education group (not handwash group) reported using hand sanitiser "occasionally at some point during the study" and 56.9% of these reported using hand sanitiser 1-2x in previous 24 hours". 2.65ml / person / day at 1.5ml sanitiser per handwash = 1.77 handwashes / day	2.65 ml	4.5 people / household; 30 days / month; 358 mls handwash per month gives: 2.65 ml/person/day
Lennell (Sweden, 2008) <sup>1, **</sup>	C-RCT	CCC	7	Ch (mean age 3 y)	1517 Ch; 29 CCC	✓		✓	✓	30 w	4 (sanitiser)	N/A	6 ml	N/A
Little (England, 2015)	RCT	Onl	26	A (≥18)	20,066 A	✓			✓	4 mo	7.48	0.04 * 1 avg + 0.10 * 3.5 avg + 0.22 * 5.5 avg + 0.26 * 8 avg + 0.38 * 10 (assuming >=10 at 10) = 7.48 avg	NR	
Nicholson (India, 2014)	C-RCT	HH	10	Ch (5 to 18 y)	NR	✓	✓		✓	41 w	16	The median soap consumption was found to be 45 g per household per week in control households compared with 235g in intervention households. 5.6 g / person / day at 0.35 g of soap per wash = 16 handwashes a day	5.60 g	235g/week; 6 people/household; gives: 5.595 / person / day
Pickering (Kenya, 2013)	C-RCT	Sch	2	Ch (2 to 13 y)	6 Sch	✓	✓	✓	✓	8 w	NR		NR	
Ram (Bangladesh, 2015)	RCT	HH	18	A (NR)	NR	✓			✓	10 d	5.89	2.06g soap / person / day at 0.35g of soap per wash = 5.89 washes / day	2.06 g	Fig 3 reports median / capita soap use in grams by day of enrollment, days 2 to 12. Median / capita soap use in grams on last day (day 12) was 2.06g
Roberts (Australia, 2000)	C-RCT	CCC	8	Ch (0 to 3 y)	23 CCC	✓	✓	✓		8 mo	NR		NR	
Sandora (USA, 2005)	C-RCT	HH	5	A (NR) and Ch (6 mo to 5 y)	292 families			✓		5 mo	5.2	N/A	5.2 ml	Assumed 1 ml/hand sanitiser use (may not be correct as it is one pump - but could have done >1pump of sanitiser each handwash), 5.2 uses/day/person

Savolainen-Kopra (Finland, 2012) <sup>2,**</sup>	C-RCT	O	18	A	683 A; 21 office work units; 6 corporations	✓	✓	✓	15-16 mo	6.1 (soap) & 6.9 (sanitiser)	N/A	NR	
Simmerman (Thailand, 2011)	C-RCT	HH	16	A and Ch (NR)	442 Ch; 1147 household members	✓		✓	3 w	4.7	N/A	7.71 ml	54 ml / person / week = 7.714 ml / person / day
Stebbins (USA, 2011)	C-RCT	Sch	14	Ch (NR)	3360 Ch; 10 Sch	✓		✓	1 flu season	2.4	N/A	1.44 ml	0.6 ml per use*2.4 times per day=1.44
Zomer (Netherlands, 2015)	C-RCT	CCC	7	Ch (6 m to 3.5 y)	545 Ch; 71 CCC	✓		✓	6 mo	NR		NR	

**C-RCT:** cluster randomized controlled trial, **RCT:** randomized controlled trial, **A:** Adults, **Ch:** Children, **CCC:** Childcare centres, **Sch:** Schools, **HH:** Households, **Onl:** Online, **O:** Offices, **N/A:** Not applicable, **NR:** Not reported


<sup>1</sup>This study was not included in the dose-response analysis as the infection was reported for any infection (not specific to respiratory infections) <sup>2</sup> Bathrooms at the workplaces were equipped with liquid hand soap (all arms)

\*Only Hand Hygiene arms of the included studies, \*\*Studies not included in the meta-analysis.

Table 1. Characteristics of included studies

### 3.1. Trials of hand sanitiser or soap and water versus control

Combining the three trials of soap and water hand hygiene versus control found a non-significant increase in ARI events: risk ratio 1.23 (95% CI 0.78 to 1.93) but with high heterogeneity (Figure 2; Appendix A.1 shows forest plot for all trials, regardless of whether number of handwashes could be estimated). Combining the six trials of hand sanitiser versus control found a significant reduction in ARI events: risk ratio 0.80 (95% CI 0.71 to 0.89), providing some indirect evidence in favour of hand sanitiser.




Number of handwashes (hws) indicated in brackets after study reference where estimable.

**Figure 2 Forest plot of meta-analysis of studies whose number of handwashes could be estimated, subgrouped by the type of handwash material (soap vs sanitiser vs combination of sanitiser and soap)**

[Coloured figure in print]

### 3.2. Dose-response relationship: hand hygiene frequency versus risk of respiratory infection (ARI, ILI or influenza)

Eleven of the trials provided sufficient information to estimate the dose of hand hygiene, which we converted to number of hand hygiene events per day. Plotted against the relative risk of ARIs, there is little dose response relationship evident for hand sanitiser (Figure 3). There are only three studies solely of soap and water hand hygiene, making a dose-response analysis impossible. The difference in effectiveness between hand sanitiser and soap and water does not appear to be explained by a difference in frequency. The cluster randomised trial by Little and colleagues [16] primarily used soap and water but also offered participants free hand sanitiser; only 18% report collecting the sanitiser.



Clear circles= studies using soap

Colored-in circles= studies using hand sanitiser

**Figure 3 Hand hygiene frequency ('dose') versus risk of respiratory infection (ARI, ILI or influenza)**

[Coloured figure in print]

### 3.3. Head-to-head trials of hand hygiene with hand sanitiser vs with soap and water

Four trials directly compared hand sanitiser with soap and water: two in childcare centres, one at a primary school, and one in workplaces. In a cluster randomised trial of children and staff in Swedish childcare centres, those at centres who were randomised to use an alcohol-based oily disinfectant gel (70% ethanol) after regular hand washing had a reduction in absenteeism rate of 12% (95% CI 4% to 20%) compared to control centres which used only soap and water [7]. The 3-arm cluster randomised trial of 24 childcare centres in Spain - educational and hand hygiene measures (one with soap and water; another with hand sanitiser) and a control group found children in the sanitiser group had a 13% lower (95% CI 6% to 28%) risk of respiratory infection than children in the soap and water group [6].

In Kenya, a cluster randomised trial assigned two primary schools to receive a handwashing with soap and water intervention, two to receive a sanitiser intervention, and two were a control [8]. Compared to control group students, both intervention groups had a reduction in observed rhinorrhea (RR 0.77, 95% CI 0.62-0.95 for both sanitiser vs control and soap vs control). No significant differences between the sanitiser and soap groups were observed for respiratory outcomes. The 3-arm trial in six companies in Finland randomised workplaces to equip workplace bathrooms with liquid hand soap (soap and control arms) or alcohol-based hand rub [9]. Participants in the intervention arms also received guidance on additional strategies for limiting infection transmission. Before the onset of the 2009 influenza pandemic (and the subsequent national hand hygiene campaign), a statistically significant ( $p = 0.002$ ) difference in the infection episodes was observed between the control (6.0 per year) and the soap-and-water arm (5.0 per year), but not between the control and the alcohol-rub arm (5.6 per year). Neither intervention had an effect on work absenteeism.

## 4. Discussion

Based on both indirect and direct (head-to-head) trials, hand hygiene using alcohol-based hand sanitiser appears more effective at reducing ARI transmission than hand hygiene using with soap and water, with the difference in effect not explained by the difference in

frequency of hand hygiene. The apparent greater effectiveness of hand sanitiser may be explained by its greater convenience, less time required to perform hand hygiene, more sustained compliance with hand hygiene, and less irritation to the skin [24].

Limitations of this review are that conclusions are mostly from indirectness evidence, with direct evidence available from only four head-to-head trials, and that it was not possible to estimate the dose of hand hygiene for some trials.

A recent Cochrane review of the effect of rinse-free handwashing, compared to traditional hand hygiene, on absenteeism for ARI in preschool and school children reported a significant reduction in absenteeism of 9 days per 1000 available days for children in the rinse-free group, with the results coming from six randomised trials [4]. The effectiveness of handwashing with materials other than sanitiser or soap and water, such as ash, which may be used in low-income countries has mostly been examined in observational studies with uncertain effects [25].

## 5. Conclusions

Hand hygiene has a modest but important role in reducing the transmission of viral respiratory infections. Adequately performed hand hygiene, with either soap or sanitiser, reduces the risk of acute respiratory virus transmission. However, from both the direct and indirect comparisons in this review, sanitiser appears more effective in practice. While further head-to-head randomised trials are warranted, the current evidence appears sufficient to promote the use of hand sanitiser as the primary means for many everyday situations.

**Abbreviations:** Acute respiratory infections (ARI), Influenza-like illness (ILI), Risk Ratio (RR), Confidence interval (CI)

**Contributors:** TH, PG, and CDM conceived the study. MB and NK screened studies for inclusion in this review and extracted the data. TH, AMS, PG and CDM analysed the data. TH wrote the first draft. All authors approved and revised the final manuscript.

**Competing interests:** None declared.

**Funding:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Ethical approval:** Ethical approval was not required.

**Acknowledgements:** We would like to acknowledge the authors of the 2020 Cochrane review update (L Al-Ansary, G Bawazeer, E Beller, J Clark, J Conly, E Dooley, E Ferroni, T Jefferson, S Thorning, M van Driel, M Jones).

## References

- [1] L. A. Al-Ansary *et al.*, "Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Part 2 - Hand hygiene and other hygiene measures: systematic review and meta-analysis," *medRxiv*, p. 2020.04.14.20065250, 2020, doi: 10.1101/2020.04.14.20065250.
- [2] T. Jefferson *et al.*, "Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2020.
- [3] T. Jefferson *et al.*, "Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 7, 2011, doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006207.pub4.
- [4] Z. Munn, C. Tufanaru, C. Lockwood, C. Stern, H. McAneney, and T. H. Barker, "Rinse-free hand wash for reducing absenteeism among preschool and school children," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 4, 2020, doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012566.pub2.
- [5] A. Koehler and C. Wildbolz, "Comparing the environmental footprints of home-care and personal-hygiene products: the relevance of different life-cycle phases," (in eng), *Environ Sci Technol*, vol. 43, no. 22, pp. 8643-51, Nov 15 2009, doi: 10.1021/es901236f.
- [6] E. Azor-Martinez *et al.*, "Effectiveness of a Hand Hygiene Program at Child Care Centers: A Cluster Randomized Trial," (in eng), *Pediatrics*, vol. 142, no. 5, Nov 2018, doi: 10.1542/peds.2018-1245. Epub 2018 Oct 8.
- [7] A. Lennell *et al.*, "Alcohol-based hand-disinfection reduced children's absence from Swedish day care centers," (in eng), *Acta Paediatr*, vol. 97, no. 12, pp. 1672-80, Dec 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.2008.01057.x.
- [8] A. J. Pickering *et al.*, "Access to waterless hand sanitizer improves student hand hygiene behavior in primary schools in Nairobi, Kenya," (in eng), *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 411-418, 2013, doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.13-0008.
- [9] C. Savolainen-Kopra *et al.*, "Hand washing with soap and water together with behavioural recommendations prevents infections in common work environment: an open cluster-randomized trial," (in eng), *Trials*, vol. 13, p. 10, Jan 16 2012, doi: 10.1186/1745-6215-13-10
- [10] D. Biswas *et al.*, "Effectiveness of a Behavior Change Intervention with Hand Sanitizer Use and Respiratory Hygiene in Reducing Laboratory-Confirmed Influenza among Schoolchildren in Bangladesh: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial," (in eng), *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, vol. 101, no. 6, pp. 1446-1455, Dec 2019, doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.19-0376
- [11] J. C. Correa, D. Pinto, L. A. Salas, J. C. Camacho, M. Rondón, and J. Quintero, "A cluster-randomized controlled trial of handrubs for prevention of infectious diseases among children in Colombia," (in English), *Revista Panamericana de Salud Publica/Pan American*

- Journal of Public Health*, Article vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 476-484, 2012, doi: 10.1590/S1020-49892012000600005.
- [12] B. J. Cowling *et al.*, "Facemasks and hand hygiene to prevent influenza transmission in households: a cluster randomized trial," (in eng), *Ann Intern Med*, vol. 151, no. 7, pp. 437-46, Oct 6 2009, doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-151-7-200910060-00142.
  - [13] B. J. Cowling *et al.*, "Preliminary findings of a randomized trial of non-pharmaceutical interventions to prevent influenza transmission in households," (in eng), *PLoS One*, vol. 3, no. 5, p. e2101, May-7 2008, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0002101.
  - [14] N. O. Hubner, C. Hubner, M. Wodny, G. Kampf, and A. Kramer, "Effectiveness of alcohol-based hand disinfectants in a public administration: impact on health and work performance related to acute respiratory symptoms and diarrhoea," (in eng), *BMC Infect Dis*, vol. 10, p. 250, Aug 24 2010, doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-10-250
  - [15] E. L. Larson, Y. H. Ferng, J. Wong-McLoughlin, S. Wang, M. Haber, and S. S. Morse, "Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on URIs and influenza in crowded, urban households," (in eng), *Public Health Rep*, vol. 125, no. 2, pp. 178-91, Mar-Apr 2010, doi: 10.1177/003335491012500206.
  - [16] P. Little *et al.*, "An internet-delivered handwashing intervention to modify influenza-like illness and respiratory infection transmission (PRIMIT): a primary care randomised trial," (in eng), *Lancet*, vol. 386, no. 10004, pp. 1631-9, Oct 24 2015, doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(15)60127-1. Epub 2015 Aug 6.
  - [17] J. A. Nicholson *et al.*, "An investigation of the effects of a hand washing intervention on health outcomes and school absence using a randomised trial in Indian urban communities," (in eng), *Trop Med Int Health*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 284-292, Mar 2014, doi: 10.1111/tmi.12254. Epub 2014 Jan 2.
  - [18] P. K. Ram *et al.*, "Impact of Intensive Handwashing Promotion on Secondary Household Influenza-Like Illness in Rural Bangladesh: Findings from a Randomized Controlled Trial," (in eng), *PLoS One*, vol. 10, no. 6, p. e0125200, 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0125200. eCollection 2015.
  - [19] L. Roberts, W. Smith, L. Jorm, M. Patel, R. M. Douglas, and C. McGilchrist, "Effect of infection control measures on the frequency of upper respiratory infection in child care: a randomized, controlled trial," (in eng), *Pediatrics*, vol. 105, no. 4 Pt 1, pp. 738-42, Apr 2000, doi: 10.1542/peds.105.4.738.
  - [20] T. J. Sandora *et al.*, "A randomized, controlled trial of a multifaceted intervention including alcohol-based hand sanitizer and hand-hygiene education to reduce illness transmission in the home," (in eng), *Pediatrics*, vol. 116, no. 3, pp. 587-94, Sep 2005, doi: 10.1542/peds.2005-0199.
  - [21] J. M. Simmerman *et al.*, "Findings from a household randomized controlled trial of hand washing and face masks to reduce influenza transmission in Bangkok, Thailand," (in eng), *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 256-67, Jul 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1750-2659.2011.00205.x. Epub 2011 Feb 17.
  - [22] S. Stebbins *et al.*, "Reduction in the incidence of influenza A but not influenza B associated with use of hand sanitizer and cough hygiene in schools: a randomized controlled trial," (in eng), *Pediatr Infect Dis J*, vol. 30, no. 11, pp. 921-6, Nov 2011, doi: 10.1097/INF.0b013e3182218656
  - [23] T. P. Zomer *et al.*, "A hand hygiene intervention to reduce infections in child daycare: a randomized controlled trial," (in eng), *Epidemiol Infect*, vol. 143, no. 12, pp. 2494-502, Sep 2015, doi: 10.1017/s095026881400329x. Epub 2015 Jan 8.

- [24] D. Pittet, "Improving adherence to hand hygiene practice: a multidisciplinary approach," (in eng), *Emerg Infect Dis*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 234-40, Mar-Apr 2001, doi: 10.3201/eid0702.010217.
- [25] A. S. Paludan-Müller, K. Boesen, I. Klerings, K. J. Jørgensen, and K. Munkholm, "Hand cleaning with ash for reducing the spread of viral and bacterial infections: a rapid review," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 4, 2020, doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD013597.

## **Appendix A. Supplementary data**

Appendix A.1 – Forest plot of meta-analysis of all studies (regardless of whether the number of handwashes could be estimated) regardless of the type of handwash material (soap vs sanitiser vs combination of sanitiser and soap)