

# A systematic review of observational methods used to quantify personal protective behaviours among members of the public during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the concordance between observational and self-report measures in infectious disease health protection

Rachel Davies<sup>1</sup>, Fiona Mowbray<sup>1</sup>, Alex F Martin<sup>1</sup>, Louise E Smith<sup>1</sup>, G James Rubin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Institute of Health Research Health Protection Research Unit in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's College London, in partnership with the UK Health Security Agency.

Corresponding author: Rachel Davies, King's College London, [Rachel.2.davies@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:Rachel.2.davies@kcl.ac.uk)

**Contribution of authors:**

**RD:** created the search strategy, carried out database searches, identified abstracts for inclusion, extracted data, interpreted the results and wrote and revised the manuscript

**FM:** carried out database searches, identified abstracts for inclusion, extracted data and revised the manuscript

**LS:** advised on the search strategy and revised the manuscript

**AFM:** identified abstracts for inclusion, extracted data and revised the manuscript

**GJR:** conceived and designed the study and aims, advised on results and revised the manuscript

## **Abstract**

**Objectives:** To assess the quantity and quality of studies using an observational measure of behaviour during the COVID-19 pandemic, and to narratively describe the association between self-report and observational data for behaviours relevant to controlling an infectious disease outbreak.

**Design:** Systematic review and narrative synthesis of observational studies.

**Data sources:** We searched Medline, Embase, PsychInfo, Publons, Scopus and the Public Health England behavioural science LitRep database from inception to 17<sup>th</sup> September 2021 for relevant studies.

**Study selection:** We included studies which collected observational data of at least one of three health protective behaviours (hand hygiene, face covering use and maintaining physical distance from others ('social distancing')) during the COVID-19 pandemic. Studies where observational data were compared to self-report data in relation to any infectious disease were also included.

**Data extraction and synthesis:** We evaluated the quality of studies using the NIH quality assessment scale for observational studies, extracted data on sample size, setting and adherence to health protective behaviours, and synthesized results narratively.

**Results:** Of 27,279 published papers on COVID-19 relevant health protective behaviours that included one or more terms relating to hand hygiene, face covering and social distancing, we identified 48 studies that included an objective observational measure. Of these, 35 assessed face covering use, 17 assessed hand hygiene behaviour and seven assessed physical distancing. The general quality of these studies was good. When expanding the search to all infectious diseases, we included 21 studies that compared observational versus self-report data. These almost exclusively studied hand hygiene. The difference in outcomes was striking, with self-report over-estimating observed adherence by up to a factor of five in some settings. In only four papers did self-report match observational data in any domains.

**Conclusions:** Despite their importance in controlling the pandemic, we found remarkably few studies assessing protective behaviours by observation, rather than self-report, though these studies tended to be of reasonably good quality. Observed adherence tends to be substantially lower than estimates obtained via self-report. Accurate assessment of levels of personal protective behaviour, and evaluation of interventions to increase this, would benefit from the use of observational methods.

## Background

Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, members of the public have been urged to engage in a set of behaviours intended to reduce transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. These have included recommendations to practice frequent hand hygiene, avoid close contact with other people ('social distancing') and to wear a face covering to prevent spread through respiratory droplets.<sup>1,2</sup> Although these interventions have been shown to be effective in reducing the transmission of SARS-CoV-2,<sup>3</sup> none of the interventions will work if people do not adhere to them or understand the messaging on when they should adhere.<sup>4</sup>

To date, public engagement with recommended behaviours has primarily been monitored by behavioural scientists, public health agencies and national governments though the use of self-report questionnaires. Using self-report methods to collect data has many benefits. Self-reported data can be quick, easy and relatively inexpensive to obtain from large numbers of participants. The association between self-reported behaviour and other self-reported variables is also relatively straightforward to examine. For many outcomes, self-report can be a good proxy measure for actual behaviour<sup>5</sup>. For example, self-report can be a useful way to assess whether someone has been vaccinated or not<sup>6</sup>. For other behaviours, self-report may be less valid<sup>7</sup>. This may be particularly true for frequently performed behaviours that are difficult to remember (e.g. frequency of handwashing in the past 24 hours) or that would be socially undesirable to admit (e.g. breaking legally enforceable rules around self-isolation)<sup>8,9,10</sup>.

In the context of COVID-19, regularly collected measures of behaviour that do not rely on self-report are rare. Notable exceptions include: mobility data based on mobile phone locations<sup>11</sup>; footfall data in city centres<sup>12</sup>; and official statistics on vaccine uptake based on electronic records<sup>13</sup>. Most of these examples relate to where people are located or whether they engage with health services.

There are fewer regularly collected data based on direct observation quantifying whether and how people engage with COVID-19 protective behaviours. To assist public health agencies in considering whether to collect more observational data, we conducted a systematic review of the use of observational measures of COVID-19 relevant behaviours. We focussed on studies that directly observed the performance of protective behaviours, excluding measures of mobility or location. Our aims were to assess: 1) the quantity of observational studies conducted during COVID-19; 2) the quality of these studies; and 3) the association between self-report and observational data. While we only included COVID-19 related studies for aims one and two, given a lack of data found during screening, we expanded our inclusion criteria for aim three and included studies relating to any infectious disease outbreak.

## Methods

### *Protocol and registration*

This review follows the PRISMA framework and is registered with PROSPERO registration number CRD42021261360. The study protocol is available from: [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\\_record.php?ID=CRD42021261360](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021261360)

### *Search strategies*

For aims one and two, we searched the following electronic databases from inception to 17<sup>th</sup> September 2021: Medline, Embase, PsycInfo, Publons, Scopus, and the Public Health England (PHE) behavioural science COVID-19 Literature Repository database (BSIU LitRep Database. Google Docs. Available from: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1qfR4NgnD5hTAS8KriPaXYhLu1s7fpZJDq8EIXQY0ZE/edit#gid=369408275> (Accessed November 2021)). Databases were searched for articles containing MeSH terms or keywords relating to COVID-19 (e.g. “SARS-CoV-2”, “novel coronavirus”), hand hygiene, physical distancing, or face coverings (e.g. “hand washing”, “face mask”, “physical distancing”) and an observational method (e.g. “observational study”, “videorecording”). Full details of our search strategies are available in Supplementary material.

For aim three, we searched Medline, Embase and PsycInfo from inception to 17<sup>th</sup> September 2021. These were searched for articles containing MeSH terms or keywords relating to hand hygiene, physical distancing, face covering and direct observation. We did not include specific search terms for infectious disease as this was already the focus of the majority of papers investigating the three relevant behaviours.

For both search strategies we examined the reference sections of any pertinent studies and reviews for further references.

### *Eligibility criteria*

For aims one and two, we included studies that were published in English since January 2020, contained an observational measure of hand hygiene, physical distancing or face covering use in relation to COVID-19, assessed these behaviours among the general public or healthcare workers, and contained original data. We excluded studies that contained only location-based data, for example, mobile phone data that measured where in space people were located (rather than what they were doing). We also excluded the use of used crowd density measurements where physical distancing of individuals within the crowd could not be determined. Studies were also excluded if they recorded impressionistic perceptions of behaviour rather than using a systematic method such as using unsystematic sampling methods or retrospective methods based on recall of behaviours.

For aim three, we included studies published in English (no date restrictions), that related to infectious disease control for any pathogen and that contained an observational measure of one or more of our defined behaviours compared to a self-report measure. We excluded studies that contained only self-report or observational data.

### *Study selection*

Titles and abstracts were independently double screened by two separate reviewers (RD screened all citations, FM screened half the citations and AFM screened the other half) using Sysrev Software to identify potentially eligible studies and record decisions. Full texts were then independently double screened (RD screened all citations, FM screened half the citations and AFM screened the other half), with any uncertainties resolved through discussion.

### *Data extraction, items and risk of bias*

Two reviewers (RD, FM) extracted data from included studies. Study and participant characteristics were noted, including study design, sample size, number of opportunities for specified behaviours, location of



observation, population characteristics and prevalence of adherence. Where needed, further details were sought by contacting study authors. For aims one and two, where papers contained a pre and post COVID-19 data collection period, only data collected during the COVID-19 pandemic were included in the narrative synthesis.

Studies were assessed for quality using the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross Sectional Studies<sup>14</sup>.

## Results

27,279 published papers were identified that included terms relating to COVID-19, and one or more terms relating to hand hygiene, face covering and social distancing. When the term 'observational' and related terms were added, 2589 papers were identified and these were screened for aims one and two, from which 105 were selected as potentially relevant to the review. Of these, 57 were excluded. A total of 48 studies met the inclusion criteria (See supplementary material). For aim three we screened 3,331 papers, from which 133 were deemed potentially relevant following abstract screening. Of these, 21 were included in the review.

### *Aim one: Quantity of studies using observational measures*

We included 48<sup>15-62</sup> studies containing an observation component during the COVID-19 pandemic. In total these included at least 116,169 participants and at least 36,060,422 behavioural observational events.

Of the included studies, 39 used direct observers, one used an automated measurement to assess hand hygiene, five used video observations and three used mixed methods including; observation supplemented with a survey, observation supplemented with media data and in-person observation plus automated technology.

Of the 48 included studies, 35 looked at wearing a face covering (five in healthcare workers, 30 in the general public), 17 studies looking at hand hygiene (12 in healthcare workers, five in the general public), and seven looked at physical distancing (one in healthcare workers and six in the general public).

Six studies contained an interventional component intended to improve adherence.

Studies had been conducted in Asia (n=18), North America (n=15), Europe (14), Africa (n=2), and Australia (n=1).

The most common setting for observation was in hospitals (n=20), in stores or shopping centres (n=12), on public streets (n=11), on public transport (n=7), in parks (n=4), high schools or universities (n=3), community healthcare (n=2) and residential care homes (n=1).

For papers for which it could be determined (N=43), sample size varied between 41 and 17,200 (median = 780).

The median number of behavioural observation events for each study was 1,020, with a minimum of 41 and maximum of 35,362,136. Two studies<sup>56,57</sup> had a very high number of observations, one with 35,362,136 opportunities and one with 593,118

Characteristics of all included studies are available in Supplementary material.

#### *Aim two: Quality of studies using observational measures*

Studies with interventions intended to improve adherence to protective behaviours (n=6) were rated out of 11 relevant criteria on the NIH quality assessment checklist and studies with no interventions (n=42) were rated out of eight relevant criteria. Studies with an intervention had a median score of 10, with a range of 8-11 (Figure 1). Studies without an intervention had a median score of 7, with a range of 4-8 (Figure 2). Overall, studies in both groups generally had clearly defined study objectives, populations and variables, however very few studies reported any sample size or power estimates.

Figure 1. Number of intervention studies displaying relevant aspects of NIH quality assessment tool





Figure 2. Number of non-intervention studies displaying relevant aspects of NIH quality assessment tool



### *Aim three: Observational data vs self-report*

In total, 21 studies contained both an observational and self-report component (see Table 1).

Characteristics of all included studies are available in the Supplementary material. Three studies

investigated COVID-19, while 18 investigated other infectious diseases or infectious disease practice pre-

COVID-19. Of the three studies investigating behaviour during COVID-19, all three studied healthcare workers (one in Germany, one in the US and one in Thailand) and one also studied the general public (In Thailand).<sup>26,52,53</sup> . All three looked at hand hygiene adherence; one also looked at face covering use.

Self-reported and observed hand hygiene behaviour differed, with self-reported rates being around twice that of observed rates. The biggest difference seen in hand hygiene rates was 99% self-reported and 46% observed in a study of healthcare workers engaging in community-based patient care activities in the US<sup>52</sup>. Observed adherence in this study varied by the activity as well as by the period during the COVID-19 pandemic when assessments were made.

Self-reported and observed face covering wearing both had high rates of adherence, with 86% self-reported adherence among patients and 95.8% among healthcare workers in one Bangkok hospital, compared to 100% adherence when observed in both groups<sup>25</sup>.

Of 18 studies investigating other infectious diseases, most studies (n=15) looked at hand hygiene in a healthcare worker population<sup>63,64,66,68-77,79,80</sup>, while two studied it in the general public<sup>65,78</sup>. One studied face covering use in healthcare workers<sup>67</sup>. None assessed physical distancing. Studies were conducted in Asia (n=7), North America (n=8), Europe (n=3) and South America (n=1).

Self-reported hand hygiene behaviour was higher than observed data in most studies (n=11). The greatest differences were 31% self-reported versus 6% observed hand hygiene in the general public in Peru<sup>80</sup>, and 67% self-reported versus 15% observed hand hygiene in healthcare workers in a large hospital in Vietnam<sup>72</sup>. In the only study that examined it, face covering wearing was self-reported at 25% but observed at 1% in emergency department personnel at a Minnesota public teaching hospital<sup>67</sup>.

In only one paper was uptake of protective behaviours lower in self-report data than observed data, and this only applied to a small subset of participants, 4% of the total sample, who expressed that their hand hygiene adherence was between 0% and 10%, compared to an observed rate of 35%. 81% of the total

sample rated their hand hygiene adherence as between 80% and 90%, comparable to the 90% adherence that was observed<sup>72</sup>.

Self-reported rates of behaviour matched observed rates in three studies, all studying hand hygiene: one study assessing healthcare workers' in a French university hospital<sup>67</sup>, one looking at medical students' <sup>75</sup>, and one looking at healthcare workers' behaviour in an intensive care unit in South India<sup>81</sup>.

**Table 1. Summary of included studies which reported an observation and self-report measure of health protective behaviour**

Study	Population; location	Observed prevalence	Self-report prevalence
Henry (1992)	ED physicians (12 staff plus rotating residents), medical students, nursing staff, and ancillary personnel; hospital emergency department	Overall face covering wearing adherence: 1.2%	Overall face covering wearing adherence: 25.5%
Raymond (2001)	Tattoo artists; Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN	Overall adherence was 71%	Overall adherence was 83%
Cohen (2002)	Dermatologists; outpatient dermatology clinics in Israel	7 (38.5%) physicians washed hands only after contact with suspected infected material and 1 (7.7%) before each physical examination. Seven physicians (53.9%) washed their hands 1–5 times a day	19 (37.3%) washed their hands only following contact with material suspected of being contaminated, 18 (35.3%) prior to examining every patient, 14 (27.5%) wash hands 1–5 times a day
Moret (2004)	Healthcare workers (physicians, nurses, and nurse assistants); French university hospital	Overall adherence was 74%	Overall adherence was 74%
Snow (2006)	60 students enrolled in a certified nursing program; on day 1 and day 30 of the clinical rotation.	Day 1. Student hand hygiene:49.1%. Day 30. Student hand hygiene:52.3%.	Based on a scale of 10-100. 10 being lowest possible commitment to handwashing. On day 30 students reported 93.0 before patient contact, 95.5 after patient contact, 84.9 before donning gloves, and 95.1 after removal of gloves.
Alemayehu (2009)	Third and fourth year students; U.S. medical school over one academic year at the beginning of every core rotation (medicine, surgery, primary care medicine, paediatrics, obstetrics/gynaecology, neurology, psychiatry)	Overall adherence: 87.9%	Overall adherence: 87.9%

Soyemi, C (2010)	Doctors and nurses; three types of hospitals, i.e., public, security forces, and private, in Eastern Saudi Arabia.	Overall adherence for physicians: 27% Overall adherence for nurses: 29%	Likert scale. Physicians mean self-report was 10.19/15 based on 3 hand hygiene opportunities, and nurses was 13.65/15 based on 3 opportunities.
Jessee (2013)	Staff on 3 medical/surgical units; a 600-bed academic medical centre (AMC) and a 110-bed community medical centre (CMC) in the South-eastern United States	Hand hygiene before glove application, was present in 14% of the CMC and 21% of the AMC staff Hand hygiene on room exit was 25% and 78% respectively.	Hand hygiene before glove application was present in 63% CMC and 50% of AMC staff. Hand hygiene on room exit 16 was 84% and 94% respectively.
Kim (2013)	Doctors; healthcare settings.	Adherence at baseline: 49.7% Adherence in fourth quarter of 2012: 82.3%	Adherence at baseline: 82.9% Adherence in fourth quarter of 2012: 93.8%
Dalen (2013)	Doctors (13%), nurses (70%), housekeeping staff (9%) and visitors of patients (9%); cancer hospital.	Overall hand hygiene adherence, nurses: 47% Overall hand hygiene, doctors: 51%	Overall hand hygiene adherence, nurses: 88% Overall hand hygiene adherence, doctors: 85%
Lakshmi (2015)	Healthcare workers (predominantly nurses); ICU in an oncology, BMT and neurosurgical centre in South India.	Use of alcohol based hand rub 98.5%, 5 moments of hand hygiene 88.5%, 6 steps of hand hygiene 65%.	Use of alcohol based hand rub 98.5%, 5 moments of hand hygiene 88.5%, 6 steps of hand hygiene 92.5%
O'Donoghue (2016)	Healthcare workers, 76 radiographers, 17 nurses, and nine healthcare assistants; a radiography unit.	Overall adherence: 29 % Post-test adherence: 51%	'I wash my hands after using the rest room' was rated a median of 5/5 on a Likert scale, quartiles 4-5 before and after intervention.
Galiani (2016)	General public; households and community settings in Peru	Handwashing with soap was observed in only 16% of the events that required it. 20% of faecal contact events, 25% of eating events, 6% of child feeding events, and 10% of food preparation events.	Less than 50% reported hand washing at times of faecal contact. 39% reported with toilet use, 34% cleaning up after children, 68% when cooking or with food preparation and 31% when feeding a child.

Keller (2018)	ED staff, 100 nurses, 13 staff emergency physicians, 25 medical interns, and various other professions (e.g. maintenance and nursing assistants). Non-ED consulting physicians and surgeons regularly visiting the ED; in an Emergency Department of the University Hospital Zurich	Hand hygiene adherence during baseline: 56%. Hand hygiene adherence during intervention: 64%	Hand hygiene adherence during baseline: 4.12. Hand hygiene during intervention 4.03 (on a Likert scale 1-5, 5 being always)
Baloh (2019)	Healthcare workers; 3 large academic US hospitals	Hand hygiene before gloving was performed 42% of the time	Hand hygiene before gloving was reported 88% of the time
Le (2019)	Healthcare workers (physicians, nurses, care assistants, and student nurses); large central hospital in Vietnam	Physicians overall hand hygiene adherence: 14.6%. Nurses overall hand hygiene adherence: 38.8%	Physicians overall hand hygiene adherence: 67.2%. Nurses overall hand hygiene adherence: 97.8%
Woodard (2019)	Healthcare workers (nurses, physicians, technicians) and patient interactions; 750-bed tertiary care hospital in Baltimore, Maryland.	Overall hand hygiene adherence: 35% of all opportunities. Overall entry and exit hand hygiene adherence: 90%	81% of the sample estimated they miss performing hand hygiene when they realize it should be performed 10%-20% of the time. An additional 11% reported missing hand hygiene 30%-40% of the time. 4% estimated they missed performing hand hygiene 90%-100% of the time.
Kelcikova (2019)	Doctors and nurses; eight hospitals in two countries (five in Slovakia and three in the Czech Republic)	Overall adherence: 67.7%	Overall adherence: 74.0%
Derksen (2020)	Healthcare workers (physicians, midwives, and nurses); two German obstetric hospitals during and after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.	After declaration of pandemic overall hand hygiene adherence: 95%. After body fluid exposure risk: 100%.	After declaration of pandemic overall hand hygiene adherence: M = 5.03, SD = 0.75 on a 6 point scale. After body fluid exposure risk: M = 5.66, SD = 0.67.



Dowding (2020)	400 U.S. home care nurses; community care organization	Overall hand hygiene adherence: 45.6%.	Overall hand hygiene adherence: 99.4%
Skuntaniyom (2021)	119 healthcare workers (mostly nurses and laboratory workers) and 100 general public (mostly administrative workers and professionals); Thailand in two inpatient hospitals providing COVID-19 testing and treatment.	100% of patients and 100% healthcare workers wore face covering correctly. 35.2% of patients and 40.0% of healthcare workers correctly cleaned all areas of both hands.	86% of patients and 95.8% of healthcare workers wore a face covering correctly. 67% of patients and 84.9% of healthcare workers reported adhering to hand hygiene.

### Quality assessment of Non COVID-19 Studies

Studies with interventions intended to improve adherence to protective behaviours (n=2) were rated out of 11 relevant criteria on the NIH quality assessment checklist and studies with no interventions (n=16) were rated out of eight relevant criteria. Studies with an intervention had a median score of 7, with a range of 6-9 (Figure 3). Studies without an intervention had a median score of 6, with a range of 1-8 (Figure 4). Overall, studies in both groups generally had clearly defined study objectives, populations and variables, however very few studies reported any sample size or power estimates.

Figure 3. Number of non-COVID-19 intervention studies displaying relevant aspects of NIH quality assessment tool





Figure 4. Number of non-COVID-19 non-intervention studies displaying relevant aspects of NIH quality assessment tool



## Discussion

Improving uptake of health protective behaviours is an important public health challenge, not only for COVID-19, but for infectious disease prevention more widely. Face coverings, hand hygiene and maintaining physical distance have all been identified as effective infection control strategies that have relatively few downsides in comparison to more far-reaching interventions such as society-wide ‘lockdowns.’<sup>12</sup> Identifying ways to achieve good adherence to such measures requires that we are first able to measure adherence accurately. Though self-report can be a useful proxy for behaviour, our review suggests that academic research has become overly reliant on it, so much so that although we identified 27, 279 papers which included terms related to COVID-19 and to hand hygiene, face covering or social distancing, just 48 of these papers (<0.2%) actually studied the behaviour in question objectively.

It is likely that several factors influence the way in which behaviour is measured. Speed, cost, ease and the ability to explore associations with other variables which may be best measured via self-report (such as, for example, trust in government, exposure to conspiracy theories or the perceived efficacy of an intervention) are all valid reasons for opting to use self-report over observation. Indeed, the importance of ease as a factor likely explains why only seven studies have attempted to assess

physical distancing using observational techniques while 35 have looked at face coverings: it is difficult for an observer to judge distance between two people and to identify whether people need to maintain distance from each other (e.g. if they do or do not live in the same household), but easier to assess whether they are wearing a face covering. Nonetheless, our review also points to the dangers of over-reliance on self-report. The 21 studies that we identified which compared self-report and observed behaviour repeatedly demonstrated that self-report over-estimates hand hygiene behaviour, sometimes dramatically so, while evidence for the validity of self-reported distancing and face covering use is limited in the current literature. Although outside the date range for our search, two recent pre-prints support this point for hand hygiene and extend the evidence of a self-report gap to include face covering and distancing. One study demonstrated that self-reports of “always” wearing a face covering when in specific public spaces in a national UK Government-funded survey matched observed behaviour in those locations, but that an additional 23% of people reported “sometimes” wearing face coverings in these situations, something which could not be accounted for in the observations.<sup>81</sup> The other study, of a single university campus in the UK, found that while 68% of survey respondents reported always cleaning their hands while entering a university building, observation of the only entrance to the main campus building found the true rate to be 16%<sup>82</sup>. Reported and observed rates for distancing were also discordant (49% vs 7%) while the gap for wearing a face covering was smaller but still noticeable (90% vs 82%). While multiple factors may account for these discrepancies<sup>83</sup>, recall bias and social desirability would seem most likely to lead to inflated estimates of behaviours such as hand hygiene and physical distancing. The relative novelty of face coverings for many people, the limited number of occasions they need to be worn during the day for many members of the general public and their greater salience and hence ease of recall may partly mitigate these biases and explain why self-reported wearing of a covering may be a more reliable measure of behaviour than self-reported hand hygiene or distancing.

Notably, the quality of studies that included an observational measure was generally good in most respects. The one exception was that relatively few studies provided a sample size justification. We

suspect this is linked to the difficulty of setting a pre-determined sample size in advance of a naturalistic study. For example, it can be difficult to predict how many people will pass by an observer over a set period of time. The relatively high quality may reflect the tendency for authors who choose to take the difficult route of evaluating behaviour via an objective measure to have also considered other ways of maximising the quality of their study.

#### *Suggestions for future research*

Plenty of scope exists for future work to expand this literature. First, there is a pressing need to establish the validity of self-reported behaviour. At present, the limited literature that exists focusses almost entirely on hand hygiene. During the COVID-19 pandemic we found no studies comparing self-report and observational data for physical distancing and only one for the use of face coverings, although more work in this area is starting to appear<sup>81,82</sup>. Future work should test approaches to improve the validity of self-report data and also test whether the correlates of self-reported behaviour (which are the basis for many policy recommendations and proposed interventions) can be replicated as correlates of observed behaviour. Consideration should be given to the potential differences in validity that may be observed across population and settings. For example, in the studies that we reviewed, observed adherence tended to be higher in studies of healthcare workers than in general population samples.

Second, our review focussed solely on three behaviours: hand hygiene, face covering use and physical distancing. While important, these are only a subset of the complex set of behaviours that members of the public have been encouraged to adopt during the COVID-19 pandemic. We have not systematically reviewed the literature on the validity of self-report measures of, for example, testing uptake or self-isolation, but have no reason to suspect that self-report is more valid for these behaviours, given that there is substantial social desirability involved and that, for some of them, research participants may technically be liable to legal action if they admit to non-adherence. Nonetheless, key studies on these outcomes rely entirely on self-report<sup>84,85</sup>. The one notable exception to this list is vaccination, a

memorable, binary outcome for which self-report has been shown to be reasonably, though not entirely, valid<sup>86,87</sup>.

Third, while our review may give the impression that observation is a single 'gold standard' metric for behaviour, it is clear that there are multiple methods of observation. We identified methods including direct study of behaviours by trained observers, video observation, automated technology, and the use of newly developed technology using AI and machine learning in place of an observer. The use of such technology has been demonstrated with face covering wearing studies, as well as studies that measure crowd density with social distancing within the crowd data<sup>88,89,90</sup>. These techniques all have their pros and cons in terms of intrusiveness, cost, capacity, ability to identify behaviours that may be partially obscured and so on. A 'one-size-fits-all approach' may not be possible. Nonetheless, further work to develop a set of standardised observational protocols for key outcomes may assist in promoting the use of such techniques and allowing better comparison between studies.

### *Limitations*

Several limitations should be considered for this systematic review. First, our conclusions are limited by the availability of data in the literature. The relative absence of observational data relating to face covering wearing or physical distancing is an important result in its own right, but also limits our ability to assess the adequacy of self-report for these behaviours. Second, while we made efforts to search widely for relevant studies, including in COVID-19 specific databases, it is possible that we missed some studies which used terminology relating to an observational method that we did not include in our search. Given the rapidity with which the COVID-19 literature has expanded, with approximately a quarter of a million papers appearing in Scopus alone in less than two years, it is likely that additional studies will have been added to the databases that we searched in the time taken between completing our search and publication of this paper.

In this review, we have not attempted to pool the rates of behaviour observed in the various studies. The differing contexts in the studies we included means that any pooled estimate would not be meaningful. For example, it is probably not useful to compare rates of observed hand hygiene among healthcare workers working on COVID-19 wards<sup>26</sup> with those among high school students attending their graduations<sup>49</sup>.

### *Conclusions*

The COVID-19 pandemic witnessed an explosion in research covering every aspect of the crisis. Within the field of behavioural science, there has been a heavy focus on ways to promote behaviours believed to reduce infection transmission. Almost all of these studies have measured whether people say they have engaged in specific behaviours. Few have measured the behaviour itself. This is problematic. For hand hygiene, observed adherence tends to be substantially lower than estimates obtained via self-report. There are few studies that have tested the validity of self-reported face covering use or physical distancing, but these also suggest that self-reports tend to be biased. Future research in this field should make greater use of observational methods where possible and should carefully consider the validity of any self-report measure where this is not possible.

### *Funding*

This study was funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response, a partnership between the UK Health Security Agency, King's College London and the University of East Anglia. Alex F Martin is supported by the Economic and Social Research Council Grant Number ES/J500057/1. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR, UK Health Security Agency or the Department of Health and Social Care.

## References

1. Scholz U, Freund AM. Determinants of protective behaviours during a nationwide lockdown in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2021;26(3):935-957. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12513
2. Center for Disease Control. Social Distancing. Available at <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/social-distancing.html> (Accessed 09 June 2021)
3. <https://www.bmj.com/content/375/bmj-2021-068302>
4. Williams SN, Armitage CJ, Tampe T, Dienes KD. Public perceptions of non-adherence to COVID-19 measures by self and others in the United Kingdom. *MedRxiv [Preprint]*. 2020;10.1101/2020.11.17.20233486
5. Tesfaye W, Peterson G. Self-reported medication adherence measurement tools: Some options to avoid a legal minefield [published online ahead of print, 2021 Aug 25]. *J Clin Pharm Ther.* 2021;10.1111/jcpt.13515. doi:10.1111/jcpt.13515
6. MANGTANI P, SHAH A, ROBERTS JA. Validation of influenza and pneumococcal vaccine status in adults based on self-report. *Epidemiology and Infection.* 2007;135(1):139-143. doi:10.1017/S0950268806006479
7. Kormos, C. & Gifford, R. The validity of self-report measures of proenvironmental behavior: A meta-analytic review. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 2014. 40, 359–371
8. Dobbins SJ, Jansen K, Dixon HG, et al. Assessing population-wide behaviour change: concordance of 10-year trends in self-reported and observed sun protection. *Int J Public Health.* 2014;59(1):157-166. doi:10.1007/s00038-013-0454-5
9. Prince SA, Adamo KB, Hamel ME, Hardt J, Connor Gorber S, Tremblay M. A comparison of direct versus self-report measures for assessing physical activity in adults: a systematic review. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2008;5:56. Published 2008 Nov 6. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-5-56
10. Smith LE, Mottershaw AL, Egan M, Waller J, Marteau TM, Rubin GJ. Correction: The impact of believing you have had COVID-19 on self-reported behaviour: Cross-sectional survey. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(2):e0248076. Published 2021 Feb 25. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0248076
11. Jeffrey B, Walters CE, Ainslie KEC, et al. Anonymised and aggregated crowd level mobility data from mobile phones suggests that initial compliance with COVID-19 social distancing interventions was high and geographically consistent across the UK. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2020;5:170. Published 2020 Jul 17. doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15997.1
12. Chen L, Grimstead I, Bell D, et al. Estimating Vehicle and Pedestrian Activity from Town and City Traffic Cameras. *Sensors (Basel).* 2021;21(13):4564. Published 2021 Jul 3. doi:10.3390/s21134564
13. Glampson B, Brittain J, Kaura A, Mulla A, Mercuri L, Brett SJ, Aylin P, Sandall T, Goodman I, Redhead J, Saravanakumar K, Mayer EK. North West London COVID-



- 19 Vaccination Programme: Real-world evidence for Vaccine uptake and effectiveness: Retrospective Cohort Study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.* 2021 Jul 8. doi: 10.2196/30010. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34265740.
14. NIH. 2021. Study Quality Assessment Tool. Available at: <https://www.nlm.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools> (Accessed 1 October 2021).
15. Ragusa R, Marranzano M, Lombardo A, Quattrocchi R, Bellia MA, Lupo L. Has the COVID-19 Virus Changed Adherence to Hand Washing among Healthcare Workers?. *Behav Sci (Basel)*. 2021;11(4):53. Published 2021 Apr 15. doi:10.3390/bs11040053
16. Shiraly R, Shayan Z, McLaws ML. Face touching in the time of COVID-19 in Shiraz, Iran. *Am J Infect Control.* 2020;48(12):1559-1561. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.08.009
17. Supehia S, Singh V, Sharma T, Khapre M, Gupta PK. Rational use of face mask in a tertiary care hospital setting during COVID-19 pandemic: An observational study. *Indian J Public Health.* 2020;64(Supplement):S225-S227. doi:10.4103/ijph.IJPH\_493\_20
18. Precioso J, Samorinha C, Alves R. Prevention measures for COVID-19 in retail food stores in Braga, Portugal. *Pulmonology.* 2021;27(3):260-261. doi:10.1016/j.pulmoe.2020.06.009
19. Liebst LS, Ejbye-Ernst P, de Bruin M, Thomas J, Lindegaard MR. Face-touching behaviour as a possible correlate of mask-wearing: A video observational study of public place incidents during the COVID-19 pandemic [published online ahead of print, 2021 Apr 5]. *Transbound Emerg Dis.* 2021;10.1111/tbed.14094. doi:10.1111/tbed.14094
20. Precioso J, Samorinha C. Prevention of COVID-19 in retail food stores in Portugal: The importance of regulations in behavioural change. *Aten Primaria.* 2021;53(2):101953. doi:10.1016/j.aprim.2020.07.011
21. Tam VCW, Tam SY, Khaw ML, Law HKW, Chan CPL, Lee SWY. Behavioural insights and attitudes on community masking during the initial spread of COVID-19 in Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Med J.* 2021;27(2):106-112. doi:10.12809/hkmj209015
22. Ganczak M, Pasek O, Duda-Duma Ł, Świstara D, Korzeń M. Use of masks in public places in Poland during SARS-Cov-2 epidemic: a covert observational study. *BMC Public Health.* 2021;21(1):393. Published 2021 Feb 23. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10418-3
23. Barrios LC, Riggs MA, Green RF, et al. Observed Face Mask Use at Six Universities - United States, September-November 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(6):208-211. Published 2021 Feb 12. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7006e1
24. Datta R, Glenn K, Pellegrino A, et al. Increasing face-mask compliance among healthcare personnel during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic [published online ahead of print, 2021 May 3]. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2021;1-7. doi:10.1017/ice.2021.205
25. Maude RR, Jongdeepaisal M, Skuntaniyom S, et al. Improving knowledge, attitudes and practice to prevent COVID-19 transmission in healthcare workers and the public in

- Thailand. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):749. Published 2021 Apr 18.  
doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10768-y
26. Avo C, Cawthorne KR, Walters J, Healy B. An observational study to identify types of personal protective equipment breaches on inpatient wards. *J Hosp Infect*. 2020;106(1):208-210. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.06.024
27. Haischer MH, Beilfuss R, Hart MR, et al. Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related differences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(10):e0240785. Published 2020 Oct 15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0240785
28. Beckage B, Buckley TE, Beckage ME. Prevalence of Face Mask Wearing in Northern Vermont in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Public Health Rep*. 2021;136(4):451-456. doi:10.1177/00333549211009496
29. Dzisi EKJ, Dei OA. Adherence to social distancing and wearing of masks within public transportation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Transp Res Interdiscip Perspect*. 2020;7:100191. doi:10.1016/j.trip.2020.100191
30. Gunasekaran, S.S.; Gunasekaran, S.S.; Gunasekaran, G.H.; Zaimi, N.S.I.; Halim, N.A.A.; Halim, F.H.A. Factors associated with incorrect facemask use among individuals visiting high-risk locations during COVID-19 pandemic. *Int. J. Public Health* **2020**, *18*, 38–48.
31. Cumbo E, Scardina GA. Management and use of filter masks in the "none-medical" population during the COVID-19 period. *Saf Sci*. 2021;133:104997. doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104997
32. Chutipimon H, Thipsunate A, Cherdchim A, et al. Effectiveness of Innovation Media for Improving Physical Distancing Compliance during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Quasi-Experiment in Thailand. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(22):8535. Published 2020 Nov 17. doi:10.3390/ijerph17228535
33. Guellich A, Tella E, Ariane M, Grodner C, Nguyen-Chi HN, Mahé E. The face mask-touching behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic: Observational study of public transportation users in the greater Paris region: The French-mask-touch study. *J Transp Health*. 2021;21:101078. doi:10.1016/j.jth.2021.101078
34. Newman MG. An Observational Study of Mask Guideline Compliance In An Outpatient OB/GYN Clinic Population. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2020;255:268-269. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2020.10.048
35. Wichaidit W, Naknual S, Kleangkert N, Liabsuetrakul T. Installation of pedal-operated alcohol gel dispensers with behavioral nudges and changes in hand hygiene behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic: A hospital-based quasi-experimental study. *J Public Health Res*. 2020;9(4):1863. Published 2020 Oct 26. doi:10.4081/jphr.2020.1863
36. Rahimi Z, Shirali GA, Araban M, Mohammadi MJ, Cheraghian B. Mask use among pedestrians during the COVID-19 pandemic in Southwest Iran: an observational study on 10,440 people. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):133. Published 2021 Jan 14. doi:10.1186/s12889-020-10152-2

37. Chen YJ, Qin G, Chen J, et al. Comparison of Face-Touching Behaviors Before and During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(7):e2016924. Published 2020 Jul 1. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.16924
38. Zhou Q, Lai X, Zhang X, Tan L. Compliance measurement and observed influencing factors of hand hygiene based on COVID-19 guidelines in China. *Am J Infect Control*. 2020;48(9):1074-1079. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.05.043
39. Neuwirth MM, Mattner F, Otchwemah R. Adherence to personal protective equipment use among healthcare workers caring for confirmed COVID-19 and alleged non-COVID-19 patients. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2020;9(1):199. Published 2020 Dec 10. doi:10.1186/s13756-020-00864-w
40. Kungurova, Y., Mera, R., Brewster, E., Ali, K., & Fakoya, A. O. (2020). COVID-19 and face mask use: A St. Kitts case study. Open access Maced. Journal of Medical Sciences., 8, 346–352. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.iee.v38n2e13>
41. Natnael T, Alemnew Y, Berihun G, et al. Facemask wearing to prevent COVID-19 transmission and associated factors among taxi drivers in Dessie City and Kombolcha Town, Ethiopia. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(3):e0247954. Published 2021 Mar 12. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0247954
42. Parikh A, Kondapalli S. FACE COVERING ADHERENCE IN AN OUTPATIENT OPHTHALMOLOGY CLINIC DURING COVID-19-19. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol*. 2021;28(4):365-368. doi:10.1080/09286586.2020.1866022
43. Kellerer JD, Rohringer M, Deufert D. Behavior in the use of face masks in the context of COVID-19-19. *Public Health Nurs*. 2021;38(5):862-868. doi:10.1111/phn.12918
44. Gosadi IM, Daghiri KA, Shugairi AA, et al. Community-based observational assessment of compliance by the public with COVID-19 preventive measures in the south of Saudi Arabia. *Saudi J Biol Sci*. 2021;28(3):1938-1943. doi:10.1016/j.sjbs.2020.12.045
45. Tamamoto KA, Rousslang ND, Ahn HJ, Better HE, Hong RA. Public Compliance with Face Mask Use in Honolulu and Regional Variation. *Hawaii J Health Soc Welf*. 2020;79(9):268-271.
46. Jabbari P, Taraghikhah N, Jabbari F, Ebrahimi S, Rezaei N. Adherence of the General Public to Self-Protection Guidelines During the COVID-19 Pandemic [published online ahead of print, 2020 Nov 18]. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2020;1-4. doi:10.1017/dmp.2020.445
47. Deschanvres C, Haudebourg T, Peiffer-Smadja N, et al. How do the general population behave with facemasks to prevent COVID-19 in the community? A multi-site observational study. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2021;10(1):61. Published 2021 Mar 29. doi:10.1186/s13756-021-00927-6
48. Sun Y, Lam TH, Cheung YTD, et al. First Report on Smoking and Infection Control Behaviours at Outdoor Hotspots during the COVID-19 Pandemic: An Unobtrusive Observational Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(3):1031. Published 2021 Jan 25. doi:10.3390/ijerph18031031

49. Mueller AS, Diefendorf S, Abrutyn S, et al. Youth Mask-Wearing and Social-Distancing Behavior at In-Person High School Graduations During the COVID-19Pandemic. *J Adolesc Health*. 2021;68(3):464-471. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.12.123
50. C. Cong, Z. Yang, Y. Song and M. Pagnucco, "Towards Enforcing Social Distancing Regulations with Occlusion-Aware Crowd Detection," 2020 16th International Conference on Control, Automation, Robotics and Vision (ICARCV), 2020, pp. 297-302, doi: 10.1109/ICARCV50220.2020.9305507.
51. Derksen C, Keller FM, Lippke S. Obstetric Healthcare Workers' Adherence to Hand Hygiene Recommendations during the COVID-19Pandemic: Observations and Social-Cognitive Determinants. *Appl Psychol Health Well Being*. 2020;12(4):1286-1305. doi:10.1111/aphw.12240
52. Dowding D, McDonald MV, Shang J. Implications of a US study on infection prevention and control in community settings in the UK. *Br J Community Nurs*. 2020;25(12):578-583. doi:10.12968/bjcn.2020.25.12.578
53. Mukherjee R, Roy P, Parik M. Achieving Perfect Hand Washing: an Audit Cycle with Surgical Internees [published online ahead of print, 2020 Oct 6]. *Indian J Surg*. 2020;1-7. doi:10.1007/s12262-020-02619-8
54. Au JKL, Suen LKP, Lam SC. Observational study of compliance with infection control practices among healthcare workers in subsidized and private residential care homes. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2021;21(1):75. Published 2021 Jan 14. doi:10.1186/s12879-021-05767-8
55. Chuang, Y., and Liu, J. C. E. (2020). Who wears a mask? Gender differences in risk behaviors in the COVID-19early days in Taiwan. *Econ. Bull.* 40, 2619–2627. Available online at: <https://ideas.repec.org/a/ebl/ecbull/eb-20-00882.html>
56. Moore LD, Robbins G, Quinn J, Arbogast JW. The impact of COVID-19pandemic on hand hygiene performance in hospitals. *Am J Infect Control*. 2021;49(1):30-33. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.08.021
57. Hess OCR, Armstrong-Novak JD, Doll M, et al. The impact of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19-19) on provider use of electronic hand hygiene monitoring technology. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2021;42(8):1007-1009. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.1336
58. Choi UY, Kwon YM, Kang HJ, et al. Surveillance of the infection prevention and control practices of healthcare workers by an infection control surveillance-working group and a team of infection control coordinators during the COVID-19pandemic. *J Infect Public Health*. 2021;14(4):454-460. doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2021.01.012
59. Roshan R, Feroz AS, Rafique Z, Virani N. Rigorous Hand Hygiene Practices Among Health Care Workers Reduce Hospital-Associated Infections During the COVID-19Pandemic. *J Prim Care Community Health*. 2020;11:2150132720943331. doi:10.1177/2150132720943331
60. Clinton M, Sankar J, Ramesh V, Madhusudan M. Use of Proper Personal Protective Measures among Parents of Children Attending Outpatient Department - An

- Observational Study. *Indian J Pediatr.* 2021;88(5):480. doi:10.1007/s12098-020-03624-1
61. McDonald MV, Brickner C, Russell D, et al. Observation of Hand Hygiene Practices in Home Health Care. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2021;22(5):1029-1034. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2020.07.031
  62. Miller ZD, Freimund W, Dalenberg D, Vega M. Observing COVID-19 related behaviors in a high visitor use area of Arches National Park. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(2):e0247315. Published 2021 Feb 22. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0247315
  63. Snow M, White GL Jr, Alder SC, Stanford JB. Mentor's hand hygiene practices influence student's hand hygiene rates. *Am J Infect Control.* 2006;34(1):18-24. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2005.05.009
  64. Cohen HA, Kitai E, Levy I, Ben-Amitai D. Handwashing patterns in two dermatology clinics. *Dermatology.* 2002;205(4):358-361. doi:10.1159/000066421
  65. Raymond MJ, Pirie PL, Halcón LL. Infection control among professional tattooists in Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN. *Public Health Rep.* 2001;116(3):249-256. doi:10.1093/phr/116.3.249
  66. Moret L, Tequi B, Lombraill P. Should self-assessment methods be used to measure compliance with handwashing recommendations? A study carried out in a French university hospital. *Am J Infect Control.* 2004;32(7):384-390. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2004.02.004
  67. Henry K, Campbell S, Maki M. A comparison of observed and self-reported compliance with universal precautions among emergency department personnel at a Minnesota public teaching hospital: implications for assessing infection control programs. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1992;21(8):940-946. doi:10.1016/s0196-0644(05)82932-4
  68. Baloh J, Thom KA, Perencevich E, et al. Hand hygiene before donning nonsterile gloves: Healthcareworkers' beliefs and practices. *Am J Infect Control.* 2019;47(5):492-497. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2018.11.015
  69. Jessee MA, Mion LC. Is evidence guiding practice? Reported versus observed adherence to contact precautions: a pilot study. *Am J Infect Control.* 2013;41(11):965-970. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2013.05.005
  70. Le CD, Lehman EB, Nguyen TH, Craig TJ. Hand Hygiene Compliance Study at a Large Central Hospital in Vietnam. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2019;16(4):607. Published 2019 Feb 19. doi:10.3390/ijerph16040607
  71. Keller J, Wolfensberger A, Clack L, et al. Do wearable alcohol-based handrub dispensers increase hand hygiene compliance? - a mixed-methods study. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control.* 2018;7:143. Published 2018 Nov 23. doi:10.1186/s13756-018-0439-5
  72. Woodard JA, Leekha S, Jackson SS, Thom KA. Beyond entry and exit: Hand hygiene at the bedside. *Am J Infect Control.* 2019;47(5):487-491. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2018.10.026
  73. C Soyemi et.al. Comparison of Patient and Healthcare Professional Perceptions of Hand Hygiene Practices with the Monthly Internal Audit at a Tertiary Medical Center. *American Journal of Infection Control.* 2011;39(5)
  74. Alemayehu H, Ho V et al. Medical students and hospital hand hygiene - What do they know, and what do they do? *P. Surg. Infect.* 2011, 12: S1

75. Kim, S., Cho, M., Kim, W. *et al.* P137: Effectiveness of a hand hygiene improvement program in doctors: active monitoring and real-time feedback. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* **2**, P137 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1186/2047-2994-2-S1-P137>
76. van Dalen R, Gombert K, Bhattacharya S, Datta SS. Mind the mind: results of a hand-hygiene research in a state-of-the-art cancer hospital. *Indian J Med Microbiol.* 2013;31(3):280-282. doi:10.4103/0255-0857.115639
77. O'Donoghue M, Ng SH, Suen LK, Boost M. A quasi-experimental study to determine the effects of a multifaceted educational intervention on hand hygiene compliance in a radiography unit. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control.* 2016;5:36. Published 2016 Oct 19. doi:10.1186/s13756-016-0133-4
78. Galiani S, Gertler P, Ajzenman N, Orsola-Vidal A. Promoting Handwashing Behavior: The Effects of Large-scale Community and School-level Interventions. *Health Econ.* 2016;25(12):1545-1559. doi:10.1002/hec.3273
79. Lakshmi, V., Ghafur, A., Mageshkumar, K. *et al.* Knowledge and practice of infection control – in the NDM1 era. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* **4**, P118 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1186/2047-2994-4-S1-P118>
80. Kelcikova S, Mazuchova L, Bielena L, Filova L. Flawed self-assessment in hand hygiene: A major contributor to infections in clinical practice?. *J Clin Nurs.* 2019;28(11-12):2265-2275. doi:10.1111/jocn.14823
81. Davies R *et al.* The impact of “freedom day” on COVID-19 health protective behaviour in England: An observational study of hand hygiene, face covering use and physical distancing in public spaces pre and post the relaxing of restrictions. OSF. Available from: [OSF | Manuscript observational study - preprint 19-10-2021.pdf](https://www.osf.io/manifest/10.13102/OSF.MANUSCRIPTOBSERVATIONALSTUDY-PREPRINT19-10-2021.PDF)
82. Davies R, Weinman J, Rubin GJ. Observed and self-reported COVID-19 health protection behaviours on a university campus and the impact of a single simple intervention. MedRxiv. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.06.15.21258920v1>
83. (Kormos, C. & Gifford, R. The validity of self - report measures of proenvironmental behavior: A meta - analytic review. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 2014. 40, 359 – 371)
84. Smith, L. E., Potts, H., Amlôt, R., Fear, N. T., Michie, S., & Rubin, G. J. (2021). Adherence to the test, trace, and isolate system in the UK: results from 37 nationally representative surveys. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 372, n608. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n608>
85. [www.ons.gov.uk](https://www.ons.gov.uk). (2021). Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England - Office for National Statistics. [online] Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/27septemberto2october2021> [Accessed 19 Nov. 2021].
86. Mangtani, P., Shah, A., & Roberts, J. A. (2007). Validation of influenza and pneumococcal vaccine status in adults based on self-report. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 135(1), 139–143. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268806006479>
87. Rolnick, S. J., Parker, E. D., Nordin, J. D., Hedblom, B. D., Wei, F., Kerby, T., Jackson, J. M., Crain, A. L., & Euler, G. (2013). Self-report compared to electronic medical record across eight adult vaccines: do results vary by demographic factors?. *Vaccine*, 31(37), 3928–3935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2013.06.041>

88. Gupta, C et.al. Coronamask: A Face Mask Detector for Real-Time Data. International Journal of Advanced Trends in Computer Science and Engineering. 2020;9. 5624-5630. [10.30534/ijatcse/2020/212942020](https://doi.org/10.30534/ijatcse/2020/212942020).
89. Pouw CAS, Toschi F, van Schadewijk F, Corbetta A. Monitoring physical distancing for crowd management: Real-time trajectory and group analysis. PLoS One. 2020;29;15(10):e0240963. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0240963](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240963).
90. Cawthorne KR, Oliver C, Cooke RPD. A user's view of commercial mobile applications designed to measure hand hygiene compliance by direct observation [published online ahead of print, 2021 Aug 14]. J Hosp Infect. 2021;117:4-8. doi:[10.1016/j.jhin.2021.08.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2021.08.008)

## Supplementary Material




Figure 5: Flow chart for included studies aims one and two






Figure 6: Flowchart for included studies aim three

Table 2: Characteristics of included studies aims one and two (COVID-19 papers)

	Date of observations	Date of publication	Intervention component	Study design	Number of events	Sample size	Hand hygiene adherence %	Face covering adherence %	Social distance adherence %	Where did observations take place	Population observed	Other location data
1	1 Jan 2015-31 Dec 2020	Apr-21	no	direct observer	13494	13494	66%	n/a	n/a	hospital	healthcare workers	Sicily, Italy
2	22 Apr-9 May 2020	13-Aug-20	no	direct observer	1000	1000	n/a	57%	n/a	public parks, banks, outpatient clinics, bus stations	general population	Iran
3	not reported	02-Jun-20	no	direct observer	382	382	n/a	64.1%	n/a	hospital	healthcare workers and hospital staff	India
4	5-8 Apr 2020	09-Jul-20	no	direct observer	78	78	n/a	32%	n/a	food stores	general population	Braga, Portugal
5	May-Jun 2020	18-May-21	no	video observation	383	383	n/a	43%	n/a	public streets	general population	Amsterdam, Netherlands
6	5-8 Apr 20; 18-27 Apr 20; 18-27 Jun 2020	Feb-21	no	direct observer	238	238	n/a	96.6% men, 100% women	n/a	food stores	general population	Braga, Portugal
7	1-29 Feb 2020	25-Mar-21	no	direct observer	10211	10211	n/a	82.5%	n/a	public streets	general population	Hong Kong
8	10, 18, 25 May 2020	23-Feb-21	no	direct observer	3965	2353	n/a	73.6% at time 1; 66.5% at time 2;	n/a	public streets, parks, enclosed	general population	Poland

								65.7% at time 3; highest while shopping (84.9%; 81.7 and 80.3%) and the lowest during outdoor sport activity (63%; 53.5 and 48.7%).		shopping centres		
9	Sep-Nov 2020	05-Feb-21	no	direct observer	17200	17200	n/a	76.70%	n/a	universities	staff and students	rural and urban universities across USA
10	20 Jul 2020 for 4 weeks; 21 Sep 2020 for 14 weeks	03-May-21	yes	direct observer	4122	4122	n/a	82.2% pre intervention; 92.2% wore after intervention	n/a	hospitals	healthcare workers	Connecticut, USA
11	Jul-Aug 2020; 23-30 Nov 2020; 1-5 Dec 2020	18-Apr-21	yes	direct observer	219	219	35.2%; 40% healthcare workers	100% of public and healthcare workers	n/a	hospitals	patients and healthcare workers	Bangkok, Thailand
12	May-20	01-Sep-20	no	direct observer	271	271	n/a	94.2% overall. 100% on COVID-19-designated	n/a	hospital	healthcare workers	UK

								wards and 48% on non-COVID-19 wards				
13	3-9 Jun 2020; 24 Jul-3 Aug 2020	15-Oct-20	no	direct observer	9935	9935	n/a	41.5%	n/a	retail stores	general population	rural and urban Wisconsin, USA
14	16-30 May 2020	13-Apr-21	no	direct observer	1004	1004	n/a	75.5%	n/a	public businesses	general population	Vermont, USA
15	5-8 May 2020	03-Aug-20	no	direct observer	892 face cover wearing, 871 social distancing	1641	n/a	12.6%	98% adherence	vehicles	drivers and passengers	Ghana
16	30 Mar-12 Apr 2020	Sep-20	no	direct observer	3322	3322	n/a	98.2% wore face cover; 92.3% wore face cover correctly	n/a	market, hospital	general population	Malaysia
17	12 days 9am-8pm during 'phase 2' in Italy	01-Jan-21	no	direct observer	1036	1036	n/a	25.5%	n/a	in the street', most people observed were outside shops, waiting to enter	general population (excluded children and 'people with special needs')	Italy
18	11am to 1pm 6-9 Aug 2020	17-Nov-20	yes	video observation quasi experiment;	1286	400	n/a	n/a	20%	a university canteen	university canteen customers	Thailand

				comparative behavioural observation								
19	4-25 May 2020	03-May-21	no	direct observer	182	182	n/a	94%	n/a	on public transport (subway and local trains)	public transportation users	Paris, France
20	21 Sep 2020 to 2 Oct 2020	24-Oct-20	no	direct observer	187	187	n/a	80.1% at perimeter, 93.4% by entry	n/a	general ob/gyn outpatient clinic	patients and visitors	North Carolina, USA
21	15-18 Jun 2020; 20-21 Jun 2020; 22-24 Jun 2020	14-Oct-20	yes	direct observer-quasi experiment; comparative behavioural observation	466	466	0% adherence pre intervention; 12% adherence post intervention	n/a	n/a	hospital	outpatients and visitors	Thailand
22	2-11 Aug 2020	14-Jan-21	no	direct observer	10440	10440	n/a	45.6% wore face cover; 75.6% of face covering wearers wore it correctly	n/a	in the street	general population	8 urban districts, 92 neighbourhoods of Ahvaz, Iran
23	Jan 2018-October	29-Jul-20	no	video observation	7586	7586	n/a	face cover wearing	n/a	public transport	general population	China, Japan,

	2019; Feb-Mar 2020			on				increased in all regions except the US, from (1.1%) to (99.4%) in mainland China.(3.1%) to (38.7%) in Japan (0.8%) to (85.5%) in South Korea. (0.2%) to (1.6%) in Western Europe and (0.4%) to (2.1%) in the US		ation stations, streets, parks		South Korea, US, England, France, Germany, Spain, Italy
24	5-7 Mar 2020	06-Jun-20	no	direct observer	1761	n/a	79.44%	n/a	n/a	hospital	healthcare workers	Tongji, China
25	27 Feb-21 Apr 2020	10-Dec-20	no	direct observer	610	127	82% adherence in COVID-19ward vs 65% non-COVID-19 ward	n/a	n/a	hospital pulmonary department	healthcare workers	Cologne, Germany
26	21-30 Apr 2020	26-Oct-20	no	direct observer	468	468	n/a	85.42% wore face	n/a	street, public	general population	Basseterre, St. Kitts

								covering; 66% wore face covering correctly;		transportation, grocery store line		
27	Jul-Aug 2020	12-Mar-21	no	direct observer	422	422	n/a	54.68%	n/a	taxi stands	taxi drivers	Dessie City and Kombolcha Towns, Ethiopia
28	20-24 Jul 2020	28-Dec-20	no	direct observer	2302	2286	n/a	98%	n/a	ophthalmology outpatient clinics	patients	Pennsylvania, USA
29	Apr-Jun 2020	03-May-21	no	direct observer	2080	2080	n/a	65%	n/a	outside grocery stores	general population	Western Australia
30	Jul-20	05-Jan-21	no	direct observer	1096	1096	n/a	70.2% at mosque; 68.7% in malls; 32.6% in park; 45.2% in barbershop	n/a	in the community (mosques, malls, parks, barbershops)	general population	cities in Jazan region of Saudi Arabia
31	30-Jul-20	01-Sep-20	no	direct observer	200	100	n/a	77%	n/a	outdoor street locations	general population	Waikiki and Honolulu, Hawaii, USA
32	Jun-20	18-Nov-20	no	direct observer	431	431	57.46% adherence on subway	78.35% on subway; 46.01% when shopping	n/a	subway station and a shop	general population	Tehran, Iran
								44.78% adherence when				

							shopp ing					
33	25 Jun-21 Jul 2020	29-Mar-21	no	direct observer	3354	3354	n/a	56.4% wore face coverings; 75.2% of face coverings were worn correctly	n/a	inside shoppin g centres and train stations; outside shoppin g centres	general population	13 cities in Pays de la Loire, France
34	4 May-11 Jun 2020	25-Jan-21	no	direct observer	3061	3061	2%	96% smokers possessed a face covering. While smoking, 0.2% wore there face covering fully, 81.6% of smokers put the face cover under the chin and 13.8% carried it in the hand, 32.4% did not wear a face covering immediate ly after	25.7%	outdoor street location s	general population	Hong Kong



								smoking.				
35	Jul-20	24-Jan-21	no	mixed methods. direct observer/ media	1152	1152 people	n/a	70%	0	in person high school graduation	high school students	USA
36	unstated, during COVID-19	Dec-20	no	video observation	1594	1594	n/a	n/a	40.4% Oxford Town Centre dataset; 17.6% in the Mall dataset; and, 58.1% CUHK Square dataset	oxford town centre	all general public any age	city centre/shopping mall UK
37	2 January to 15 March 2020	Oct-21	no	direct observer	267	unknown	47 per cent pre-COVID-19 pandemic to 95 per cent just before lockdown	n/a	n/a	obstetric ward	healthcare worker	Germany
38	unknown	Dec-20	no	direct observer and survey	400	400 people	45.6%	n/a	n/a	home health care	nurses	USA
39	June 1, 2020, to	Oct-20	yes	direct observer	42	42 people	33.59%	n/a	n/a	tertiary care	surgical trainees	Calcutta

	July 1, 2020									hospital		
40	unknown	Jan-21	no	direct observer	1053	unknown	15%	68.2%	n/a	private and government-subsidized RCHs	healthcare worker	Hong Kong
41	February 7 to 25, 2020	2020	no	direct observer	11680	12208 people	n/a	for women, 70.5% and men 50%	n/a	residential areas, shopping districts, office quarters	adults and children over 2 in general population.	Taipei and major satellite cities in New Taipei
42	10 weeks before the time of the school closures (the week beginning January 5 through the week beginning March 8) with the 10-week period after school closures (the week beginning March 15 through the week	Jan-21	no	automated technology hand sanitizer event measurement	35,362,136	unknown	48.52% before the school closures to 58.05% after	n/a	n/a	9 US hospitals	healthcare workers/general public	USA

	beginning May 17).											
43	Mar 2020 - Jun 2020)	Nov-20	no	mixed methods. automated technology hand sanitizer event measurement and observer	593,118	unknown	85% hospital wide and 90% on COVID-19 wards	n/a	n/a	inpatient areas of the hospital	healthcare workers	USA

44	April to July 2020	Apr-21	yes	direct observer	60	60	n/a	n/a	78.3%	regional hospital in Korea.	healthcare workers	Korea
----	--------------------	--------	-----	-----------------	----	----	-----	-----	-------	-----------------------------	--------------------	-------

45	March and April 2020	April 2020	no	direct observer	unknown	unknown	97%	n/a	n/a	tertiary care hospital Pakistan	healthcare workers	Pakistan
----	----------------------	------------	----	-----------------	---------	---------	-----	-----	-----	---------------------------------	--------------------	----------

46	Oct-20	Jul-20	no	direct observer	300	300	85%	74%	86%	paediatric tertiary care centre	parents of children on arrival to hospital	India
----	--------	--------	----	-----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---------------------------------	--	-------

47	unknown	Sep-20	no	direct observer	400	48	45.6%. highest after contact with body fluid (65.1%) and lowest after touching a patient (29.5%).	n/a	n/a	home health care	healthcare workers	USA
----	---------	--------	----	-----------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	------------------	--------------------	-----

48	Jul-20	Feb-21	no	video recording	780	780	n/a	61%	69%	Arches National Park	general public	USA
----	--------	--------	----	-----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----------------------	----------------	-----



**Table 3: Characteristics of included studies aim 3 (Non COVID-19)**

<b>Study</b>	<b>Date of observation</b>	<b>Date of pub</b>	<b>Study design</b>	<b>Number of events</b>	<b>Sample size</b>	<b>Hand hygiene adherence observed</b>	<b>Self-reported prevalence</b>	<b>Where did observations take place</b>	<b>Population observed</b>	<b>Other location data</b>
1	unknown	2006	direct observer/survey	890	60	period 1, student hand hygiene was 49.1%, mentors 44.3 % during observation 1 period 2, student hand hygiene was 52.3%, mentor 53.3%.	students reported 92.98 before patient contact, 95.53 for commitment to handwashing after patient contact, 84.89 before donning gloves, and 95.11 after removal of gloves. Based on a scale of 10-100. 10 being lowest possible.	hospital setting	sixty students enrolled in a certified nursing program were selected to participate in the study.	USA
2	unknown but questionnaire was 1 year before observations	2002	questionnaire, observation and hand bacteria measurement	555 observed hand hygiene opportunities	13 observed, 51 survey responses (from a conference - not the same people)	31.4% of all opportunities; 53.9% 1-5 times a day; 38.5% only after contact with infected material;	37.3% following contact with contaminant; 35.3% prior to every patient examination; 27.5% 1-5 times a day 3.9% following every	two outpatient dermatology clinics	physicians	Israel

						7.7% before each physical examination	patient exam; 3.9% once per hour			
3	October 1999-April 2000	2001	questionnaire, observation	not reported	61 artists surveyed, 25 of whom were observed	71%	83%	29 professional tattoo studios	professional tattooists	the seven-county metropolitan area of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota
4	Sep-02	Nov-04	questionnaire, observation	not reported	1050 survey responses, 206 observed	74%	74%	25 care units within a University Hospital	medical staff (physicians, nurses, nursing assistants)	Nantes University Hospital, France
5	July-Sept 1989	Jan-92	questionnaire, observation	1,018 procedures were reported x 4 outcomes = 4072	66 survey responses, 88 staff working (not reported how many were observed)	face covering 1.2%;	face coverings: 25.5%;	emergency department of a university hospital	medical staff (12 staff physicians, five to ten resident physicians, physician assistants registered nurses, nursing assistants and other ancillary and support staff) healthcare workers	urban, the Minneapolis/StPaul (twin cities) metropolitan area

6	2016 observations, 6 months later (2017) interviews	2019	interview and observation	4957 hand hygiene opportunities	25 interviews, observed not stated	hand hygiene before gloving was performed 42%	88%	3 teaching hospitals, including 33 units (haemodialysis units, paediatric wards, intensive care units (ICUs), and emergency departments (EDs))	(physician, physician assistant, nurse, nursing assistant, nurse practitioner)	eastern and midwestern USA
7	Nov-13	March-May	mixed methods, self-		51	hand hygiene	hand hygiene before glove	3 medical/surgic	registered nurses	USA

		2012	report and direct observed by observer	91		before glove application, was present in 14% of the CMCs and 21% of the MDAMCs	application CMCs (63%) MDAMCs (50%). hand hygiene on room exit CMCs (84%) MDAMCs (94%)	al units at 2 medical centres within the south-eastern United States. One was a 44-bed medical/surgical unit at a 110-bed community medical centre (CMC) and the other 2 units were 28-bed medical/surgical units at a 600 bed magnet-designated academic medical centre (MDAMC)	comprised 78% of the total sample of respondents. Although physicians and therapy providers were invited to participate, none completed the survey. Therefore, results focus on licensed and unlicensed nursing staff.	
8	unknown	Feb-19	mixed methods: direct observer and survey	997	371 survey participants. 997 people observed	physicians had the lowest rate of compliance at 14.6%, while nurses had the highest rate of compliance at 38.8%.	physicians had the lowest rate (67.2%) of self-reported hand hygiene compliance, while nurses had the highest rate (97.8%),	11 inpatient service departments were chosen for the study: Five internal medicine services, five paediatrics services, and one intensive care unit service	the subjects of the study were healthcare workers of different positions: physicians, nurses, care assistants, and student nurses.	Vietnam
9	April and June 2016	May 2019	direct observers and	811 opportunities	87	overall hand hygiene	self-reported hand hygiene	University Hospital	healthcare workers	Switzerland

			survey	observed. A total of 87 questionnaires were returned		compliance was 56% during baseline and 64% during intervention period, respectively.	compliance did not differ between baseline and intervention (4.12 vs 4.03) on a Likert scale 1-5, 5 being always	Zurich		
10	July-August 2016	May-19	mixed methods: direct observer and survey, interviews	302.	104 observed, 218 survey	hand hygiene was 35% of all opportunities. Overall entry and exit hand compliance was 90%	81% of the sample estimating they miss performing hand hygiene when they realize it should be performed 10%-20% of the time. An additional 11% reported missing hand hygiene 30%-40% of the time. 4% estimated they missed performing hand hygiene 90%-100% of the time.	ICU at the University of Maryland Medical Center, a 750-bed tertiary care hospital in Baltimore, Maryland.	healthcare workers	USA
11	unknown	Oct-18	mixed methods, self-report and direct observed by observer	249 observed hand hygiene	87 participants (46 medical doctors, 21 from the public hospital, 9 from the	physicians (27%) and nurses (29%)	Likert scale. Physicians mean self-report was 10.19/15 based on 3 hand hygiene opportunities, and nurses was	outpatient examination rooms and emergency departments of three types of hospitals	87 physicians and nurses recruited while on duty during the scheduled observation periods, with each healthcare	Eastern region of Saudi Arabia

					private clinic, and 16 from the Security Forces; and 41 nurses, 14 from the public hospital, 9 from the private clinic, and 18 from the security forces hospital) were recruited. Of the 87 participants who completed the questionnaire , 83 participants were observed during exams with at least three patients and hand hygiene practices were recorded using the checklist		13.65/15 based on 3 opportunities.		worker being observed during individual medical examinations with at least three patients	
12	unknown	2011	survey self-report vs	unknown	160 medical students in	direct observations	87.90%	hospital setting	medical students	USA

			direct observation		year 3 and 98 in year 4	reported proper hand hygiene in 87.9%				
13	fourth quarter of 2011 to 82.3% in fourth quarter of 2012	Jun-13	mixed methods, self-report and direct observed by observer	unknown	unknown	the overall hand hygiene compliance rate increased from a baseline of 49.7% in fourth quarter of 2011 to 82.3% in fourth quarter of 2012	increased from a baseline of 82.9% to 93.8%	healthcare settings	healthcare workers doctors	Korea

14	Aug-12	2013	mixed methods, self-report and direct observed by observer	470 minutes of observations in total	the observed population was 13% doctors, 70% nurses, 9% housekeeping staff, 9% visitors of patients. Questionnaires were 35 nurses and 34 doctors.	nurses: 47% actual observed compliance with hand hygiene, doctors: 51% actual observed compliance	nurses: 88% compliance with hand hygiene, doctors: 85% compliance	modern oncology hospital	medical staff (nurses, doctors) and some housekeeping staff and visitors	India
15	unknown	2016	direct observer/survey	457	102	29% overall compliance. post-test compliance increased to 51 %	“i wash my hands after using the rest room” was rated a median of 5/5 on a Likert scale, quartiles 4-5 before and after	hospital setting	(healthcare workers, comprising 76 radiographers, 17 nurses, and nine healthcare assistants (HCA), agreed to participate	Hong Kong



							intervention		in the study.	
16	the baseline survey was held from May through August 2008 and covered a total of 3576 households. The follow-up survey was conducted following the completion of the project activities (March–June 2011).	Oct-15	survey self-report vs direct observation	unknown	3576 in survey, 45-60 households observed	handwashing with soap was observed in only 16% of the events that required it. 20% of faecal contact events, 25% of eating events, 6% of child feeding events, and 10% of food preparation events.	although almost all caregivers reported having washed their hands with soap at least once during the previous 24 h, fewer than half confirmed having carried out so at times of faecal contact (39% of caregivers associated handwashing with soap with toilet use and 34% with cleaning up after children). cooking or food preparation (68%), but lower when feeding a child (31%).	households	general public	Peru
17	unknown	Jun-15	survey self-report vs direct observation	unknown	sixty nine respondents participated in the survey which predominantly included the nurses	use of alcohol based hand rub 94.2%, five moments of hand hygiene 88.5%, 6	use of alcohol based hand rub 98.5, five moments of hand hygiene Q 88.5, 6 steps of hand hygiene Q-92.5	in ICU in an oncology, BMT and neurosurgical centre in South India	healthcare workers mostly nurses	South India

						steps of hand hygiene 65%.				
18	2015-2016	Feb-2019	survey self-report vs direct observation	127	639 ,127 of these healthcare workers had been also directly observed.	67.7%	74%	hospital setting	healthcare workers physicians and nurses	5 hospitals in Slovakia and 3 in Czech republic

## Search Strategy

EMBASE SEARCH COVID-19 papers Aim 1 and 2

1. exp coronavirus disease 2019/

2. exp Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2/

3. exp Coronavirinae/

4. COVID-19-19.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

5. coronavirus.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

6. COVID-19.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

7. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6

8. exp hand washing/

9. (hand adj3 wash\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

10. (hand adj3 hygiene).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

11. (hand adj3 sanit\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

12. (hand adj3 disinect\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

13. hand-sanit\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

14. (hand adj3 clean\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

15. hand-wash\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

16. hand-hygiene.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

17. 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16

18. exp face mask ventilation/ or exp mask/ or exp cloth mask/ or exp face mask/ or exp pediatric face mask/ or exp surgical mask/
19. (face adj3 cover\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
20. mask\*.mp.
21. (wear adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
22. (facial adj3 cover\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
23. (facial adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
24. facial-cover\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
25. (wore adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
26. 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25

27. exp social distancing/

28. (social\* adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

29. (physical\* adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

30. (safe adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

31. 27 or 28 or 29 or 30

32. CCTV.mp.

33. (closed adj3 circuit adj3 television).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

34. exp videorecording/

35. (surveillance adj3 camera).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

36. 32 or 33 or 34 or 35

37. exp observational study/ or exp observational method/

38. observ\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

39. 37 or 38

40. 17 or 26 or 31

41. 7 and 40

42. 39 and 41

43. 7 and 36 and 40

44. 42 or 43

MEDLINE SEARCH COVID-19 papers Aim 1 and 2

1. exp COVID-19-19/

2. exp SARS-CoV-2/

3. exp Coronavirus/

4. COVID-19-19.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

5. coronavirus.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

6. COVID-19.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

7. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6

8. exp Hand Disinfection/

9. (hand adj3 wash\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

10. (hand adj3 hygiene).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

11. (hand adj3 sanit\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

12. (hand adj3 disinfect\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]



13. hand-sanit\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

14. (hand adj3 clean\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

15. hand-wash\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

16. hand-hygiene.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

17. 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16

18. exp Masks/

19. (face adj3 cover).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

20. mask\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

21. (wear adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

22. (facial adj3 cover\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

23. (facial adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

24. facial-cover\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

25. (wore adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

26. 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25

27. exp Physical Distancing/

28. (social\* adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

29. (physical\* adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

30. (safe adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

31. 27 or 28 or 29 or 30

32. exp Video Recording/

33. CCTV.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

34. (closed adj3 circuit adj3 television).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism

supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

35. (surveillance adj3 camera).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

36. 32 or 33 or 34 or 35

37. exp Observational Study/

38. observ\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

39. 37 or 38

40. 17 or 26 or 31

41. 7 and 40

42. 39 and 41

43. 7 and 36 and 40

44. 42 or 43

### SEARCH STRATEDGY Aim 3

1. exp hand washing/

2. (hand adj3 wash\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

3. (hand adj3 hygiene).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

4. (hand adj3 sanit\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

5. (hand adj3 disinect\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

6. hand-sanit\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

7. (hand adj3 clean\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

8. hand-wash\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
9. hand-hygiene.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
10. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9
11. exp face mask ventilation/ or exp mask/ or exp cloth mask/ or exp face mask/ or exp pediatric face mask/ or exp surgical mask/
12. (face adj3 cover\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
13. mask\*.mp.
14. (wear adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
15. (facial adj3 cover\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
16. (facial adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

17. facial-cover\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
18. (wore adj3 mask).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
19. 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18
20. exp social distancing/
21. (social\* adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
22. (physical\* adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
23. (safe adj3 distanc\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
24. 20 or 21 or 22 or 23
25. CCTV.mp.
26. (closed adj3 circuit adj3 television).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

27. exp videorecording/

28. (surveillance adj3 camera).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

29. 25 or 26 or 27 or 28

30. exp observational study/ or exp observational method/

31. observ\*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

32. exp infection/

33. 10 or 19 or 24

34. 32 and 33

35. 30 or 31

36. 29 or 35

37. 34 and 36



**Table 4: COVID-19 Included papers in data synthesis**

	Title	Journal	Authors
1	Has the COVID-19 Virus Changed Adherence to Hand Washing among Healthcare workers?	Behav Sci (Basel)	Ragusa, Rosalia; Marranzano, Marina; Lombardo, Alessandro; Quattrocchi, Rosalba; Bellia, Maria Alessandra; Lupo, Lorenzo
2	Face touching in the time of COVID-19 in Shiraz, Iran	Am. J. Infect. Control	Shiraly, Ramin; Shayan, Zahra; McLaws, Mary-Louise
3	Rational use of face mask in a tertiary care hospital setting during COVID-19 pandemic: An observational study	Indian J Public Health	Supehia, Sakshi; Sharma, Twinkle; Singh, Vanya; Khapre, Meenakshi; Gupta, Puneet Kumar
4	Prevention measures for COVID-19 in retail food stores in Braga, Portugal	Pulmonology	Precioso, J.; Samorinha, C.; Alves, R.
5	Face-touching behaviour as a possible correlate of mask-wearing: A video observational study of public place incidents during the COVID-19 pandemic	Transboundary Emer. Dis.	Liebst, Lasse S.; Ejbye-Ernst, Peter; Thomas, Josephine; de Bruin, Marijn; Lindegaard, Marie R.
6	Prevention of COVID-19 in retail food stores in Portugal: The importance of regulations in behavioural change	Aten. Prim.	Precioso, Jose; Samorinha, Catarina
7	Behavioural insights and attitudes on community masking during the initial spread of COVID-19 in Hong Kong	Hong Kong Med. J.	Tam, Victor C. W.; Tam, S.Y.; Law, Helen K. W.; Lee, Shara W. Y.; Khaw, M.L.; Chan, Catherine P. L.
8	Use of masks in public places in Poland during SARS-Cov-2 epidemic: a covert observational study	BMC Public Health	Ganczak, Maria; Pasek, Oskar; Duda-Duma, Lukasz; Swistara, Dawid; Korzen, Marcin
9	Observed Face Mask Use at Six Universities - United States, September-November 2020	MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep	Barrios, Lisa C.; Riggs, Margaret A.; Green, Ridgely Fisk; Czarnik, Michaila; Nett, Randall J.; Staples, J Erin; Welton, Michael David; Muilenburg, Jessica Legge; Zullig, Keith J.; Gibson-Young, Linda; Perkins, Andrea V.; Prins, Cindy; Lauzardo, Michael; Shapiro, Jerne; Asimellis, George; Kilgore-Bowling, Genesis; Ortiz-Jurado, Kenny; Gutilla, Margaret J.
10	Increasing Facemask Compliance among Healthcare Personnel during the COVID-19 Pandemic	Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.	Pellegrino, Anthony; Datta, Rupak; Glenn, Keith; Tuan, Jessica; Kayani, Jehanzeb; Patel, Kavin; Fisher, Ann; Linde, Brian; Calo, Lisbeysi; Dembry, Louise Marie
11	Improving knowledge, attitudes and practice to prevent COVID-19 transmission in Healthcare workers and the public in Thailand	BMC Public Health	Skuntaniyom, Sumawadee; Muntajit, Thanomvong; Malathum, Kumtorn; Maude, Rapeephan R.; Jongdeepaisal, Monnaphat; Khuenpetch, Worarat; Taleangkaphan, Keetakarn; Blacksell, Stuart D.; Pan-Ngum, Wirichada; Maude, Richard James
12	An observational study to identify types of personal protective equipment breaches	J. Hosp. Infect.	Avo, C.; Cawthorne, K.-R.; Walters, J.; Healy, B.

	on inpatient wards		
13	Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related differences during the COVID-19 pandemic	PLoS ONE	Hart, Meggie Rose; Opielinski, Lauren; Zirgaitis, Gretchen; Haischer, Michael H.; Beilfuss, Rachel; Uhrich, Toni D.; Hunter, Sandra K.; Wrucke, David
14	Prevalence of Face Mask Wearing in Northern Vermont in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic	Public Health Rep.	Beckage, Brian; Buckley, Thomas E.; Beckage, Maegan E.
15	Adherence to social distancing and wearing of masks within public transportation during the COVID-19 pandemic	Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives	Dzisi, E.K.J.; Dei, O.A.
16	Factors associated with incorrect facemask use among individuals visiting high-risk locations during COVID-19 pandemic	Journal of Public Health and Development	Gunasekaran, S.S.; Gunasekaran, S.S.; Gunasekaran, G.H.; Zaimi, N.S.I.; Halim, N.A.A.; Halim, F.H.A.
17	Management and use of filter masks in the "none-medical" population during the COVID-19 period	Saf. Sci.	Cumbo, Enzo; Scardina, Giuseppe Alessandro
18	Effectiveness of innovation media for improving physical distancing compliance during the COVID-19 pandemic: A quasi-experiment in Thailand	Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health	Chutipimon, Hattaya; Thipsunate, Apinya; Cherdchim, Atigun; Boonyaphak, Bootsarakam; Vithayasirikul, Panat; Choothong, Patiphan; Vichathai, Swit; Ngamchaliew, Pitchayanont; Vichitkunakorn, Polathep
19	The face mask-touching behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic: Observational study of public transportation users in the greater Paris region: The French-mask-touch study.	J Transp Health	Guellich, Aziz; Tella, Emilie; Ariane, Molka; Grodner, Camille; Nguyen-Chi, Hoai-Nam; Mahe, Emmanuel
20	An Observational Study of Mask Guideline Compliance In An Outpatient OB/GYN Clinic Population	Eur. J. Obstet. Gynecol. Reprod. Biol.	Newman, Mark G.
21	Installation of pedal-operated alcohol gel dispensers with behavioral nudges and changes in hand hygiene behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic: A hospital-based quasi-experimental study	J. Public Health Res.	Wichaidit, Wit; Liabsuetrakul, Tippawan; Naknual, Sommanas; Kleangkert, Nanta
22	Mask use among pedestrians during the COVID-19 pandemic in Southwest Iran: an observational study on 10,440 people	BMC Public Health	Rahimi, Zahra; Cheraghian, Bahman; Shirali, Gholam Abbas; Araban, Marzieh; Mohammadi, Mohammad Javad
23	Comparison of Face-Touching Behaviors before and during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic	JAMA Netw. Open	Chen, Yong-Jian; Chen, Jie; Wu, Xiang-Yuan; Li, Xing; Qin, Gang; Xu, Jian-Liang; Feng, Ding-Yun
24	Compliance measurement and observed influencing factors of hand hygiene based on COVID-19 guidelines in	Am. J. Infect. Control	Zhou, Qian; Zhang, Xinping; Lai, Xiaoquan; Tan, Li

	China		
25	Adherence to personal protective equipment use among Healthcare workers caring for confirmed COVID-19 and alleged non-COVID-19 patients	Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control	Neuwirth, Meike M.; Mattner, Frauke; Otchwemah, Robin
26	COVID-19 and face mask use: A st. kitts case study	Open Access Maced. J. Med. Sci.	Kungurova, Yulia; Brewster, Evelyn; Mera, Ritha; Ali, Khalil; Fakoya, Adegbenro O.J.
27	Facemask wearing to prevent COVID-19 transmission and associated factors among taxi drivers in Dessie City and Kombolcha Town, Ethiopia	PLoS ONE	Natnael, Tarikuwa; Berihun, Gete; Abebe, Masresha; Adane, Metadel; Alemnew, Yeshiwork; Andualem, Atsedemariam; Ademe, Sewunet; Tegegne, Belachew
28	Face Covering Adherence In An Outpatient Ophthalmology Clinic During COVID-19	Ophthalmic Epidemiol.	Parikh, Ankur; Kondapalli, Srinivas
29	Behavior in the use of face masks in the context of COVID-19	Public Health Nurs.	Kellerer, Jan D.; Rohringer, Matthias; Deufert, Daniela
30	Community-based observational assessment of compliance by the public with COVID-19 preventive measures in the south of Saudi Arabia.	Saudi J Biol Sci	Gosadi, Ibrahim M; Daghri, Khaled A; Shugairi, Ahmad A; Alharbi, Ali H; Suwaydi, Abdullatif Z; Alharbi, Mohammed A; Majrashi, Ali A; Sumaily, Ibraheim A
31	Public Compliance with Face Mask Use in Honolulu and Regional Variation	Hawaii J Health Soc Welf	Tamamoto, Kasey A.; Rousslang, Nikki D.; Ahn, Hyeong Jun; Better, Heidi E.; Hong, Robert A.
32	Adherence of the General Public to Self-protection Guidelines During the COVID-19 Pandemic	Disaster Med Public Health Prep	Jabbari, Parnian; Taraghikhah, Nazanin; Jabbari, Forouq; Ebrahimi, Saied; Rezaei, Nima
33	How do the general population behave with facemasks to prevent COVID-19 in the community? A multi-site observational study	Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control	Haudebourg, Thomas; Blanckaert, Karine; Deschanvres, Colin; Boutoille, David; Peiffer-Smadja, Nathan; Lucet, Jean-Christophe; Birgand, Gabriel
34	First report on smoking and infection control behaviours at outdoor hotspots during the COVID-19 pandemic: An unobtrusive observational study	Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health	Sun, Yuying; Lam, Tai Hing; Chen, Jianjiu; Zhang, Xiaoyu; Ho, Sai Yin; Cheung, Yee Tak Derek; Wang, Man Ping; Wu, Yongda; Li, William H. C.
35	Youth Mask-Wearing and Social-Distancing Behavior at In-Person High School Graduations During the COVID-19 Pandemic	J. Adolesc. Health	Mueller, Anna S.; Beardall, Katherine A.; Millar, Krystina; Watkins, James T.; Diefendorf, Sarah; Abrutyn, Seth; O'Reilly, Lauren; Steinberg, Hillary
36	Towards Enforcing Social Distancing Regulations with Occlusion-Aware Crowd Detection	16th IEEE International Conference on Control, Automation, Robotics and Vision, ICARCV 2020	Cong, C.; Yang, Z.; Song, Y.; Pagnucco, M.

37	Obstetric Healthcare workers' adherence to hand hygiene recommendations during the COVID-19 pandemic: Observations and social-cognitive determinants.	Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being	Derksen, Christina; Keller, Franziska M; Lippke, Sonia
38	Implications of a US study on infection prevention and control in community settings in the UK	British Journal of Community Nursing	Dowding, D.; McDonald, M.V.; Shang, J.
39	Achieving Perfect Hand Washing: an Audit Cycle with Surgical Internees	Indian Journal of Surgery	Mukherjee, R.; Roy, P.; Parik, M.
40	Observational study of compliance with infection control practices among Healthcare workers in subsidized and private residential care homes	BMC Infectious Diseases	Au, J.K.L.; Suen, L.K.P.; Lam, S.C.
41	Who Wears a Mask? Gender Differences in Risk Behaviours in the COVID-19 Early Days in Taiwan	Economics Bulletin	Chuang, Y.; Chung-En Liu, J.
42	The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on hand hygiene performance in hospitals	journal of infection control	Moore LD, Robbins G, Quinn J, Arbogast JW
43	The impact of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) on provider use of electronic hand hygiene monitoring technology	Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.	Hess OCR, Armstrong-Novak JD, Doll M, et al
44	Surveillance of the infection prevention and control practices of healthcare workers by an infection control surveillance-working group and a team of infection control coordinators during the COVID-19 pandemic	J Infect Public Health	Choi UY, Kwon YM, Kang HJ, et al.
45	Rigorous Hand Hygiene Practices Among Health Care Workers Reduce Hospital-Associated Infections During the COVID-19 Pandemic.	J Prim Care Community Health.	Roshan R, Feroz AS, Rafique Z, Virani
46	Use of Proper Personal Protective Measures among Parents of Children Attending Outpatient Department - An Observational Study	Indian J Pediatr	Clinton M, Sankar J, Ramesh V, Madhusudan M.
47	Observation of Hand Hygiene Practices in Home Health Care.	J Am Med Dir Assoc.	McDonald MV, Brickner C, Russell D, et al.
48	Observing COVID-19 related behaviours in a high visitor use area of Arches National Park	PLoS One.	Miller ZD, Freimund W, Dalenberg D, Vega M.

**Table 5: NON-COVID-19 papers included in synthesis**

Study	Title	Journal	Authors
1	Mentor's hand hygiene practices influence student's hand hygiene rates.	Am J Infect Control	Snow, Michelle; White, George L Jr; Alder, Stephen C; Stanford, Joseph B
2	Handwashing patterns in two dermatology clinics.	Dermatology	Cohen, H A; Kitai, E; Levy, I; Ben-Amitai, D
3	Infection control among professional tattooists in Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN.	Public Health Rep	Raymond, M J; Pirie, P L; Halcon, L L
4	Should self-assessment methods be used to measure compliance with handwashing recommendations? A study carried out in a French university hospital.	Am J Infect Control	Moret, Leila; Tequi, Brigitte; Lombraill, Pierre
5	A comparison of observed and self-reported compliance with universal precautions among emergency department personnel at a Minnesota public teaching hospital: Implications for assessing infection control programs	ANN. EMERG. MED.	Henry, K.; Campbell, S.; Maki, M.
6	Hand hygiene before donning nonsterile gloves: Healthcare workers' beliefs and practices.	Am J Infect Control	Baloh, Jure; Thom, Kerri A; Perencevich, Eli; Rock, Clare; Robinson, Gwen; Ward, Melissa; Herwaldt, Loreen; Reisinger, Heather Schacht
7	Is evidence guiding practice? Reported versus observed adherence to contact precautions: a pilot study.	Am J Infect Control	Jessee, Mary Ann; Mion, Lorraine C
8	Hand Hygiene Compliance Study at a Large Central Hospital in Vietnam.	Int J Environ Res Public Health	Le, Cam Dung; Lehman, Erik B; Nguyen, Thanh Huy; Craig, Timothy J
9	Do wearable alcohol-based handrub dispensers increase hand hygiene compliance? - a mixed-methods study.	Antimicrob. resist. infect. control	Keller, Jonas; Wolfensberger, Aline; Clack, Lauren; Kuster, Stefan P; Dunic, Mesida; Eis, Doris; Flammer, Yvonne; Keller, Dagmar I; Sax, Hugo
10	Beyond entry and exit: Hand hygiene at the bedside.	Am J Infect Control	Woodard, Jennifer A; Leekha, Surbhi; Jackson, Sarah S; Thom, Kerri A

11	Comparison of patient and healthcare professional perceptions of hand hygiene practices with the monthly internal audit at a tertiary medical center, Illinois 2010	Am. J. Infect. Control	Soyemi, Caroline
12	Medical students and hospital hand hygiene - What do they know, and what do they do?	Surg. Infect.	Alemayehu, Hanna; Ho, Vanessa P.; Leviter, Julie I.; Drusin, Lewis M.; Barie, Philip S.
13	Effectiveness of a hand hygiene improvement program in doctors: Active monitoring and real-time feedback	Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control	Kim, S.R.; Cho, M.H.; Kim, W.J.; Song, J.Y.; Cheong, H.J.
14	Mind the mind: Results of a hand-hygiene research in a state-of-the-art cancer hospital	Indian J. Med. Microbiol.	Dalen, R.; Gombert, K.; Bhattacharya, S.; Datta, S.
15	A quasi-experimental study to determine the effects of a multifaceted educational intervention on hand hygiene compliance in a radiography unit	Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control	O'Donoghue, Margaret; Ng, Suk-Hing; Suen, Lorna K.P.; Boost, Maureen
16	Promoting Handwashing Behavior: The Effects of Large-scale Community and School-level Interventions	Health Econ.	Galiani, Sebastian; Gertler, Paul; Ajzenman, Nicolas; Orsola-Vidal, Alexandra
17	Knowledge and practice of infection control-in the NDM1 era	Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control	Lakshmi, V.; Ghafur, A.; Mageshkumar, K.; Karupusamy, C.
18	Flawed self-assessment in hand hygiene: A major contributor to infections in clinical practice?	Journal of Clinical Nursing	Kelcikova, Simona; Mazuchova, Lucia; Bielenka, Lubica; Filova, Lenka

**Table 7: NIH quality assessment checklist**

Criteria	Yes	No	Other (CD, NR, NA)*
1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?			
2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?			
3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?			
4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?			
5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?			
6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?			

Criteria	Yes	No	Other (CD, NR, NA)*
7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?			
8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?			
9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?			
10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?			
11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?			
12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?			



It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

Criteria	Yes	No	Other (CD, NR, NA)*
13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?			
14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?			