

1 **Title: Mothers' hygiene experiences in confinement centres: a cohort study**

2 **Authors:**

3 1. Siew Cheng Foong^{1*}

4 2. Wai Cheng Foong¹

5 3. May Loong Tan¹

6 4. Jacqueline Judith Ho¹

7 ¹Department of Paediatrics, RCSI & UCD Malaysia Campus (formerly Penang Medical

8 College), 4, Jalan Sepoy Lines, 10450 George Town, Penang, Malaysia.

9 *Corresponding author and email address: Siew Cheng Foong, scfoong@rcsiucd.edu.my

10 All authors contributed equally to this work.

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Ethnic Malaysian Chinese used to observe the 1-month postpartum confinement period at
14 home and many families would engage a traditional postpartum carer (TPC) to help care for
15 the mother and newborn. A recent trend has been the development of confinement
16 centres (CCs) which are private non-healthcare establishments run by staff not trained in
17 health care. Concerns about hygiene in CCs arose after infections were reported. We
18 describe the practice of hand hygiene observed in CCs, the availability of resources for
19 hygiene and to determine the prevalence of health related problems in CCs.

20 **Methods**

21 This is a cohort study of ethnic Chinese mothers intending to breastfeed their healthy
22 infants. They were recruited post-delivery along with a comparison group who planned to
23 spend their confinement period at home, then all were telephone interviewed after their 1-
24 month confinement period about their experience. To avoid any alteration in behaviour,
25 mothers were not told at recruitment that they had to observe hygiene practices. Multiple
26 logistic regression was used to assess the effect of place of confinement on rates of infant
27 health problems.

28 **Results**

29 Of 187 mothers, 88 (47%) went to 27 different CCs while 99 (53%) stayed at home.
30 Response rates for the 1-month interviews were 88% (CC) versus 97% (home).
31 Mothers in CC group stayed in one to four-bedded rooms and 92% of them had their baby
32 sleeping separately in a common nursery described to have up to 17 babies at a time; 74%
33 of them spent less than six hours a day with their babies; 43% noticed that CC staff had

34 inadequate hand hygiene practices; 66% reported no hand-basins in their rooms; 30%
35 reported no soap at hand-basins; 28% reported inexperienced or inadequate staff and 4%
36 reported baby item sharing.

37 Of mothers staying at home, 35% employed a TPC to care for her baby; 32% did not room-in
38 with their babies, but only 11% spent less than 6 hours a day with their babies. 18% of
39 mothers who employed TPCs reported that their TPC had unsatisfactory hand hygiene
40 practices.

41 Health problems that were probably related to infection (HPRI) like fever and cough were
42 similar between the groups: 14% (CC) versus 14% (home) ($p=0.86$). Multiple logistic
43 regression did not show that CCs were a factor for HPRI: aOR 1.28 (95% CI 0.36 to 4.49).
44 Three mothers reported events that could indicate transmission of infection in CCs.

45 **Conclusion**

46 We found unsatisfactory hygiene practices in CCs as reported by mothers who spent their
47 confinement period there. Although we were not able to establish any direct evidence of
48 infection transmission but based on reports given by the mothers in this study, it is likely to
49 be happening. Therefore, future studies, including intervention studies, are urgently needed
50 to establish an appropriate hygiene standard in CCs as well as the best method to
51 implement this standard. Empowering CC staff with hygiene knowledge so that they can be
52 involved and contribute to the development of the development of these standards would
53 be important.

54

55 **Keywords:** confinement centre, hand hygiene, postpartum, infection, neonate, traditional

56 postpartum carer

57 **Background**

58 The 30-day postpartum (confinement) period is an important time for women of Chinese
59 ethnicity in Malaysia and elsewhere [1, 2]. Despite modernisation, most families still adhere
60 strictly to traditional practices based on maintaining the Yin and Yang with the belief that
61 failure to do so could potentially be detrimental to the mother's health [2-5]. Many families
62 engaged a traditional postpartum carer (TPC), known locally as a 'confinement lady' or 'yue
63 sao' to stay in the new mother's home during the confinement period and assist the mother.
64 The TPC is traditionally someone who is considered an expert in the necessary postpartum
65 diet and practices. Their skills were probably obtained through experience rather than
66 formal training [1, 6].

67 Over the last decade, confinement centres (CCs) where post-partum Chinese mothers could
68 stay and observe traditional post-partum practices during their confinement period, have
69 emerged as an alternative option. CCs are private establishments, usually converted from
70 residential or commercial properties, with rooms for mothers' accommodation. CC staff are
71 generally women who are familiar with the Chinese cultural confinement requirements and
72 diet, similar to a TPC. Although some CCs do employ qualified nurses and midwives [6],
73 others may employ untrained staff to help [7].

74

75 Concerns about hygiene in these centres arose when anecdotal reports suggested that
76 babies in CCs were frequently hospitalised with serious infections. In 2007, Rai et al
77 published a report about an Echovirus infection outbreak in a CC and poor hygiene practices
78 in that CC were highlighted [8]. Therefore, to learn more about how hygiene is practiced in
79 CCs, we asked mothers who had chosen to stay in a confinement centre about hygiene
80 practices they had observed during the stay. Mothers who had employed a TPC to help

81 them at home were also asked about the TPC's hygiene practice. This is part of a larger
82 study where we looked at mothers' breastfeeding experiences in CCs and compared these
83 with a cohort of women who had their traditional confinement period at home [7].

84

85 The aim of this paper is to describe the practice of hand hygiene observed in CCs, the
86 availability of resources for hygiene and to determine the prevalence of health related
87 problems in CCs.

88

89 **Methods**

90 Details of the study methods are published in Foong 2021 [7] and we describe these in brief
91 here. Malaysian mothers of Chinese ethnicity who intended to spend their confinement
92 period in a CC, who had delivered term healthy infants and had the intention to breastfeed,
93 were recruited prior to discharge. We also recruited a comparison group of mothers who
94 went home for their confinement period, some of whom engaged a TPC. For this paper we
95 used this comparison group to gauge hand hygiene practices in the CC with the TPC and to
96 compare health-related problems in CCs with those in the community. Recruitment and
97 collection of baseline data was done by the baby's attending doctor, who apart from this
98 was not otherwise involved in the study. Written consent was obtained from the mothers
99 prior to recruitment. To avoid any alteration in behaviour, mothers were not told at
100 recruitment that they would be asked about hygiene practices.

101

102 After discharge, there was no contact between the research team and the mother until
103 immediately after her 30-day confinement period. At this point we conducted a telephone
104 interview with all mothers. We firstly asked mothers questions related to their baby's

105 general health. We then categorised the reported health related problems to those that we
106 judged were possibly related to infection and those that were probably not related to
107 infections. Health problems possibly related to infection (HPRI) included fever, diarrhoea
108 and baby being inactive. Those that we judged to be health problems that were unlikely
109 related to infection (HPUI) included neonatal jaundice and regurgitation of feeds. If any
110 health problem was reported, we asked if they had sought advice from a healthcare
111 professional.

112

113 Where applicable, we asked whether or not they had observed their CC staff or TPC (in the
114 case of those at home), washing their hands before handling their babies; and their
115 response if hand-washing practices were not observed. We did not ask mothers staying at
116 home who did not employ TPC whether or not their family members washed hands because
117 the information was deemed to be possibly unreliable. Specifically for mothers who went to
118 CCs, we asked the number of rooms in their CC, the number of mothers staying together in
119 a room, if they had a hand basin in their room, if soap was available in all hand basins, what
120 was provided for mothers to dry their hands, whether alcohol hand sanitizers were available,
121 the number of babies in each nursery, availability of quarantine rooms for sick mothers or
122 babies and their perception of cleanliness in their CC (either very dirty, somewhat dirty,
123 clean or very clean). At the end of the interview, we asked mothers to share with us
124 anything else they would like to about their experience in CCs.

125

126 All questions used had been tested in a separate group of mothers not involved in the study.
127 The telephone interview was conducted by three trained research staff and the responses
128 were directly entered into a specially designed interview form. A sample size of 188 was

129 calculated based on the primary objectives of the primary study. Details of this are
130 published in Foong 2021 [7]. This study received ethical approval from the Joint Penang
131 Independent Ethics Committee (JPEC No 08-17-0103).

132

133 **Data analyses**

134 We tabulated the baseline demographics of the mothers according to place of confinement.
135 Continuous data was presented as means with standard deviations (SD) and categorical data
136 presented as frequency with percentage (%). Chi-square analysis was used to compare the
137 baseline characteristics between mothers staying in confinement centres (CCs) and those
138 staying at home. Comments from free field options were tabulated and categorized into
139 groups. Some of these free field responses were quoted as illustrations. We used simple
140 logistic regression; and multiple logistic regression after adjusting for clinically important
141 confounders to determine the likelihood of HPRI and HPUI as a function of CCs. The results
142 were presented as crude and adjusted odd ratios (cOR and aOR) with 95% confidence
143 intervals (CI). Statistical analysis was done using Stata 13 [9]. We considered a p-value of
144 less than 0.05 as significant.

145


146 **Results**

147 A total of 187 mothers consented to participate, of which 88 (47%) stayed in a CC and 99
148 (53%) went home. At one month post-partum we were able to interview 77 (88%) mothers
149 from the CC group and 96 (97%) from the home group. Based on the reported names of the
150 CCs given by the mother, the 77 mothers in the CC group had gone to one of probably 27
151 CCs during their confinement period. Unfortunately we were not able to verify reported
152 names of CC because at the time of the study there was no record of all CCs in Penang

153 available and we are therefore uncertain about the exact number of CCs in the study. Of the
154 96 mothers from the home group, 34 hired a TPC while the remainder received care from
155 family members. (Figure 1).

156

157 **Figure 1: Study flow diagram**



174 **Baseline characteristics**

175 The maternal and infant baseline characteristics are presented in Table 1. The overall mean
176 maternal age was 32 (SD 4) years. Most mothers had tertiary education, and all had at least
177 secondary school education, which reflects what is expected in Penang. The overall mean
178 infant gestational age was 39 (SD 1) weeks and mean birth weight 3149 (SD 322) g. We
179 found that significantly more primiparas went to CCs (53% CC vs 34% H, $p = 0.01$) but there
180 were no differences in the age, education background, mode of delivery; infant gestation
181 and birth weight between the two groups. (Table 1).

182

183 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the mothers and infants (n = 187)**

Characteristics	Place of confinement, n (%)	
	Confinement centre (n = 88)	Home (n = 99)
Age of mothers (years), mean (SD)	32 (4)	32 (3)
Received tertiary Education	70 (80)	80 (81)
Primigravida*	47 (53)	34 (34)
Male infant	45 (51)	56 (57)
Gestational age at birth (weeks), mean (SD)	39 (1)	39 (1)
Infant's birth weight (g), mean (SD)	3141 (304)	3156 (339)

184 * p value < 0.05

185

186

187

188

189 **Description of confinement centres**

190 The description of the CCs came from mother's reports during the interview. More than one
191 mother may have stayed in the same CCs. The CCs had between four to 10 rooms for
192 mother's accommodation.

193 The number of mothers staying together in a room ranged from one to four. 45 mothers
194 occupied a single bedded room, 20 mothers occupied a two bedded room, 11 occupied
195 three bedded room and one stayed in a four bedded room. Most of the mothers did not
196 room-in with their babies beside them (n = 71, 92%). Instead, their babies slept in the
197 common nursery; and majority of mothers (n = 57, 74%) spent less than six hours a day with
198 their babies. Regardless of CC size, all had a single common nursery for babies. The number
199 of babies in the nursery at a time was reported to range from one to 17.

200 Of the mothers staying at home, 31 (32%) did not room-in with their babies, but only 11
201 (11%) spent less than six hours a day with their babies.

202

203 **Hygiene and infection control measures at CC**

204 When asked to rate the overall cleanliness of the CCs, all mothers reported that their centre
205 was either 'clean' (n = 41, 53%) or 'very clean' (n = 36, 47%). However, only 17 (22%)
206 mothers noticed that their CC staff washed hands in between handling babies and 33 (43%)
207 mothers noticed that CC staff did not. When asked what they did if the CC staff failed to
208 wash hands before handling a baby, two mothers reported that they went on to ask the
209 staff to do so; two mothers said that not washing hands in between handling babies was not
210 of any concern, and one just said that she felt sorry for the staff who was short-handed at
211 that time. The remaining 27 (35%) mothers had not paid attention to whether or not their
212 CC staff washed hands. (Table 2).

213 **Table 2: Mothers' perception that hand hygiene was practiced before handling babies**

	Hand hygiene practised	Hand hygiene not practised	Don't know if hand hygiene practised
CC staff (n, %)	17 (22)	33 (43)	27 (35)
TPC (n, %)	34 (35)	6 (18)	11 (32)

214

215

216 Only 55 (63%) of mothers reported that their CCs supplied hand soap. Among the 32 (36%)
217 mothers who reported that their CCs provided alcohol-based hand sanitizers, three reported
218 that alcohol-based hand sanitizers were restricted to staff use only. Twenty-six (34%)
219 mothers reported the availability of a sink for hand washing in their room. Only 23 mothers
220 reported availability of hand towels for drying hands and these items were reported to be
221 either a single cloth-towel that was shared by everyone in the centre or toilet rolls. (Table 3).

222

223 **Table 3: Mothers' perception of the availability of hand hygiene resources at CCs (n = 77)**

Hand hygiene resource	Available (n)
Sink in own room	26
Readily available hand soap at each sink	55
Hand towels to dry hands	23
Readily available alcohol hand sanitizers	32

224

225

226 The availability of a quarantine room for sick mothers was reported by 17% of mothers
227 while the availability of quarantine rooms for sick babies were reported by 24% of mothers.

228 One mother reported that her CC required all visitors to don gowns prior to entering the
229 nursery. During the course of the interview, mothers also revealed one or more of the
230 comments related to poor hygiene listed in Table 4.

231

232 **Table 4: Comments related to hygiene in CCs**

Staff shortage and inexperienced staff who were unaware of hygiene practices
Only one toilet to be shared by all mothers hence quite dirty
A common towel used to burp all babies in the nursery
A common hand towel used by all mothers to wipe their hands
The same pail that was used for holding bath water was used for washing the floor
The same basin used to wash babies' bottoms was also used to wash milk bottles
Milk bottles that fell to the floor (staff fell asleep) were simply picked up and used to continue feeding the baby without being washed
Breast-pump parts were just soaked in hot water and not properly sterilized
Use of a common milk bottle that was sticky and dirty looking
Infrequent changing of diapers, cot sheets and bed sheets
Nursery cramped and not spaced
3 babies sharing a single cot
Flies and mosquitos in their room
Poor quality paper hand towels - toilet rolls that easily disintegrate
Alcohol hand sanitizers were only for staff usage

233 With regards to hygiene practices by TPCs at home, 6 (18%) of mother reported that their

234 TPC did not washed hands before handling their baby and after changing diapers while 11

235 (32%) mothers did not know whether their TPC practiced hand hygiene. When we asked
236 what they did when they saw poor hand hygiene, two reported that they asked their TPC to
237 do so, while four did not do anything.

238

239 **Babies' general health at CCs and at home**

240 Baby's general health at CCs and home were generally similar. HPRI were reported by 11
241 mothers (14%) from CCs compared to 13 mothers (14%) from home; p value 0.86. Of these,
242 10 mothers from CC compared to 13 mothers from home consulted a healthcare
243 professional. Reported HPRI included one or more of these: 'fever', 'viral infection', 'cough',
244 'stuffy nose' 'runny nose' and 'oral thrush'. None of the infants from the CC group had any
245 form of serious illness. One infant from the Home group was hospitalised for viral infection
246 which the mother thought was caught from the baby's older brother.

247

248 The main HPUI was 'jaundice'. Others included one or more of the following: 'colic',
249 'constipation', 'regurgitation' and 'umbilical hernia'. HPUI were reported by 70 mothers
250 (92%) from CCs compared to 88 mothers (92%) from home; p value 0.92. Of these, 43
251 mothers from CC and 63 mothers from home consulted a healthcare professional.

252

253 Simple logistic regression showed no association between HPRI and place of confinement,
254 OR 1.08 (95% CI 0.45 to 2.57), p = 0.86. There was also no association between HPUI and
255 place of confinement, OR 1.06 (95% CI 0.35 to 3.20). Multiple logistic regression adjusted for
256 known clinically important confounders (maternal education level, spent less than six hours
257 a day with baby, not sleeping with baby at night and no exclusive breastfeeding) also did not

258 show that the CC or home was a factor affecting HPRI (aOR 1.28 (95% CI (0.36 to 4.49), p =
 259 0.71); or HPUI (aOR 2.01(95% CI 0.52) to 7.82, p=0.32). (Table 5).

260 **Table 5: Crude and adjusted ORs for HPRI and HPUI defined by place of confinement**

		Number of mothers who reported (n)	Odds Ratio, OR (95% CI)	Adjusted Odds Ratio, aOR (95% CI) ^a
HPRI	Confinement Centres (n = 77)	11	1.08 (0.45, 2.57)	1.28 (0.36, 4.49)
	Home (n = 96)	13		
HPUI	Confinement Centres (n = 77)	70	1.06 (0.35, 3.20)	2.01 (0.52, 7.82)
	Home (n = 96)	88		

261

262 ^a Adjusted for maternal education level, spent less than six hours a day with baby, not
 263 sleeping with baby at night and no exclusive breastfeeding

264

265 HPRI: Health problems probably related to infections

266 HPUI: Health problems probably unrelated to infections

267

268

269 When we asked mothers if they had anything else to share with us, we found three events
 270 that could indicate a possibility of infection transmission in CCs. One mother reported that
 271 there were visits from the health authorities to her CC because a number of babies in her CC
 272 had fever and were hospitalized. One mother reported that all babies in her CC had either
 273 blocked or runny noses within a one-week period. Another thought her baby's oral thrush

274 and rashes on her baby were due to sharing of a baby wash cloth at the CC. The mothers
275 who reported these events probably came from three different CCs.

276

277 **Discussion**

278 The main finding from our study was inadequate hand hygiene among caregivers of babies
279 not only in CCs but also at home. We also found inadequate infection control facilities in CCs.
280 Despite this, mothers reported that they were satisfied with the cleanliness of their CCs.
281 Due to small numbers, we were unable to show whether there was a difference for the type
282 and prevalence of reported health problems between the two groups. However, practices at
283 CCs that may potentially have caused infection were noted. These practices most likely
284 result from lack of resources, inconsistent hand hygiene practices and over-crowding, and
285 perhaps lack of awareness.

286 We are unable to find other studies looking at confinement centres, but our study draws
287 parallels with studies conducted with nursing homes and child care centres. One similarity
288 with these is that they are populations who are relatively susceptible to infection. These
289 studies found that over-crowding and lack of hand hygiene led to infection transmission [10,
290 11]. A number of studies describe how infection could be prevented through improving
291 hand hygiene practices, the availability of resources and improved role modelling [12-16]. In
292 addition, these studies also found that education and training could effectively increase
293 hygiene practices in nursing homes [11, 16, 17]. Drawing from the findings of these studies,
294 it is very likely that all of these could apply to CCs. Therefore, we could expect that if
295 education and training were put in place, hygiene practices in CCs could improve. However,
296 good hand hygiene practices are known to be one of those practices that are difficult to

297 sustain and therefore regular audit and feedback to improve sustainability might also be
298 needed[18].

299 Current guidelines for hygiene practice in healthcare settings differ little in their
300 recommendations but little is known about the appropriate standard of care in community
301 settings such as CCs. Infection control as it is practiced in healthcare settings may be difficult
302 to implement in CCs and is costly. There is currently little research to guide practice. It is
303 noted that CCs are not healthcare institutions, and their staff are not healthcare staff. In
304 addition, the traditional confinement care offered by CCs is not a medical treatment but at
305 the same time CCs need to be cognisant of the increased infection risk of neonates and have
306 adequate infection prevention strategies in place.

307 Studies have shown that nursing homes struggle to strike a balance in attempting to
308 preserve a homelike environment and hospital-level measures to control of infection [11, 19,
309 20]. This is likely to apply to the CC environment as well. CCs would need to consider what
310 measures if implemented would be accepted by both staff and mothers and could be
311 complied with. However, at the same time there is no doubt that infection control measures
312 are needed and hand hygiene is obviously the place to start. Research in this area is much
313 needed as well as research on effective training and methods of consolidating hand hygiene
314 practice in CCs.

315 Many of the home-based TPCs in our control group were also reported to not practice good
316 hand hygiene. There is currently no literature about their hygiene knowledge and practices.
317 However, to improve safe practices, home-based TPCs should also be drawn into training
318 interventions.

319 We found many mothers who stayed at CCs were discouraged from rooming-in with their
320 babies, and their babies spent most of the time in the nursery [7]. Since there is a body of
321 evidence showing that both mother-infant rooming-in and breastfeeding prevent infection
322 [21-24], ways to improve these practices could also be looked at. Although exclusive
323 breastfeeding rates in this study cohort were as good if not better than other local
324 populations, direct breastfeeding rates were poor [7]. Feeding expressed breastmilk carries
325 an increased risk of infection since it involves use of breast pumps and bottles which need a
326 high level of disinfection [25]. One way to improve direct breastfeeding would be to
327 empower CC staff to provide support for direct breastfeeding and to provide rooming-in
328 facilities for mother and baby. This might mean that maternal accommodation needs
329 further study to establish appropriate recommendations, for example, spacing between
330 mothers. There is also a possibility of considering kangaroo care as a means of infection
331 prevention, but studies are needed both in terms of feasibility and safety.

332 A limitation of our study would be that we did not have accurate data on which CC the
333 mothers went to. We feel that our sample of mothers reasonably represents the mothers
334 using CCs in Penang, however it is probable not all CCs in Penang were represented in the
335 data. Since our sampling was of women and not CCs and these 77 women went to around
336 27 CCs, our data represents the number of women and their babies who were exposed to
337 poor hygiene practices and not the number of CCs having poor hygiene practices. Another
338 limitation of the study was the sample size which was not calculated to show a difference in
339 HPRI rates. It is also important to note that our findings are those perceived by mothers.

340 The data was collected after they had left the CC and we did not verify their reports.

341 Therefore, they could be subject to recall bias as well as observer bias. To overcome this
342 bias, further studies in this area should involve CC operators and managers. Therefore, there
343 is a need to establish rapport with them early.

344

345 **Conclusion**

346 We found unsatisfactory hygiene practices in CCs as reported by mothers who spent their
347 confinement period there. Although we were not able to establish any direct evidence of
348 infection transmission but based on reports given by the mothers in this study, it is likely to
349 be happening. Therefore, future studies, including intervention studies, are urgently needed
350 to establish an appropriate hygiene standard in community postpartum care facilities such
351 as these as well as the best method to implement this standard. Empowering CC staff with
352 hygiene knowledge so that they can be involved and contribute to the development of the
353 development of these standards would be important.

354

355 **List of abbreviations**

- 356 1. CC: Confinement centre
- 357 2. TPC: Traditional postpartum carer
- 358 3. HPRI: Health problems that are probably related to infections
- 359 4. HPUI: Health problems that are unlikely related to infections

360

361 **Declarations**

362 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** This study was registered with the National
363 Medical Research Registry (NMRR-17-1174-36384 S1) and ethical approval by Joint Penang

364 Independent Ethics Committee (JPEC 02-18-0026). All mothers gave written informed
365 consent.

366 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable

367 **Availability of data and material:** The datasets used and/or analysed during the current
368 study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

369 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests

370 **Funding:** RCSI & UCD Malaysia Campus provided a research grant (PMC RC-17) but did not
371 play any role in the design of the study, data collection, analysis and interpretation of data
372 nor in the writing of the manuscript or decision to publish.

373 **Authors' contributions:** SCF, WCF, MLT, and JJH were major contributors in the design of
374 the study and in writing the manuscript. WCF and SCF analysed and interpreted the data. All
375 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

376 **Acknowledgements:** The authors acknowledge Ru Jian Jonathan Teoh (initial draft of the
377 protocol); Adele Tan, Hon Kit Cheang, Yee Chern Hwang, Giap Liang Dan, Jessica Tan, Kwai
378 Meng Pong, Siti Khadijah Hamdan, Balkees Abdul Majeed (mother recruitment); Caryn Lim,
379 Wei Wen Lee, Zcho Huey Lee, Claire Lee and Bee Hong Ang (data management); as well as
380 all mothers and hospitals who participated in this study.

381 **Authors' information:** SCF, MLT, WCF and JJH are all paediatricians and advocates for
382 breastfeeding.

383

384 **References**

385 1. Fok D, Aris IM, Ho J, Lim SB, Chua MC, Pang WW, et al. A Comparison of Practices
386 During the Confinement Period among Chinese, Malay, and Indian Mothers in Singapore.
387 Birth. 2016;43(3):247-54.

- 388 2. Raven JH, Chen Q, Tolhurst RJ, Garner P. Traditional beliefs and practices in the
389 postpartum period in Fujian Province, China: a qualitative study. BMC pregnancy and
390 childbirth. 2007;7:8.
- 391 3. Dennis CL, Fung K, Grigoriadis S, Robinson GE, Romans S, Ross L. Traditional
392 postpartum practices and rituals: a qualitative systematic review. Womens Health (Lond).
393 2007;3(4):487-502.
- 394 4. Ding G, Tian Y, Yu J, Vinturache A. Cultural postpartum practices of 'doing the month'
395 in China. Perspect Public Health. 2018;138(3):147-9.
- 396 5. Poh B, Koon W, Yuen P, Norimah A. Postpartum dietary intakes and food taboos
397 among Chinese women attending maternal and child health clinics and maternity hospital,
398 Kuala Lumpur. Mal J Nutr. 2005;11:1-21.
- 399 6. Su-Lyn B. New mothers paying big bucks to be 'confined'. Malay Mail. 2013 7 July
400 2013.
- 401 7. Foong SC, Tan ML, Foong WC, Ho JJ, Rahim FF. Comparing breastfeeding experiences
402 between mothers spending the traditional Chinese confinement period in a confinement
403 centre and those staying at home: a cohort study. International breastfeeding journal.
404 2021;16(1):4.
- 405 8. Bina Rai S, Wan Mansor H, Vasantha T, Norizah I, Chua KB. An outbreak of echovirus
406 11 amongst neonates in a confinement home in Penang, Malaysia. The Medical journal of
407 Malaysia. 2007;62(3):223-6.
- 408 9. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 13. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.
409 2013.

- 410 10. Brown KA, Jones A, Daneman N, Chan AK, Schwartz KL, Garber GE, et al. Association
411 Between Nursing Home Crowding and COVID-19 Infection and Mortality in Ontario, Canada.
412 JAMA internal medicine. 2020.
- 413 11. Hammerschmidt J, Manser T. Nurses' knowledge, behaviour and compliance
414 concerning hand hygiene in nursing homes: a cross-sectional mixed-methods study. BMC
415 health services research. 2019;19(1):547.
- 416 12. Alp E, Ozturk A, Guven M, Celik I, Doganay M, Voss A. Importance of structured
417 training programs and good role models in hand hygiene in developing countries. Journal of
418 infection and public health. 2011;4(2):80-90.
- 419 13. Baldwin A, Mills J, Birks M, Budden L. Role modeling in undergraduate nursing
420 education: an integrative literature review. Nurse education today. 2014;34(6):e18-26.
- 421 14. Cure L, Van Enk R. Effect of hand sanitizer location on hand hygiene compliance.
422 American journal of infection control. 2015;43(9):917-21.
- 423 15. Perry RN. Role modeling excellence in clinical nursing practice. Nurse education in
424 practice. 2009;9(1):36-44.
- 425 16. Yeung WK, Tam WS, Wong TW. Clustered randomized controlled trial of a hand
426 hygiene intervention involving pocket-sized containers of alcohol-based hand rub for the
427 control of infections in long-term care facilities. Infection control and hospital epidemiology.
428 2011;32(1):67-76.
- 429 17. Sax H, Uçkay I, Richet H, Allegranzi B, Pittet D. Determinants of good adherence to
430 hand hygiene among healthcare workers who have extensive exposure to hand hygiene
431 campaigns. Infection control and hospital epidemiology. 2007;28(11):1267-74.

- 432 18. Ivers N, Jamtvedt G, Flottorp S, Young JM, Odgaard-Jensen J, French SD, et al. Audit
433 and feedback: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane*
434 *Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2012(6).
- 435 19. Smith PW, Bennett G, Bradley S, Drinka P, Lautenbach E, Marx J, et al. SHEA/APIC
436 Guideline: Infection prevention and control in the long-term care facility. *American journal*
437 *of infection control*. 2008;36(7):504-35.
- 438 20. Gould DJ, Moralejo D, Drey N, Chudleigh JH, Taljaard M. Interventions to improve
439 hand hygiene compliance in patient care. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;9(9):CD005186-
440 CD.
- 441 21. Mustajab I, Munir M. A rooming-in program for mothers and newborns at Gunung
442 Wenang General Hospital Manado. *Paediatrica Indonesiana*. 1986;26(9-10):177-84.
- 443 22. Kramer MS, Kakuma R. Optimal duration of exclusive breastfeeding. *Cochrane*
444 *Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2012(8).
- 445 23. Sankar MJ, Sinha B, Chowdhury R, Bhandari N, Taneja S, Martines J, et al. Optimal
446 breastfeeding practices and infant and child mortality: a systematic review and meta-
447 analysis. *Acta paediatrica (Oslo, Norway : 1992)*. 2015;104(467):3-13.
- 448 24. Bowatte G, Tham R, Allen KJ, Tan DJ, Lau M, Dai X, et al. Breastfeeding and childhood
449 acute otitis media: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta paediatrica (Oslo, Norway :*
450 *1992)*. 2015;104(467):85-95.
- 451 25. Brown SL, Bright RA, Dwyer DE, Foxman B. Breast pump adverse events: reports to
452 the food and drug administration. *Journal of human lactation : official journal of*
453 *International Lactation Consultant Association*. 2005;21(2):169-74.
- 454