

1 **Impact of a multimodal hand hygiene improvement intervention in a 1000-bed hospital**
2 **in Thailand: a stepped wedge cluster randomized controlled trial**

3

4 Short title: Hand hygiene compliance in a resource limited setting

5

6 Maliwan Hongsuwan¹, Pramot Srisamang², Somboon Nuntalohit³, Nantasit Luangasanatip¹,

7 Cherry Lim^{1,4}, Nicholas P. Day^{1,4}, Direk Limmathurotsakul^{1,5}, Ben S. Cooper^{1,4}

8

9 ¹ Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol

10 University, Bangkok, Thailand

11 ² Department of pediatrics, Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital, Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand

12 ³ Department of infection control, Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital, Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand

13 ⁴ Center for Tropical Medicine, Nuffield Department of Clinical Medicine, University of

14 Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

15 ⁵ Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University,

16 Bangkok, Thailand Bangkok, Thailand

17

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Good hand hygiene compliance amongst healthcare workers is critical for
3 patient safety and plays a central role in preventing healthcare-associated infections. The World
4 Health Organization (WHO) recommends a multimodal strategy to improve healthcare worker
5 hand hygiene. We aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of this strategy in a middle-income
6 country using a stepped-wedge cluster randomized trial.

7 **Methods:** The trial was conducted between 2013 and 2015 in 58 wards in a 1000-bed hospital
8 in Thailand. The intervention was adapted from the WHO's Hand Hygiene Improvement
9 Strategy and implemented by the hospital's infection control team. The primary outcome was
10 observed hand hygiene compliance among healthcare workers in the study wards. This study
11 was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01933087).

12 **Findings:** During 4,230 observation sessions, 54,073 hand hygiene opportunities were
13 identified. Hand hygiene compliance increased from 10.0% (2,660/26,482) to 11.0%
14 (3,048/27,591) after the intervention (odds ratio [OR] 1.12; 95% CI: 1.01-1.24). Among the
15 five moments for hand hygiene, the greatest improvement in compliance was observed in hand
16 hygiene before patient contact (OR 1.52; 95% CI: 1.21, 1.91).

17 **Interpretation:** While hand hygiene compliance improved slightly, the intervention failed to
18 achieve the substantial improvements that were needed. There is a need for new strategies to
19 ensure that all hospitals in low and middle-income countries can achieve and maintain
20 acceptable levels of hand hygiene.

21 **Funding:** Oak Foundation, MRC

22 **Keywords:** Hand hygiene compliance, hand hygiene intervention, behavioural change,
23 infection prevention and control, multimodal strategy

1 **Introduction**

2 Healthcare-associated infections (HCAIs) are a major source of preventable morbidity and
3 mortality worldwide, and particularly so in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).¹⁻³ In
4 2011 the World Health Organization (WHO) estimated that 7% of patients in developed and
5 10% of patients in developing countries acquired at least one HCAI during hospital
6 admission.^{2,4} Mortality due to such infections in developing countries exceeds that in developed
7 countries.⁵

8 Improving hand hygiene practice among healthcare workers (HCWs) can substantially
9 reduce the transmission of important healthcare-associated pathogens resulting in reduced
10 incidence of HCAI and is a key intervention for combating multidrug-resistant (MDR) bacterial
11 infections in hospitals.^{6,7} Successful hand hygiene campaigns are associated with reductions in
12 incidence rates of MDR bacterial infections at the hospital, regional and national levels.
13 Interventions to improve hand hygiene behavior are relatively inexpensive and expected to be
14 cost-effective (and potentially cost-saving) in most circumstances.

15 The WHO established evidence-based guidelines on hand hygiene in healthcare settings to
16 support efforts to improve hand hygiene compliance.⁸ These guidelines, which were designed
17 to be used in all healthcare facilities, irrespective of the level of resources or prior hand hygiene
18 initiatives, advocate a multimodal strategy consisting of five components: 1) system change,
19 2) training and education, 3) observation and feedback, 4) reminders in the work place , and 5)
20 a hospital safety climate.⁹ A recent systematic review concluded that the WHO multimodal
21 hand hygiene improvement strategy is effective at improving HCW hand hygiene
22 compliance.^{10,11} However, evaluations of the effectiveness of this strategy in LMICs using
23 methodologically robust study designs were found to be lacking.^{4,10,12} A more recent systematic
24 review of interventions to improve hand hygiene compliance in patient care concluded that
25 there is “an urgent need to undertake methodologically robust research to explore the

1 effectiveness of multimodal versus simpler interventions to increase hand hygiene compliance,
2 and to identify which components of multimodal interventions or combinations of strategies
3 are most effective in a particular context".¹³ Given that LMICs face the highest burden of
4 HCAs and also unique challenges related to delivery of effective infection control
5 interventions, we sought to address this research gap.

6 A stepped wedge design (where all clusters receive the intervention but at randomly
7 allocated times) is appropriate when there are prior reasons to believe the intervention will be
8 beneficial, as was the case here.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Although hand hygiene promotion is part of routine work
9 for infection control teams (ICTs) in most provincial hospitals in Thailand, hand hygiene levels
10 have been consistently reported to be below 45% in hospitals.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ The aim of this study was
11 to evaluate the impact of a multimodal intervention to improve hand hygiene compliance
12 amongst HCWs in a LMIC using a stepped wedge cluster-randomized trial.

13

14 **Methods**

15 **Study design, setting and Participants**

16 A stepped wedge cluster randomized controlled trial was performed in a resource-limited
17 tertiary hospital in northeast Thailand between 1st December 2013 and 2nd May 2015. Fifty-
18 eight wards, which included 20 intensive care units (ICUs) and 38 non-ICU wards were
19 included in this study. The trial included a 5-week baseline period (phase 1), a 64-week
20 intervention period (phase 2), and a 5-week follow-up period (phase 3) (Figure 1).

21 During the study period, the hospital had 1000-beds, and an ICT consisting of four infectious
22 disease physicians, four specialist infection control nurses, and one assistant. Hospital-
23 produced alcohol-based hand sanitizer was readily available in all wards throughout the study
24 period.

1 All hospital staff who had direct patient contact were eligible to be included in the study.
2 The participants included physicians, nurses, nursing aides and hospital support staff who
3 worked in the participant wards on a regular basis. Other hospital staff who were included in
4 the study and had direct contact with patients but did not work in the study wards on a regular
5 basis were medical students, nursing students, physical therapists, and radiologists. In 2014,
6 the four members of the ICT attended a training course on “Healthcare-associated Infection
7 Prevention and Management” held by ESCMID-SHEA Training Course in Hospital
8 Epidemiology. The ICT had performed infection control training for all HCWs annually, and
9 monitored hospital preventive measures during hospital accreditation events and when an
10 outbreak was detected.

11 This study was approved by the Ethical and Scientific Review Committees of Faculty of
12 Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Thailand (MUTM 2012-042-01), and
13 Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital (002/2556). This study was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov
14 (NCT01933087).

15

16 **Randomization and procedure**

17 After a 5-week baseline period, fifty-eight participating wards were randomized to one of
18 29 intervention dates which occurred at two-week intervals (Figure 2). Randomization was
19 performed by a statistician using a computer-generated sequence with two wards randomly
20 selected to receive the intervention on each of the intervention dates. Masking of study
21 participants and observers was not possible due to the nature of the interventions.

22

23 **Study intervention**

24 The study intervention was derived from the WHO Multimodal Hand Hygiene Improvement
25 Strategy.²⁰ In order to engage ward staff in the decision-making process, to increase their

1 ownership of the intervention, and to ensure the intervention was adapted to local conditions
2 in each ward, the implementation details of the intervention were chosen by ward staff in
3 consultation with the ICT. To do this a set of actions was presented to ward staff as a “five-
4 course menu” with each “course” representing one of the five elements of the WHO multimodal
5 strategy. Staff on each ward were asked to create a definite plan to implement all the strategy
6 components by choosing at least one item from each “course”. Ward staff were also encouraged
7 to create original ideas for improving the implementation of the strategy components. The
8 intervention package, which was provided in the local (Thai) language in both the electronic
9 and hard copy format, contained four key elements: (1) details of each component of the WHO
10 strategy with a number of suggestions for how this could be applied and a minimum
11 requirement for implementing each component; (2) details of the step-wise approach, which
12 determined the intervention steps; (3) details of WHO recommendations for implementation of
13 each component of the WHO strategy; and (4) ward self-assessment that allowed the ward to
14 consider all components of the strategy.

15 In addition, staff on each ward were asked to follow the step-wise approach of the WHO
16 Multimodal Hand Hygiene Improvement Strategy, which included 1) facility preparedness, 2)
17 baseline evaluation, 3) implementation, 4) follow-up evaluation, and 5) ongoing planning and
18 review cycle as part of the implementation process.²⁰

19

20 **Outcome measurements**

21 The primary outcome was compliance with the WHO’s recommended five moments for
22 hand hygiene amongst HCWs who had direct patient contact. This was assessed through direct
23 observation by the investigation team. Inter-rater reliability was assessed before and during the
24 study on a monthly basis with hand hygiene compliance data recorded independently by
25 different observers for the same hand hygiene opportunities.

1 The trial start and finish date were pre-specified as 24th December 2013 and 2nd May 2015.
2 Directly observed hand hygiene compliance data were collected during the study by observers.
3 Staff were not informed that their hand hygiene behavior was being observed. The protocol
4 specified 58 observation sessions (one per ward), each lasting 15-30 minutes, in each week of
5 the study, with a minimum of five hand hygiene opportunities observed in each session.

6 The observers were trained to record hand hygiene compliance data in accordance with
7 WHO recommendations, using tools for training and education for observers provided by the
8 WHO (http://www.who.int/gpsc/5may/tools/training_education/en/) and also making use of
9 the WHO's "5-movements" framework and the standard WHO hand hygiene compliance
10 observation forms.⁹ Hand hygiene observation data were entered daily on a secure password-
11 protected study database implemented in OpenClinica®.

12

13 **Sample size calculation**

14 Power calculations were performed based on Hussey & Hughes (2007).^{21,22} Assuming 52
15 wards, and 60 one-week time periods with the observation of an average of five hand hygiene
16 opportunities per ward per week throughout the study, and with an intra-cluster correlation
17 coefficient of 0.01 and baseline compliance 5%, the power to detect a 2% increase in hand
18 hygiene significant at the 0.05 level was 93%; this reduced to 70% for a baseline compliance
19 of 10%. We assumed extra binomial variation in hygiene compliance increased the outcome
20 variance by a factor of two.

21

22 **Statistical analysis**

23 The primary analysis was done on an intention to intervene basis (using the weeks at which
24 each ward was randomized to receive the intervention). Response functions for modelling the
25 effect of the intervention allowed for both changes in level and trend of outcome measures.

1 The analysis was performed at the cluster level, with observations of hand hygiene compliance
2 within each ward for each time period (week of study) and used a generalized linear mixed
3 model. Analysis was performed using STATA version 14.0 (StataCorp LP, College station,
4 Texas). The overall compliance for each ward in each week was calculated as the average
5 compliance over all observed hand hygiene opportunities. An additional per protocol analysis
6 (using the weeks when wards actually received the intervention) was performed using the same
7 multilevel logistic regression analysis accounting for clustering at the ward level. Exploratory
8 subgroup analyses were performed for hand hygiene opportunities corresponding to each one
9 of the “five moments” and by ward type. Cohen’s kappa statistic was used to quantify inter-
10 rater reliability between the observers.²³ A sensitivity analysis to relax the assumption of
11 immediate treatment effect was performed as described elsewhere.²² In brief, exposure time
12 (the amount of time that has passed since the start of the treatment as assigned for a given
13 cluster) was included in the model.

14

15 **Results**

16 Intention-to-treat analysis was performed on the 58 study wards using the assigned
17 intervention implementation date. Thirty-two wards (57%) initiated implementation of the
18 intervention within one month of the time specified at randomization. Twenty-three wards
19 (40%) had a delay greater than one month (range 5–57 weeks). One ward implemented the
20 intervention before the week of randomization due to an administrative error. One ward refused
21 to participate in the study and one ward failed to implement the WHO multimodal strategy
22 during the intervention period. Intention-to-treat analyses were performed on 57 participating
23 wards, and per-protocol analyses were performed on the 56 wards using the actual week of
24 implementing the intervention (Figure 1). To ensure that the last ward that implemented the

1 intervention had a 5-week period of post-intervention data collection, the data collection period
2 was extended for all wards by six weeks.

3

4 **Hand hygiene compliance observations**

5 Inter-rater reliability of hand hygiene observations (based on 18 assessments made
6 throughout the study) was good and the mean kappa score was 0.93. There were 4,230
7 observation sessions. In total, 54,073 hand hygiene opportunities were observed throughout the
8 study (Table 1). The median number of observed opportunities per ward per week was 11 (IQR
9 8-16).

10 During the baseline period (phase 1), 3,907 hand hygiene opportunities were observed with
11 a median compliance per observation session of 0% (IQR 0-10%). During the intervention
12 period (phase 2), 47,141 hand hygiene opportunities were observed with a median compliance
13 of 5% (IQR 0-17%), while for the follow-up period (phase 3), 3,025 hand hygiene opportunities
14 were observed with a median compliance of 0% (IQR 0-17%).

15 More than half of the observed hand hygiene opportunities came from nurses (61.1%
16 [33,040/54,073]), followed by auxiliaries (25.7% [13,882/54,073]), and physicians (4.7%
17 [2,564/54,073]). Thirty-eight of 57 wards were non-ICUs. These wards accounted for the
18 majority of observed hand hygiene opportunities (68.5% [37,050/54,073]).

19

20 **Overall impact of the intervention on hand compliance**

21 Hand hygiene compliance in the pre- and post- intervention periods, as defined per actual
22 implementation, was 10.4% (3,384/32,634) and 11.0% (3,048/27,591), respectively (Figure 2).
23 The intention-to-treat analysis indicated a small effect of the intervention on hygiene
24 compliance (odds ratio [OR] 1.10; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.00-1.21) (Table 2). After
25 adjustment for time of day, day of the week, month of the year, type of ward (ICU or non-ICU),

1 and type of HCW, the estimated OR was 1.11 (95% CI: 1.00-1.22). An interaction term was
2 added to account for the different magnitudes of effect of intervention on compliance by type
3 of ward. The largest impact of the intervention was in the department of obstetrics and
4 gynecology (OR 3.96; 95% CI 1.88, 8.31). Per-protocol analysis showed similar findings and
5 indicated a small improvement in hand hygiene compliance (Table 2). A sensitivity analysis
6 that relaxed the assumption of immediate treatment effect by including the exposure time in
7 the model showed similar findings.

8

9 **Hand hygiene compliance stratified by “My five moments for hand hygiene”**

10 The most commonly observed moment for hand hygiene was ‘after touching patient
11 surroundings’, which accounted for 30.2% (16,121/54,073) of all hand hygiene opportunities,
12 followed by ‘before touching a patient’, which accounted for 22.6% (12,060/54,073) (Table 1).
13 The highest effects of the intervention were found for the indication ‘before touching a patient’
14 and the estimated odds ratio from the intention-to-treat analysis was 1.52 (95%: CI 1.21, 1.91).
15 Per-protocol analysis gave similar findings.

16

17 **Variation in hand hygiene compliance by ICU ward and type of ward staff**

18 Hand hygiene compliance in ICU wards (15.4% [2,624/17,023]) was higher than in non-
19 ICU wards (8.3% [3,084/37,050]). Compliance in non-ICU wards increased from 7.0% before
20 intervention to 9.4% of after intervention, while in ICU no improvements in compliance were
21 seen (15.6% before intervention vs. 15.1% of after intervention in the ITT analysis).

22 Hand hygiene compliance varied by the type of HCW during the pre-intervention period.
23 The highest compliance was observed in nurses (10.0% [229/ 2,280]), followed by that in
24 medical students (6.9% [13/188]), and then auxiliaries (5.4% [48/884]). The highest absolute
25 improvement in hand hygiene compliance was seen in student nurses (3.3% before intervention

1 vs. 6.2% after interventions), followed by physicians (7.3% before intervention vs. 9.6% of
2 after intervention), and nurses (11.4% before intervention vs. 12.6% of after intervention).

3

4 **Discussion**

5 The principal finding is that while a multimodal intervention based on the WHO's Hand
6 Hygiene Improvement Strategy led to improvements in hand hygiene compliance, the
7 improvements were small and would not be expected to substantially reduce HCAI rates. To
8 our knowledge, this is the first time a hospital-wide implementation of the WHO hand hygiene
9 strategy has been evaluated in a randomized trial in a LMIC, so it is important to consider why
10 it was unsuccessful at achieving the desired change. We believe three main factors are likely
11 to have been important. First, human resource limitations are likely to have played a role.
12 Because we wanted our findings to be generalizable to other resource-limited hospitals in
13 LMICs, the intervention only made use of resources normally available to the hospital and its
14 infection control team. We therefore deliberately did not employ additional infection control
15 staff for delivering the intervention; nor did we bring in external expertise in behavior change
16 or social marketing, and all promotional and training materials were produced in-house without
17 professional help. We did, however, provide access to high quality training in infection control
18 to members of the hospital infection control team before the intervention started, with members
19 of the ICT attending a course on "Healthcare-associated Infection Prevention and
20 Management" held by ESCMID-SHEA Training Course in Hospital Epidemiology in 2014.
21 We also translated the WHO's hand hygiene strategy into Thai
22 (<https://doi.org/10.21954/ou.ro.0000d7f3>), to ensure that infection control staff were able to
23 acquire a good knowledge of the WHO strategy. We provided additional resources for
24 evaluating the intervention to ensure that this did not in any way impact on the ICT's workload.
25 Nonetheless, the ICT were not always able to deliver the intervention as planned because of

1 competing infection control and organizational priorities including routine surveillance,
2 responding to outbreaks and preparing for a nationally mandated hospital accreditation event.
3 While we did not attempt to assess qualitative aspects of the intervention components which
4 were implemented, clearly some approaches to providing reminders in the workplace, training,
5 system change, promoting a safety climate, and giving feedback are likely to be more effective
6 than others. We can speculate that had more resources, including time and professional
7 expertise in designing effective behavior change interventions, been devoted to these
8 components there would have been more chance of effecting meaningful improvements.

9 Second, while certain wards did take ownership of the intervention as had been the intention,
10 resulting in some substantial ward-specific improvements in hand hygiene behavior, a more
11 common pattern was that the intervention was not fully implemented or was implemented late.
12 The ICT were not always able to obtain the co-operation of the majority of ward staff despite
13 high-level endorsement of the intervention by the hospital director. This reflects the fact that
14 although the intervention was explicitly endorsed by senior hospital management,
15 organizational factors and other priorities sometimes got in the way. For example, hospital staff
16 changes occurring during the study caused some delays in implementing the intervention. Other
17 studies have reported similar problems, with higher priority work preventing effective
18 implementation of hand hygiene interventions.²⁴

19 Third, physical resource limitations may have also played a role, particularly for opportunities
20 when hand washing with soap and water was indicated, and insufficient provision of
21 conveniently located sinks and lack of provision of towels at sinks were both reported by
22 hospital staff as likely contributory factors to poor hand hygiene compliance
23 (<https://doi.org/10.21954/ou.ro.0000d7f3>)

24 The baseline hand hygiene compliance in this study of about 10% is low, but not atypical.
25 Similar pre-intervention rates have been reported in other studies in both low- and high-income

1 countries.²⁵⁻²⁷ A recent systematic review found compliance rates of below 20% to be common
2 for all types of HCW.²⁸

3 The most extensive previous evaluation of the WHO's multimodal strategy for improving
4 hand hygiene in LMIC settings used a before-after study design and included three countries:
5 Mali, Costa Rica and Pakistan.^{27,29} Substantial improvements in hand hygiene in all three
6 countries were reported: respectively, from 8% pre- to 22% post-intervention compliance in
7 Mali, from 40% to 60% in Costa Rica, and from 38% to 59% in Pakistan. Although the before-
8 after design employed in this study is considered to be weak because of its vulnerability to
9 secular trends, the magnitude of the changes reported is consistent with moderate to large
10 beneficial effects. In a similar manner to our study, the interventions were obtained mainly
11 with the use of local resources and expertise. One important difference, however, is the direct
12 involvement of the WHO team who developed the multimodal strategy. Assuming that the
13 changes seen were caused by the intervention, it is possible that the involvement of such a high-
14 profile team helped to galvanize behavior change amongst hospital staff and overcome
15 organizational inertia. More recently, one other study in Sub-Saharan Africa has reported
16 substantial increases in hand hygiene compliance (from 34% at baseline to 69% post-
17 intervention), but again using a weak before-after study design. Assessment of the published
18 literature also needs to take into account the likelihood of publication bias, whereby small
19 (often methodologically weak) study designs are more likely to be reported if they show a
20 positive result.^{13,30} A previous systematic review of hand hygiene interventions that included
21 such before-after studies found clear evidence of such publication bias,³⁰ and it is notable that
22 large studies of hand hygiene interventions employing the strongest study designs (and with
23 pre-registered protocols) have consistently shown the smallest effects.³¹⁻³³ Indeed, our
24 estimated effect size is consistent with those seen in previous interrupted time series studies.³¹
25 For these reasons, we believe that our experience of an intervention that achieved a statistically

1 but not clinically significant improvement in hand hygiene may be representative of an
2 underlying problem that has been largely neglected from the published literature. Indeed, the
3 difficulties in implementing the intervention as planned in this study echo those from a previous
4 CRCT of a hand hygiene improvement intervention,³⁴ which found that poor fidelity to the
5 planned intervention may have substantially diluted the potential benefits. Competing priorities
6 with other quality improvement initiatives were identified as one possible cause of these
7 implementation difficulties.

8 Well-resourced national campaigns modelled on the WHO strategy have helped to bring
9 large, persistent and well-documented improvements in hand hygiene compliance in some
10 high-income countries and these have been shown to be associated with reductions in
11 infection.^{35,36} There is also some evidence that the WHO strategy can be further improved by
12 adding interventions including goal-setting, reward incentives, and accountability.¹⁰ In our
13 study, goal-setting was used as an additional intervention by two wards who chose to have
14 routine meetings to evaluate the intervention plan, revise the goals and plan to achieve target
15 rates of hand hygiene. It has also been proposed that team-based approaches could help
16 promote hand hygiene with ward-based workshops to discuss the workflow and make ward-
17 specific plans.²⁴ Using this approach Huis *et al.* found high improvement in certain wards that
18 were successful in making culture changes at the ward to make staff more aware of performing
19 hand hygiene.³⁷ In our study, there were also examples of creative ideas originating from ward
20 staff to promote hand hygiene. For example, some wards set a hand hygiene day in every
21 month. On these days there were activities to promote hand hygiene in the ward in a similar
22 manner to the annual hospital hand hygiene day.

23 The principal strength of our study is the strong design used to evaluate the impact of the
24 WHO strategy,^{16,34} and the hospital-wide intervention. Most previous studies from LMICs have
25 evaluated interventions only in more restricted study populations.

1 The study's main limitation was that, as with other hand hygiene studies based on direct
2 observation, Hawthorne effects may have distorted HCW hand hygiene behavior. We had
3 hoped to overcome this problem by independently assessing hand hygiene compliance by
4 measuring volume of alcohol-based hand sanitizer use on each ward, though this proved
5 impossible to do reliably in practice. A second limitation is the possibility of contamination
6 between clusters, as interventions made on one ward could affect staff behavior on other wards.
7 This would be expected to result in overall increases in compliance over time, but might lead
8 to smaller differences between pre- and post-intervention periods in implementing wards.

9

10 **Conclusions**

11 Hand hygiene is an essential part of infection control practice and there is compelling evidence
12 that it can be highly effective at reducing nosocomial infection, particularly MDR bacterial
13 clones adapted for hospital transmission. Previous studies in high income settings have had
14 remarkable success in substantially improving hand hygiene in HCWs using interventions
15 based on the WHO's multimodal strategy. Such successes have been documented at the level
16 of the hospital, at a regional level, and nationally. Each time the improvements have been
17 accompanied by substantial reductions in multi-drug resistant infections. However, with the
18 exception of countries, such as Australia, which require independent auditing and public
19 reporting of hand hygiene compliance in all hospitals, we do not have a good idea of how
20 widespread these improvements have been nor have there been methodologically rigorous
21 evaluations of the WHO's multimodal strategy in resource-constrained settings. Our study,
22 performed in a typical resource-constrained hospital in a middle-income country, demonstrates
23 that institutional obstacles to improving hand hygiene can be substantial, and that without
24 additional resources attempts to change behavior using the WHO's multimodal strategy are not
25 guaranteed to succeed. While we do not have a good idea of how widespread such

1 refractoriness is, the strong evidence of publication bias in the literature and the high frequency
2 of reported compliance below 20% suggest that our findings may be representative, at least for
3 a substantial subset of hospitals in LMICs.

4 We believe the vital role that hand hygiene plays in preventing infections and controlling
5 antimicrobial resistance should make it a public health priority to establish country-level hand
6 hygiene programs that ensure acceptable hand hygiene compliance in every hospital. This is
7 likely to require independent hand hygiene audits and appropriately-resourced nationally
8 coordinated hand hygiene campaigns based on the WHO strategy or evidence-based extensions
9 of this. Such national campaigns have had remarkable success in high income countries, and
10 recent analysis has shown that unless baseline compliance is already very high, such investment
11 in hand hygiene will almost certainly be cost-effective (and often cost-saving) in lower income
12 settings. Country-wide roll-out of such campaigns to hospitals in a stepped wedge manner
13 would also enable the generation of robust evidence concerning the effectiveness and cost-
14 effectiveness of the intervention.

15 **Contributors**

16 BSC and DL conceptualized the project and designed the study. BSC supervised the project,
17 acquired funding, and is the manuscript's guarantor. MH, PS, SN, collected and curated the
18 data. MH cleaned the data. MH and CL performed the formal data analysis. MH and CL
19 produced the figures. MH and CL drafted the manuscript. All authors interpreted the data and
20 critically revised the manuscript for intellectual content. All authors had full access to all the
21 data in the study. All authors, read and approved the final manuscript.

22

23

24 **Declaration of interests**

25 We declare that we have no competing interests.

1

2 **Funding**

3 This study was supported by The Oak Foundation. None of the authors or their institutions at
4 any time received payment or services from a third party for any aspect of the submitted work.

5

6

1 List of the figures and tables

- 2 1. Figure 1: Design of the stepped-wedge cluster randomised trial
- 3 2. Figure 2: Hand hygiene compliance over the study period
- 4 3. Table 1: Hand hygiene opportunities during baseline, intervention, and post-
5 intervention periods.
- 6 4. Table 2: Estimated effect of intervention on hand hygiene compliance

7

Figure 1: Design of the stepped-wedge cluster randomized trial





Figure 2: Hand-hygiene compliance over the study period.



1 **Table 1:** Hand hygiene opportunities during baseline, intervention, and post-intervention
2 periods.

	Baseline	Intervention	Follow-up
n	3,907	47,141	3,025
Day			
Monday	772 (19.8%)	8,628 (18.3%)	600 (19.8%)
Tuesday	835 (21.4%)	8,265 (12.5%)	483 (16.0%)
Wednesday	839 (21.5%)	7,577 (16.1%)	577 (19.1%)
Thursday	668 (17.1%)	11,996 (25.4%)	612 (20.2%)
Friday	682 (17.5%)	9,466 (20.1%)	647 (21.4%)
Saturday	111 (2.8%)	512 (1.1%)	106 (3.5%)
Sunday	0 (0%)	697 (1.5%)	0 (0%)
Time of day			
Morning	2248 (57.5%)	24,517 (52.0%)	1,673 (55.3%)
Afternoon	1659 (42.5%)	22,624 (48.0%)	1,352 (44.7%)
WHO Moment			
1-before touching a patient	859 (22.0%)	10,580 (22.4%)	621 (20.5%)
2-before clean or aseptic procedure	1068 (27.3%)	10,210 (21.7%)	375 (12.4%)
3-after body fluid exposure risk	444 (11.4%)	5,911 (12.5%)	320 (10.6%)
4-after touching a patient	691 (17.7%)	6,594 (14.0%)	2279 (9.2%)
5-after touching patient surroundings	845 (21.6%)	12,846 (29.4%)	1,430 (47.3%)
Profession			
Physicians	291 (7.4%)	2,223 (4.7%)	60 (1.7%)
Nurses	2,280 (58.4%)	28,591 (60.6%)	2,169 (71.7%)
Auxiliaries	884 (22.6%)	12,261 (26.0%)	737 (24.4%)
Nursing students	36 (0.9%)	403 (0.9%)	0 (0%)
Medical students	188 (4.8%)	2,212 (4.7%)	69 (2.3%)
Visiting specialist	228 (5.8%)	1,451 (3.1%)	0 (0%)

3 Data are n (%), unless indicated otherwise.

4

1 **Table 2:** Estimated effect of intervention on hand hygiene compliance.

	Hand-hygiene compliance (%)	Estimated odds ratio (95% CI)
Intention-to-intervene analysis		
Before randomisation	2,660/26,482 (10.0%)	Reference
After randomisation	3,048/27,591 (11.0%)	1.10 (1.00, 1.21)
Per-protocol analysis		
Before implementation	3,384/32,634 (10.4%)	Reference
After implementation	2,324/21,439 (10.8%)	1.14 (1.03 to 1.26)

2

3

1 References

- 2 1. Organization WH. Report on the burden of endemic health care-associated infection worldwide.
3 Geneva, Switzerland: WHO Document Production Services, 2011.
- 4 2. Allegranzi B, Bagheri Nejad S, Combescure C, et al. Burden of endemic health-care-associated
5 infection in developing countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2011; **377**(9761):
6 228-41.
- 7 3. Hongsuwan M, Srisamang P, Kanoksil M, et al. Increasing incidence of hospital-acquired and
8 healthcare-associated bacteremia in northeast Thailand: a multicenter surveillance study. *PloS one*
9 2014; **9**(10): e109324.
- 10 4. Pittet D, Allegranzi B, Storr J, et al. Infection control as a major World Health Organization priority
11 for developing countries. *The Journal of hospital infection* 2008; **68**(4): 285-92.
- 12 5. Antimicrobial Resistance C. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a
13 systematic analysis. *Lancet* 2022; **399**(10325): 629-55.
- 14 6. Allegranzi B, Pittet D. Role of hand hygiene in healthcare-associated infection prevention. *The*
15 *Journal of hospital infection* 2009; **73**(4): 305-15.
- 16 7. Lee AS, Cooper BS, Malhotra-Kumar S, et al. Comparison of strategies to reduce meticillin-
17 resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* rates in surgical patients: a controlled multicentre intervention trial.
18 *BMJ open* 2013; **3**(9): e003126.
- 19 8. Organization WH. Guidelines on Core Components of Infection Prevention and Control
20 Programmes at the National and Acute Health Care Facility Level. Guidelines on Core Components
21 of Infection Prevention and Control Programmes at the National and Acute Health Care Facility
22 Level. Geneva; 2016.
- 23 9. Organization WH. WHO Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care: First Global Patient Safety
24 Challenge Clean Care Is Safer Care. WHO Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care: First Global
25 Patient Safety Challenge Clean Care Is Safer Care. Geneva; 2009.
- 26 10. Luangasanatip N, Hongsuwan M, Limmathurotsakul D, et al. Comparative efficacy of
27 interventions to promote hand hygiene in hospital: systematic review and network meta-analysis.
28 *Bmj* 2015; **351**: h3728.
- 29 11. Gould DJ, Moralejo D, Drey N, Chudleigh JH. Interventions to improve hand hygiene compliance
30 in patient care. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2010; (9): CD005186.
- 31 12. Allegranzi B, Gayet-Ageron A, Damani N, et al. Global implementation of WHO's multimodal
32 strategy for improvement of hand hygiene: a quasi-experimental study. *The Lancet Infectious*
33 *diseases* 2013; **13**(10): 843-51.
- 34 13. Gould DJ, Moralejo D, Drey N, Chudleigh JH, Taljaard M. Interventions to improve hand hygiene
35 compliance in patient care. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2017; **9**: CD005186.
- 36 14. Hemming K, Haines TP, Chilton PJ, Girling AJ, Lilford RJ. The stepped wedge cluster randomised
37 trial: rationale, design, analysis, and reporting. *Bmj* 2015; **350**: h391.
- 38 15. Mdege ND, Man MS, Taylor Nee Brown CA, Torgerson DJ. Systematic review of stepped wedge
39 cluster randomized trials shows that design is particularly used to evaluate interventions during
40 routine implementation. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011; **64**(9): 936-48.
- 41 16. Beard E, Lewis JJ, Copas A, et al. Stepped wedge randomised controlled trials: systematic review
42 of studies published between 2010 and 2014. *Trials* 2015; **16**: 353.
- 43 17. Danchaivijitr S, Supchutikul A, Waitayapiches S, Kachintorn K. Quality of nosocomial infection
44 control in Thailand. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmai het thangphaet* 2005;
45 **88 Suppl 10**: S145-9.
- 46 18. Buachum S, Soparat P, Yimyaem S, Jariyasethpong T, Danchaivijitr S. Nosocomial infection control
47 in regional and provincial hospitals. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmai het*
48 *thangphaet* 2005; **88 Suppl 10**: S124-7.
- 49 19. Apisarnthanarak A, Eiamsitrakoon T, Mundy LM. Behavior-based interventions to improve hand
50 hygiene adherence among intensive care unit healthcare workers in Thailand. *Infection control and*

- 1 *hospital epidemiology : the official journal of the Society of Hospital Epidemiologists of America*
- 2 2015; **36**(5): 517-21.
- 3 20. Safety WHO WP. A guide to the implementation of the WHO multimodal hand hygiene
- 4 improvement strategy. World Health Organization; 2009.
- 5 21. Brown CA, Lilford RJ. The stepped wedge trial design: a systematic review. *BMC medical research*
- 6 *methodology* 2006; **6**: 54.
- 7 22. Hussey MA, Hughes JP. Design and analysis of stepped wedge cluster randomized trials.
- 8 *Contemporary clinical trials* 2007; **28**(2): 182-91.
- 9 23. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)* 2012; **22**(3): 276-82.
- 10 24. Huis A, Schoonhoven L, Grol R, Donders R, Hulscher M, van Achterberg T. Impact of a team and
- 11 leaders-directed strategy to improve nurses' adherence to hand hygiene guidelines: a cluster
- 12 randomised trial. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2013; **50**(4): 464-74.
- 13 25. Grayson ML, Russo PL, Cruickshank M, et al. Outcomes from the first 2 years of the Australian
- 14 National Hand Hygiene Initiative. *The Medical journal of Australia* 2011; **195**(10): 615-9.
- 15 26. Allegranzi B. Global implementation of WHO's multimodal strategy for improvement of hand
- 16 hygiene: a quasi-experimental study'. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* 2013; **13**.
- 17 27. Allegranzi B, Sax H, Bengaly L, et al. Successful implementation of the World Health Organization
- 18 hand hygiene improvement strategy in a referral hospital in Mali, Africa. *Infection control and*
- 19 *hospital epidemiology : the official journal of the Society of Hospital Epidemiologists of America*
- 20 2010; **31**(2): 133-41.
- 21 28. Erasmus V, Daha TJ, Brug H, et al. Systematic review of studies on compliance with hand hygiene
- 22 guidelines in hospital care. *Infection control and hospital epidemiology : the official journal of the*
- 23 *Society of Hospital Epidemiologists of America* 2010; **31**(3): 283-94.
- 24 29. Allegranzi B. Healthcare associated infections. In Summary of the evidence on patient safety :
- 25 implications for research. *World Health Organization, Geneva* 2008.
- 26 30. Schweizer ML, Reisinger HS, Ohl M, et al. Searching for an Optimal Hand Hygiene Bundle: A Meta-
- 27 analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2014; **58**(2): 248-59.
- 28 31. Luangasanatip N, Hongsuwan M, Limmathurotsakul D, et al. Comparative efficacy of
- 29 interventions to promote hand hygiene in hospital: systematic review and network meta-analysis.
- 30 *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2015; **351**: h3728.
- 31 32. Stewardson AJ, Sax H, Gayet-Ageron A, et al. Enhanced performance feedback and patient
- 32 participation to improve hand hygiene compliance of health-care workers in the setting of
- 33 established multimodal promotion: a single-centre, cluster randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*
- 34 *Infectious Diseases* 2016.
- 35 33. Muller MP, Wallace E, Junaid S. A Cluster Randomized Trial of Immediate Hand Hygiene
- 36 Compliance Feedback. *Open forum infectious diseases* 2016; **3**(suppl_1).
- 37 34. Fuller C, Michie S, Savage J, et al. The Feedback Intervention Trial (FIT)--improving hand-hygiene
- 38 compliance in UK healthcare workers: a stepped wedge cluster randomised controlled trial. *PloS one*
- 39 2012; **7**(10): e41617.
- 40 35. Stone SP, Fuller C, Savage J, et al. Evaluation of the national Cleanyourhands campaign to reduce
- 41 *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia and *Clostridium difficile* infection in hospitals in England and
- 42 Wales by improved hand hygiene: four year, prospective, ecological, interrupted time series study.
- 43 *Bmj* 2012; **344**: e3005.
- 44 36. Stewardson AJ, Sax H, Gayet-Ageron A, et al. Enhanced performance feedback and patient
- 45 participation to improve hand hygiene compliance of health-care workers in the setting of
- 46 established multimodal promotion: a single-centre, cluster randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*
- 47 *Infectious diseases* 2016; **16**(12): 1345-55.
- 48 37. Huis A, van Achterberg T, de Bruin M, Grol R, Schoonhoven L, Hulscher M. A systematic review of
- 49 hand hygiene improvement strategies: a behavioural approach. *Implementation science : IS* 2012; **7**:
- 50 92.