

1 **Bacterial contamination of Healthcare workers' mobile phones in**
2 **Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis**

3 Demisu Zenbaba^{1*}, Biniyam Sahiledengle¹, Girma Beressa¹, Fikreab
4 Desta¹, Zinash Teferu¹, Fikadu Nugusu¹, Daniel Atlaw², Zerihun Shiferaw²,
5 Ayele Mamo³, Wogane Negash⁴, Getahun Negash⁵, Mohammedaman
6 Mama⁵, Eshetu Nigussie⁵, Vijay Kumar Chattu^{6, 7, 8}

7 ¹Department of Public Health, School of Health Sciences, Madda Walabu University,
8 P.O.Box 302, Goba, Ethiopia

9 ² Anatomy Unit, School of Medicine, Madda Walabu University, P.O.Box 302, Goba,
10 Ethiopia

11 ³Department of Pharmacy, School of Medicine, Madda Walabu University, P.O.Box 302,
12 Goba, Ethiopia

13 ⁴Department of Nursing, School of Health Sciences, Madda Walabu University, P.O.Box
14 302, Goba, Ethiopia

15 ⁵ Department of Medical Laboratory, School of Health Sciences, Madda Walabu
16 University, P.O.Box 302, Goba, Ethiopia

17 ⁶Center for Trans disciplinary Research, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical
18 Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai 600077, India

19 ⁷Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Datta Meghe Institute of
20 Medical Sciences, Wardha 442107, India

21 ⁸School of Public Health, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 1C9, Canada

22 ***Corresponding author**

23 **Email: zdemisu@gmail.com (DZ)**

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background:** Mobile phones are potential reservoirs for pathogens and sources of
28 healthcare-associated illnesses. More microbes can be found on a mobile phone than on
29 a man's lavatory seat, the sole of a shoe, or a door handle. When examining patients,
30 frequent handling of mobile phones can spread bacteria and provide a suitable breeding
31 environment for numerous microorganisms. Nevertheless, evidence of bacterial
32 contamination of mobile phones among healthcare workers in Africa was not conclusive.
33 Thus, this meta-analysis and systematic review was conducted to estimate the pooled
34 prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile phones used by healthcare workers and
35 the most frequent bacterial isolates in Africa.

36 **Methods:** We systematically retrieved relevant studies using PubMed/MEDLINE,
37 Scopus, POPLINE, HINARI, Science Direct, Cochrane Library databases, and Google
38 Scholar from 2009 to 2021 publication year. We included observational studies that
39 reported the prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile phones among healthcare
40 workers. Two independent authors assessed the quality of the studies. The
41 DerSimonian-random Laird's effect model was used to calculate effect estimates for the
42 pooled prevalence of bacterial contamination in mobile phones, as well as a 95%
43 confidence interval (CI).

44 **Results:** Among 3882 retrieved studies, 23 eligible articles with a total sample size of
45 2,623 study participants were included in the meta-analysis. The pooled prevalence of
46 mobile phones bacterial contamination among healthcare workers was 83.9% (95% CI:
47 80.6, 87.2%; $I^2 = 98\%$, $p\text{-value} < 0.001$). The most dominant type of bacteria isolated in
48 this review was *coagulase-negative staphylococci* (CONS) which accounted for 44.5% of
49 the pooled contamination rate of mobile phones used by healthcare workers, followed by
50 *Staphylococcus aureus* (32.3%), and *Escherichia coli* (8.4%).

51 **Conclusion:** The review indicated that the contamination with a different bacterial isolate
52 of mobile phones used by health care workers was high. The most dominant bacterial
53 isolates were *Coagulase-negative staphylococci*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and
54 *Escherichia coli*. Hence, these findings would have implications for policymakers and
55 resource allocation for preventive measures initiatives.

56 **Keywords:** Bacteria, Contamination, Healthcare workers, Mobile Phone, Africa

57 Introduction

58 Currently, mobile phones have become essential accessories for healthcare workers and
59 social life [1, 2]. Mobile phones have become an important part of the healthcare delivery
60 system because they improve the quality of care and communication [1, 3]. It also makes
61 interdepartmental communication easier, allowing for faster interactions within healthcare
62 institutions and more efficient access to information for patient care [4, 5]. Despite all of
63 the potential benefits, mobile phones play a critical role in becoming potential germ
64 reservoirs and are known to induce healthcare-associated diseases [6-9].

65 A variety of bacteria, including skin flora and pathogenic bacteria, have been identified
66 on the surface of mobile phones [10, 11]. In HICs, bacterial infections on healthcare
67 personnel's mobile phones range from 75 to 96% [12-19]. *Coagulase-negative*
68 *staphylococci (CoNS)* and *Micrococcus* were the most commonly recovered bacteria,
69 followed by *methicillin-sensitive and methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA)*,
70 *Acinetobacter*, and *Pseudomonas species* [12-19]. In low-and middle-income countries'
71 healthcare settings, bacterial contamination rates of mobile phones used by healthcare
72 personnel ranged from 42% to 100%. The most prevalent bacteria isolated were
73 *coagulase-negative staphylococci*, *Escherichia coli*, *Acinetobacter species*,
74 *Pseudomonas species*, and *MRSA* bacteria [20-26]. Several infectious illnesses,
75 including diarrhea, food poisoning, and wound infections, are caused by these bacteria
76 [3, 27, 28].

77 The global burden of healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) is increasing, resulting in
78 increased morbidity and death among patients and significant challenges for the
79 healthcare system [7, 29, 30]. The cumulative incidence of HAIs ranges from 5.7 to
80 48.5% within African countries [31]. Contamination of inanimate gadgets used by
81 healthcare professionals, such as cell phones, is one of the many sources of healthcare-
82 acquired infections [30, 32]. More bacteria can be found on a mobile phone than on a
83 man's lavatory seat, the sole of a shoe, or a door handle [31, 33, 34]. Drug-resistant
84 organisms such as *MRSA* and *vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE)* have also been
85 found in hospital settings using mobile phones. The drug-resistant bacterium that can

86 cause HAIs and is a public health issue was found to be responsible for 40% to 70% of
87 the contamination of healthcare professionals' mobile phones [14, 33].

88 When examining patients, frequent handling of mobile phones can spread bacteria and
89 provide a suitable breeding environment for numerous microorganisms [10, 35, 36].
90 Although there has been some small-scale research on the bacterial contamination of
91 mobile phones among healthcare workers, a comprehensive review and meta-analysis
92 have not been conducted for Africa. Therefore, this systematic review and meta-analysis
93 aimed to estimate the pooled prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile phones
94 used by healthcare workers and the most common bacterial isolates in Africa. Besides,
95 we anticipated descriptively summarizing bacterial isolates' antimicrobial susceptibility
96 and multidrug resistance patterns.

97 **Methods**

98 **Registration and protocol**

99 This systematic review and meta-analysis (SRMA) was conducted to estimate the pooled
100 prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile phones among HCWs in Africa. To
101 ensure the usefulness of this SRMA to the readers, we developed a transparent,
102 complete, and accurate report of the purpose of this review, using the Preferred
103 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) criteria (Additional
104 file 1 Table). This systematic review was carried out following the Joanna Briggs
105 Institute (JBI) methodology for systematic reviews of a proportion of evidence [37]. The
106 systematic review and meta-analysis were prospectively registered in PROSPERO
107 (record ID: CRD42022306250, February 22, 2022).

108 **Search strategy**

109 We systematically retrieved relevant studies using PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus,
110 POPLINE, HINARI, Science Direct, Cochrane Library databases, and Google Scholar
111 from inception to March 25, 2022. All the databases were comprehensively searched to
112 find potentially relevant papers published and unpublished between 2009 and 2021. All
113 searches were limited to English-language papers. In addition to the electronic database
114 search, Google was used to look for grey literature. We also looked for related studies in
115 the reference lists of included studies. For the PubMed/MEDLINE search, the following

116 phrases and keywords were used:[“Bacterial Contamination” OR “microbial
117 contamination” OR “Contamination, equipment” AND "Cell Phones" OR "Mobile Phone"
118 OR "Mobile Phones" OR "Smart Phones" OR "cellular Phones" AND Health Personnel”
119 OR “HealthCare Providers” OR “Health Care Provider” OR “Provider, Health Care” OR
120 “Healthcare Providers” OR “Healthcare Provider” OR “Provider, Healthcare” OR
121 “Healthcare Workers” OR “Healthcare Worker” OR “Health Care Professionals” OR
122 “Health Care Professional” OR “Professional, Health Care” AND Africa). We used
123 database-specific subject headings linked with the above terms and keywords used in
124 PubMed for the other electronic databases (Additional file 2).

125 **Eligibility criteria**

126 **Inclusion Criteria**

127 The review process included all studies that met the following criteria: (1) studies that
128 reported the magnitude of bacterial contamination from healthcare workers' mobile
129 phones surfaces, (2) studies published in English but conducted only in Africa at any
130 given time, and (3) studies conducted using standard bacteriological techniques (i.e.,
131 swab method or settle plate sampling method) [32, 38, 39]. (4) Studies that accurately
132 reported the swab culture growth rate for bacterial isolates, (5) all relevant free-of-charge
133 full-text original research articles, and (6) all observational study designs, including
134 published and unpublished studies, were all taken into account.

135 **Exclusion Criteria**

136 The study was excluded for the following reasons: inaccessible or irretrievable full-text
137 articles after contacting the corresponding authors via email at least two times; reviews,
138 commentaries, letters to the editor, conference proceedings, and abstracts; studies with
139 unclear methods; reports from inanimate objects other than mobile phones (such as
140 Stethoscopes, BP apparatus, and patient beds); studies conducted on non-healthcare
141 workers; and studies that did not report the outcome of interest.

142 **Assessment of outcome variables**

143 The primary outcome variable was the prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile
144 phones used by healthcare workers, as defined by the included studies' operational
145 definition. The prevalence of mobile phone bacterial contamination was calculated by
146 dividing the total number of swabs collected from the mobile phones of healthcare
147 professionals by the total number of swabs taken from mobile phones of healthcare
148 workers and multiplying by 100. The second objective of this study was to descriptively
149 characterize the most common types of bacteria isolated from healthcare workers'
150 mobile phones and their drug sensitivity and resistance patterns, utilizing studies that
151 were included.

152 **Operational definitions**

153 **Non-selective bacteria isolation method:** Culture mediums such as blood agar and
154 nutrient agar can grow a wide variety of bacteria [39].

155 **Selective bacteria isolation method:** A culture medium such as MacConkey agar is
156 more selective to isolate 'bile tolerant' bacteria found in the large intestine [39].

157 **Study selection and data extraction**

158 All the retrieved citations were imported into EndNote version X8 and duplicates were
159 removed. The JBI data extraction format was used to extract the data [40]. Based on the
160 established inclusion criteria, two authors (DZ and BS) independently assessed and
161 identified papers by their titles, abstracts, and full texts. Any disagreements that arose
162 were resolved by consensus or with the additional author/s (DZ and GB). The data
163 extraction format included the primary author, publication year, country, study area,
164 bacteria isolation method, optimum temperature, incubation period, the most prevalent
165 types of bacteria isolated, isolated bacteria drug sensitivity, isolated bacteria drug
166 resistance, sample size, and prevalence of mobile phone bacterial contamination.

167 **Assessment of risk of bias**

168 The quality of the appended studies was assessed using the JBI meta-analysis of
169 statistics assessment and review instrument (MAStARI) quality rating tool [40, 41]. An
170 appropriate sampling frame, proper sampling technique, study subject and setting
171 description, sufficient data analysis, use of valid methods for the identified conditions, a
172 valid measurement for all participants, using appropriate statistical analysis, in a valid
173 and reliable outcome measure, with a 50% or higher overall score considered low risk of

174 bias, are among the JBI parameters. As a result, bias risks were classified as low (total
175 score of 2), moderate (total score of 3-4), or high (total score of > 5) [41]. Two
176 independent authors rated the quality of the included studies (DZ and BS). Any
177 disagreements that arose were addressed through consensus. Finally, papers with a
178 score of 5 or higher were ruled out as having a significant risk of bias (Additional file 3).

179 **Data synthesis**

180 Before being evaluated, the data was extracted into a Microsoft Excel file. The data were
181 analyzed using STATA software version 16. The standard errors of the included studies
182 were determined using the formula ($SE = p(1-p)/n$). To investigate heterogeneity in the
183 stated proportion, the I^2 statistics and p-values of the Cochrane Q-test were utilized. The
184 Cochrane Q-test p-values are less than 0.1 and are deemed to indicate the presence of
185 heterogeneity among studies. To assess the percentage of total variance owing to
186 heterogeneity across trials, we used the Higgins I^2 test statistics [41]. Although no
187 specific criterion exists for when heterogeneity becomes substantial, some researchers
188 suggest low heterogeneity when I^2 values are between (25–50%), moderate (50–75%),
189 and high (> 75%) [41]. Because the test statistic revealed significant heterogeneity
190 among the research ($I^2 = 98\%$, p-value 0.001), the DerSimonian-influence Laird's was
191 analyzed using a random-effects model. The effect sizes were calculated as a
192 percentage with a 95% confidence interval (CI). There was a lot of variation in the
193 included studies in this review according to the I^2 category. We used subgroup analysis
194 by sub-region, study area, bacteria isolation method, sample size, and publication year
195 to find the source of variation. The meta-analysis findings were displayed using a forest
196 plot. A funnel plot was employed in conjunction with meta-regression to assess
197 publication bias. The plot resembles an asymmetrical, huge, inverted funnel in the
198 absence of publication bias. Egger's weighted regression and Begg's rank correlation
199 tests (p-value < 0.05) were used to objectively assess publication bias; however, only
200 Egger's test was shown to be statistically significant (p-value = 0.001). To test the
201 findings' robustness, a leave-one-out sensitivity meta-analysis was used.

202 **Results**

203 A total of 3,882 articles were identified after a thorough search of the literature. Of these
204 articles, 2,951 duplicates were removed, and 931 were screened only based on their

205 titles and abstracts. Following the exclusion of 844 articles, a total of 87 full-text papers
 206 were verified for eligibility using the pre-determined criteria, with 64 articles being
 207 excluded. Finally, 23 articles [21-25, 42-59] that satisfied the criteria were included in the
 208 meta-analysis (Fig. 1).

209 Descriptions of the included studies

210 All included studies were cross-sectional by design and were published between 2009
 211 and 2021. The current meta-analysis used 2,623 mobile phones from healthcare
 212 professionals to estimate the pooled proportion of bacterial contamination. In terms of
 213 sub-regional distribution, nine studies were from Eastern Africa [22, 24, 25, 42, 44-46,
 214 58], four studies from Western [21, 51, 52, 55], seven studies from Northern [23, 47-50,
 215 54, 57], one study from Southern [56], and two studies from middle African countries [53,
 216 59] (Table 1).

217 **Table 1: Descriptive summary of 23 studies included in the meta-analysis to**
 218 **estimate pooled prevalence of HCWs bacterial contamination of mobile phones in**
 219 **Africa.**

Study ID	Authors (year)	Country	Healthcare facility	Bacterial isolation method	Temperature for growth in C°	Incubation time in hours	Sample size	Overall mobile phones bacteria contamination rate with 95%CI
1	Asfaw <i>et al.</i> , 2021 [22]	Ethiopia	Referral Hospital	MacConkey agar	35-37	24	65	99.9 (99.3,100.67)
2	Gashaw <i>et al.</i> , 2014[45]	Ethiopia	Health center	MacConkey agar, chocolate agar, and blood agar plates	37	24-48	57	98.3(94.9, 101.66)
3	Daka 2014[42]	Ethiopia	Referral Hospital	Blood agar	37	18-24	100	62 (52.5, 71.5)
4	Ayalew <i>et al.</i> , 2019[43]	Ethiopia	Referral Hospital	Blood agar	37	18-24	422	59.4(54.7, 64.1)
5	Misgana <i>et al.</i> , 2014[44]	Ethiopia	specialized Hospital	Blood agar	37	24-48	66	86.4(78.1, 94.7)
6	Bodena <i>et al.</i> , 2019[46]	Ethiopia	specialized Hospital	MacConkey Agar	37	18-24	226	94.2(91.2, 97.3)
7	Araya <i>et al.</i> 2021[24]	Ethiopia	specialized Hospital	MacConkey and Blood agar	37	24-48	572	79.4(76.1, 82.7)
8	Mohamedin <i>et</i>	Egypt	Internation	MacConkey	37	24-48	150	79.3(72.8, 85.8)

	<i>al.</i> 2019[47]		al Hospital	and Blood agar				
9	Elgabeery 2021[48]	Egypt	University Hospital	MacConkey's agar, nutrient agar, blood agar	37	24	160	84.4(78.8, 90.0)
10	Selim <i>et al.</i> ,2015[49]	Egypt	University Hospital	MacConkey's and Blood agar plates.	37	24	40	99.9(98.9, 100.9)
11	Shahaby <i>et al.</i> ,2012[50]	Egypt	University clinic	MacConkey agar plates	37	48	8	10.3(-10.8, 31.4)
12	Mohamadou <i>et al.</i> 2021[53]	Cameroon	different levels of Hospital	Blood, Chocolate, and Mannitol Salt agar	37	24-48	156	95.7(92.5, 98.9)
13	Christelle <i>et al.</i> , 2019[59]	DR Congo	General Hospital	MacConkey Agar	NR	NR	54	99.9(99.1, 100.7)
14	Yar <i>et al.</i> 2021[51]	Gana	Hospital	Blood and MacConkey Agar	37	24hr	35	99.9(98.9, 100.9)
15	Fandoh 2018[52]	Gana	Hospital	RODAC plate	NR	NR	39	97.5(97.5, 102.4)
16	Daoudi <i>et al.</i> ,2017[54]	Morocco	University Hospital	Blood agar	37	72	17	99.9(98.4, 101.4)
17	Nwankwo <i>et al.</i> , 2014[21]	Nigeria	Hospital	MacConkey and blood agar plates.	37	18-24	56	94.6(88.7, 100.5)
18	Akinyemi <i>et al.</i> ,2009[55]	Nigeria	University Hospital	blood agar and eosin methylene blue agar plates	37	24	38	15.3(3.9, 26.8)
19	Bobat <i>et al.</i> ,2016[56]	South Africa	University Hospital	Colistin, nalidixic acid agar, and MacConkey agar plates.	37	18-24	100	3021.0, 39.0)
20	Haghamad. 2021[23]	Sudan	University Hospital	Blood agar and MacConkey agar	37	18-24	100	87(80.4, 93.6)
21	Osman <i>et al.</i> ,2018[57]	Sudan	Hospital	blood agar, MacConkey agar, and chocolate agar	37	24	57	95(89.3, 100.7)
22	Tusabe <i>et al.</i> 2021[58]	Uganda	Referral Hospital	MacConkey agar plates	37	24	13	93(79.1, 106.9)

23	Mushabati <i>et al.</i> 2021[25]	Zambia	University Hospital	MacConkey, chocolate, and blood agar	35-37	18-24	92	79(70.7, 87.3)
----	----------------------------------	--------	---------------------	--------------------------------------	-------	-------	----	----------------

220 **NR-** not reported; **RODAC-** Replicate Organism Detection and Count Plates

221 **Prevalence and types of bacterial isolates**

222 The pooled prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile phones used by healthcare
 223 professionals in Africa was 83.9%; 95% CI: (80.6, 87.2%) (Fig.2). the high heterogeneity
 224 was showed among included studies ($I^2 = 98\%$, $p = 0.001$). As a result, a random effect
 225 model was used to estimate the pooled prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile
 226 phones of healthcare personnel. A univariate meta-regression analysis was performed
 227 using variables such as year of publication, quality score, and sample size to identify
 228 credible sources of heterogeneity. Accordingly, the year of publication was a significant
 229 source of variability among the variables included in the studies (Table 2).

230 The most prevalent bacteria in this review were *coagulase-negative staphylococci*
 231 (CONS), which accounted for 44.5% of the pooled contamination rate (95% CI: 34.3,
 232 54.8%) of mobile phones used by healthcare workers, followed by *Staphylococcus*
 233 *aureus*, which accounted for 32.3% of the pooled contamination rate (95% CI: (34.3,
 234 54.8%) of mobile phones used by healthcare workers (24.3, 40.2%). On the other hand,
 235 the gram-negative bacterium *Escherichia coli* was found in 8.4% of mobile phones used
 236 by healthcare personnel (95% CI: (5.1, 11.7%)) (Fig. 3-5).

237 **Table 2: Factors with the heterogeneity of HCWs mobile phones bacterial**
 238 **contamination based on univariate meta-regression**

Variable	Coefficient	p-value	95% CI
Year of publication	3.42	<0.001	2.28, 4.56
Sample size	-0.03	0.003	-0.05, 0.01
Sub-region	0.42	0.781	-2.53, 3.37
Culture media	-2.28	0.414	-7.74, 3.19
Quality score	1.88	0.722	-8.48, 12.24

239

240

241 **Sensitivity analysis**

242 The findings were put to the test using a leave-one-out sensitivity analysis. The random-
243 effects model was shown to be robust, and according to the sensitivity analyses, no
244 single study had an effect on the pooled rate of bacterial contamination of mobile phones
245 used by healthcare personnel. The pooled mobile phone bacterial contamination was
246 nearly equal to the real effect magnitude when a single study was eliminated from a
247 meta-analysis (Fig. 6).

248 **Publication bias**

249 The funnel plot was used to examine the publication bias. The funnel plot demonstrated
250 that the item distribution was consistent. We employed Begg's and Egger's tests to
251 objectively confirm the asymmetry. In the prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile
252 phones used by healthcare workers, Egger's test indicated evidence of publishing bias (p
253 0.001). However, Begg's test revealed no indication of publication bias ($p = 1.999$). (Fig.
254 7). As a result, a non-parametric trim-and-fill analysis of the publication bias linear
255 estimator was performed on the left, with the pooled prevalence of bacterial
256 contamination set to 79.8% (Fig.8).

257 **Subgroup analysis**

258 This meta-analysis used subgroup analysis based on the country's sub-regions, study
259 setting, and sample size. As a result, the northern African countries had the greatest
260 pooled prevalence of bacterial contamination of mobile phones, at 87.3% (95% CI: (81.6,
261 93.0%)), followed by the eastern African countries, at 83.62 % (95 % CI: 74.40, 92.84%).
262 A subgroup analysis depending on the year of publication was also performed. The
263 combined percentage of bacterial contamination in mobile phones among studies
264 conducted from 2009 to 2014 and 2015 to 2021 was 62.5% and 88% respectively. The
265 prevalence of bacterial contamination on mobile phones was 95.2% in studies that used
266 a selective bacterial isolation method. However, it was found to be 70.4% in studies that
267 used a non-selective bacterial isolation method, and 86.3% among studies that used
268 both (selective + non-selective) bacterial isolation methods. A substantial source of
269 variability was observed across the country's sub-regions, year of publication, types of
270 healthcare facilities, and bacterial isolation methods of included studies in all subgroup
271 analyses (Table 3).

272 **Table 3: The subgroup rate of mobile phone bacterial contamination among**
 273 **healthcare workers in Africa (2009–2021)**

Variables	Subgroup	No of included study	Sample size	mobile phone's bacterial contamination rate (95% CI)	Heterogeneity across the studies		Heterogeneity between group (p-value)
					I ² (%)	p-value	
Sub-region	Eastern	9	1613	83.62(74.40, 92.84)	98.4	<0.001	<0.001
	Western	4	168	77.97(58.86, 97.07)	98.6	<0.001	
	Northern	7	532	87.32(81.64, 92.99)	96.0	<0.001	
	Southern	1	100	30.0(21.0, 38.94)	0		
	Middle	2	210	98.1(94.02, 102.17)	84.0	0.012	
Year of publication	2009-2014	6	325	62.46(39.97, 84.96)	98.2	<0.001	0.027
	2015-2021	17	2298	83.03(84.78, 91.29)	97.9	<0.001	
Types of Health facility	Hospital	19	2558	84.54(81.16, 87.93)	98.1	<0.001	<0.001
	Health center	1	57	98.3(94.94, 101.66)	0		
	Clinic	1	8	10.30(-10.76, 31.36)	0		
Sample size	≤ 114	17	937	86.10(82.87, 89.32)	97.4	<0.001	0.481
	>114	6	1686	82.15(71.65, 92.64)	97.6	<0.001	
Bacteria isolation method	Selective	5	366	95.19(91.32, 99.06)	95.0	<0.001	0.001
	non-selective	5	761	70.39(53.14, 87.64)	99.0	<0.001	
	Selective & non-selective	13	1496	86.33(81.13, 91.53)	97.6	<0.001	

274

275 **Narrative review**

276 **Antimicrobial susceptibility and multidrug resistance patterns**

277 We descriptively explained the antimicrobial susceptibility and multidrug resistance of
 278 bacterial isolates using 14 studies [21, 22, 24, 25, 42-46, 53-56, 58]. According to an
 279 Ethiopian study, bacterial isolates had a greater rate of resistance to *penicillin* (84%),

280 *ampicillin* (81%), and *tetracycline* (81%). Nevertheless, a study conducted in Nigeria
 281 revealed that over 75% of bacterial isolates were sensitive to *fluoroquinolone* and
 282 *ceftriaxone* (Table 4).

283 **Table 4: Summary of antimicrobial susceptibility and multidrug resistance pattern**
 284 **of bacterial isolates in Africa**

Authors(Year)	Country	Antimicrobial susceptibility of the bacterial Isolates	MDR Pattern of Bacterial isolates
Asfaw et al. 2021 [22]	Ethiopia	Lower resistance rate against <i>ciprofloxacin</i> (24%), <i>gentamycin</i> (23%), and <i>nicol</i> (18 %).	-The overall MDR prevalence was found to be (42.9%). -Bacterial isolates showed a higher resistance rate against <i>penicillin</i> (84%), <i>ampicillin</i> (81%), and <i>tetracycline</i> (42%).
Gashaw et al., 2014[45]	Ethiopia	- <i>Ceftriaxone</i> and <i>ciprofloxacin</i> were effective against 71.7% and 89.1%, respectively, the Gram-positive bacteria -About 87.5% of <i>S. aureus</i> , 89.3% of CONS, and all <i>S. pyogenes</i> isolate. -Among the Gram-negative bacteria <i>E. coli</i> was found to be 100% sensitive to <i>ciprofloxacin</i> , <i>gentamycin</i> , and <i>trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole</i> .	-More than half (52.2%) and 60.9% of Gram-positive bacteria were resistant to <i>amoxicillin</i> and <i>trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole</i> . - <i>E. cloacae</i> were 100% resistant to <i>ceftriaxone</i> , <i>ciprofloxacin</i> , <i>amoxicillin</i> , and <i>chloramphenicol</i>
Misgana et al., 2014[44]	Ethiopia	-About 81% of the isolates tested for antimicrobial susceptibility	-About 39.40% of <i>S. aureus</i> isolates were MDRSA, of which 38.50% (5/13) were <i>vancomycin-resistant</i> .
Bodena et al., 2019[46]	Ethiopia	- <i>Ceftriaxone</i> (80.6%), <i>ciprofloxacin</i> (77.3%), and <i>gentamicin</i> (72.7%) showed higher activity against bacterial isolates, - <i>Ampicillin</i> and <i>trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole</i> had less effect, with a resistance rate of 61.6% and 56.9%, respectively.	- Overall prevalence of MDR bacterial isolates was 69.9%. -Amongst all the bacterial isolates, <i>Pseudomonas sp.</i> (87.5%), <i>Klebsiella sp.</i> (86.7%), and <i>Citrobacter sp.</i> (75%) showed MDR
Araya et al. 2021[24]	Ethiopia	- High-level resistance to <i>ampicillin</i> was observed in 100% of all isolated species except for : <i>Citrobacter</i> (80%) and <i>K. pneumonia</i> (92%) <i>K. niae</i> , and <i>E. coli</i> also exhibited substantial resistance to <i>ampicillin</i> (92% and 100%, respectively)	-About 79.2% of the ESBL-producing isolates showed multidrug resistance. - <i>K. oxytoca</i> , <i>Salmonella spp.</i> , <i>P. vulgaris</i> , and <i>P.mirabilis</i> showed 100% MDR characteristics

Mohamedin <i>et al.</i> , 2019[47]	Egypt	-About 100% of <i>S. aureus</i> was sensitive to Kanamycin and <i>Trimethoprim sulphamethoxazole</i>	-Around 98.2% of <i>S.aureus</i> was resistant to Methicillin, Oxacillin, and Ampicillin antibiotics
Mohamadou <i>et al.</i> 2021[53]	Cameroon	- <i>Ciprofloxacin</i> (85.7%), <i>Ofloxacin</i> (78.6%), <i>Gentamicin</i> (71.4%) to bacterial isolates	Not reported
Daoudi <i>et al.</i> , 2017[54]	Morocco	Not reported	-Of the 17 mobile phones, 6 were contaminated with multi-drug-resistant pathogens, with a contamination rate of 35%.
Nwankwo <i>et al.</i> , 2014[21]	Nigeria	Not reported	-High level of bacterial isolate resistance against <i>cotrimoxazole</i> , <i>tetracycline</i> and <i>ampicillin</i> , <i>gentamicin</i> , <i>ceftriaxone</i> , and <i>ciprofloxacin</i>
Akinyemi <i>et al.</i> 2009[55]	Nigeria	-Over 75% of the isolates were susceptible to the <i>fluoroquinolone</i> and <i>ceftriaxone</i> antibiotics.	Not reported
Bobat <i>et al.</i> , 2016[56]	South Africa	-All of the <i>S. aureus</i> isolated were <i>methicillin/cloxacillin</i> sensitive.	Not reported
Osman <i>et al.</i> , 2018[57]	Sudan	- <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> isolates' sensitivity to Oxacillin was 1.40%.	- <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> isolates were 98.6% resistant to Oxacillin
Tusabe <i>et al.</i> 2021[58]	Uganda	Not reported	-About 45% of the organisms were multidrug-resistant. -Resistance was major to <i>penicillin</i> , <i>cotrimoxazole</i> , <i>ciprofloxacin</i> , and <i>Gentamicin</i>
Mushabati <i>et al.</i> 2021[25]	Zambia	-Most of the isolates were susceptible to first-line antimicrobial agents, except penicillin which showed 100% resistance for all Gram-positive isolates. - <i>S. aureus</i> was susceptible to <i>ciprofloxacin</i> (88%), <i>clindamycin</i> (88%), <i>gentamicin</i> (84%), <i>cotrimoxazole</i> (50%) and <i>erythromycin</i> (50%)	Resistance to <i>cefoxitin</i> was detected in 25% (6/24) of <i>S. aureus</i> and 48% (21/49) of CoNS

285 CONS: Coagulase-negative staphylococci; ESBL: Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase; MDR:
286 Multidrug resistance

287

288

289 Discussion

290 Mobile phones (MPs) are now widely used worldwide and are regarded as one of the
291 essential gadgets. This technology is thought to be one of the most significant threats to
292 human health [60, 61]. Healthcare workers' (HCWs') continuous handlings of MPs
293 promote the spread of healthcare-associated illnesses [62]. In addition, pathogenic
294 organisms colonizing mobile phones may increase antibiotic resistance [1]. The objective
295 of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to estimate the pooled prevalence of
296 bacterial contamination of mobile phones used by healthcare workers in Africa. As a
297 result, 83.9% of mobile phones were found to be contaminated with bacteria. Mobile
298 phone bacterial contamination is responsible for different infectious illnesses and
299 increases the burden of nosocomial infections unless standard guidelines for using and
300 cleaning mobile phones in health care settings are established [1, 3, 27, 28]. On the
301 other hand, bacterial contamination of MPs could be a significant concern influencing the
302 execution of efficient infection prevention measures, thus jeopardizing efforts to limit
303 cross-contamination [63]. This review's result was somewhat higher than that of a meta-
304 analysis in Egypt, which reported a pooled prevalence of bacterial contamination of
305 mobile phones of 78% [26]. Similarly, this review finding was consistent with findings
306 from a systematic review published elsewhere [64]. The variation in bacterial
307 contamination of mobile phones could be due to the varying levels of hand hygiene
308 practiced by healthcare staff, the different models of mobile phones utilized, and
309 bacterial isolation method [17, 65]. Furthermore, the type and load of bacterial
310 contamination are known to be influenced by the design of touchscreen phones and the
311 type of keypad surface [66-68].

312 We conducted a sub-group analysis based on country sub-region, finding that research
313 from northern African countries had the highest incidence of bacterial contamination in
314 mobile phones. In contrast, studies from southern African countries had the lowest
315 prevalence. Compared to research conducted in other countries in sub-regions, most of
316 the papers included in this review were from eastern and northern African countries, and
317 differences in healthcare facilities could explain regional heterogeneity. Another reason
318 for the disparities could be variances in healthcare personnel's hand hygiene standards,

319 mobile phone cleaning methods, and phone types (touchscreen versus Keypad surface).
320 As a result of our findings, it may be necessary to encourage all African countries to
321 achieve a zero prevalence of bacterial contamination in mobile phones.

322 A subgroup analysis was also performed using the year of publication and the method of
323 bacterial isolation. As a result, studies conducted from 2015 to 2021 found a higher
324 incidence of bacterial contamination in mobile phones than studies conducted from 2009
325 to 2014, which demonstrated a lower frequency of bacterial contamination. This disparity
326 could be because smartphones or screen touch mobile phones, which have a high
327 contamination rate and have been used by healthcare personnel in recent years, have a
328 high contamination rate. In terms of bacterial isolation methods, research using selective
329 bacterial isolation methods like MacConkey had the highest frequency of bacterial
330 contamination on mobile phones compared to studies using non-selective and both
331 (selective & non-selective) bacterial isolation methods. These differences could be
332 related to competition among bacteria as selective media inhibit other contaminating
333 organisms.

334 *Coagulase-negative staphylococci (CONS)* were the most common bacteria isolated in
335 this review, followed by gram-positive bacteria such as *Staphylococcus aureus*.
336 However, *Staphylococcus aureus* is the most common bacterial infection in most
337 countries and is responsible for over 1 million worldwide deaths, with no focus on global
338 public health expenditure [10]. *Escherichia coli* were the most isolated gram-negative
339 bacteria from mobile phones used by healthcare personnel. The possible reason for the
340 high isolation of *Staphylococci* species might be related to their residence in mucosal
341 systems and the isolation of *E. coli*, possibly due to cross-contamination with
342 gastrointestinal samples. This finding was in line with findings from other studies [1, 2,
343 10, 16, 69].

344 The review's second objective was to describe medication sensitivity and resistance
345 patterns among African bacterial isolates. In a study conducted in Ethiopia, *ceftriaxone*
346 and *ciprofloxacin* were effective against 71.7% and 89.1% of gram-positive bacterial
347 isolates such as CONs and *S. aureus*, respectively, while *E. coli* was 100% sensitive to
348 ciprofloxacin, gentamycin, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole [42]. However, a study

349 conducted in Nigeria found substantial resistance levels to *cotrimoxazole*, *tetracycline*,
350 *ampicillin*, *gentamicin*, *ceftriaxone*, and *ciprofloxacin* [21]. Most patients who are treated
351 at home are resistant to one or more antimicrobials [66]. Different bacterial strains,
352 hospital environment, empirical treatment practice, use of antibacterial as a prophylactic,
353 easy availability of some drugs without a prescription, drug dose, and
354 indiscriminate/prolonged use of common antibiotics could all contribute to discrepancies
355 in antimicrobial susceptibility in the included studies [70].

356 **Limitations**

357 This research has certain limitations. Since all of the studies examined were cross-
358 sectional studies in design, it could be difficult to establish a cause-effect relationship.
359 The study's findings were only generalizable to the included country's sub-regions. In the
360 end, only articles written in English were considered. Finally, future researchers should
361 concentrate on observational studies with well-designed designs, such as cohort and
362 interventional studies.

363 **Conclusion**

364 The contamination of mobile phones used by HCWs with various bacterial isolates was
365 found to be high in this review. The most common bacteria isolated were *coagulase-*
366 *negative staphylococci*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and *Escherichia coli*. The prevalence of
367 bacterial contamination in mobile phones varies by country and sub-region. Healthcare
368 workers should be required to practice proper hand hygiene and clean after using their
369 phones in healthcare facilities. Thus, healthcare planners and policymakers should adopt
370 guidelines to govern healthcare workers' hand hygiene, disinfection, sterilization, and
371 cleansing after using mobile phones in healthcare facilities.

372 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

373 Not applicable.

374 **Consent for publication**

375 Not applicable.

376 **Availability of data and materials**

377 The manuscript contains all pertinent information.

378 **Competing interests**

379 There are no competing interests declared by the authors.

380 **Funding**

381 There was no funding for this work from any entity.

382 **Author's contributions**

383 DZ, BS, GB contributed to the conception, design, data extraction, and AM, FD, FN, DA,
384 WN, MM, ZT and VC evaluated the methodological quality of the articles included, as
385 well as the participated in data analysis, interpretation, writing the first draft of the paper.
386 Finally, the authors read, commented on, edited, and approved the final draft version.

387 **Additional files**

388 Additional file 1: PRISMA checklist (DOC)

389 Additional file 2: Search results of electronic databases (Screenshot)

390 Additional file 3: Risk of bias assessment of included studies (XLSX).

391 **References**

- 392 1. Kotris I, Drenjanèeviaè D, Talapko J, Bukovski S. Identification of microorganisms
393 on mobile phones of intensive care unit health care workers and medical students
394 in the tertiary hospital. *Medicinski glasnik*. 2017;14(1).
- 395 2. Heyba M, Ismaiel M, Alotaibi A, Mahmoud M, Baqer H, Safar A, et al.
396 Microbiological contamination of mobile phones of clinicians in intensive care units
397 and neonatal care units in public hospitals in Kuwait. *BMC infectious diseases*.
398 2015;15(1):434-.
- 399 3. Ulger F, Dilek A, Esen S, Sunbul M, Leblebicioglu H. Are healthcare workers'
400 mobile phones a potential source of nosocomial infections? Review of the
401 literature. *Journal of infection in developing countries*. 2015;9(10):1046-53.
- 402 4. Prgomet M, Georgiou A, Westbrook JI. The impact of mobile handheld technology
403 on hospital physicians' work practices and patient care: a systematic review.
404 *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2009;16(6):792-801.
- 405 5. Ventola CL. Mobile devices and apps for health care professionals: uses and
406 benefits. *Pharmacy and Therapeutics*. 2014;39(5):356.

- 407 6. Manning ML, Davis J, Sparnon E, Ballard RM. iPads, droids, and bugs: Infection
408 prevention for mobile handheld devices at the point of care. *American journal of*
409 *infection control*. 2013;41(11):1073-6.
- 410 7. Brady RR, Verran J, Damani N, Gibb A. Review of mobile communication devices
411 as potential reservoirs of nosocomial pathogens. *Journal of Hospital Infection*.
412 2009;71(4):295-300.
- 413 8. Smibert O, Aung A, Woolnough E, Carter G, Schultz M, Howden B, et al. Mobile
414 phones and computer keyboards: unlikely reservoirs of multidrug-resistant
415 organisms in the tertiary intensive care unit. *Journal of Hospital Infection*.
416 2018;99(3):295-8.
- 417 9. Christensen G, Bruggemann H. Bacterial skin commensals and their role as host
418 guardians. *Benef Microbes* 5 (2): 201–215. 2014.
- 419 10. Shah PD, Shaikh NM, Dholaria KV. Microorganisms isolated from mobile phones
420 and hands of health-care workers in a tertiary care hospital of Ahmedabad,
421 Gujarat, India. *Indian Journal of Public Health*. 2019;63(2):147.
- 422 11. Ulger F, Dilek A, Esen S, Sunbul M, Leblebicioglu H. Are healthcare workers'
423 mobile phones a potential source of nosocomial infections? Review of the
424 literature. *The journal of infection in developing countries*. 2015;9(10):1046-53.
- 425 12. Ustun C, Cihangiroglu M. Health care workers' mobile phones: a potential cause
426 of microbial cross-contamination between hospitals and community. *Journal of*
427 *occupational and environmental hygiene*. 2012;9(9):538-42.
- 428 13. Saxena S, Singh T, Agarwal H, Mehta G, Dutta R. Bacterial colonization of rings
429 and cell phones carried by health-care providers: are these mobile bacterial zoos
430 in the hospital? *Tropical doctor*. 2011;41(2):116-8.
- 431 14. Bhat SS, Hegde SK, Salian S. Potential of mobile phones to serve as a reservoir
432 in spread of nosocomial pathogens. *Online Journal of Health and Allied Sciences*.
433 2011;10(2).
- 434 15. Parthasarathy A, Wong NH, Weiss AN, Tian S, Ali SE, Cavanaugh NT, et al.
435 Selfies and cellfies: Whole genome sequencing and annotation of five antibiotic
436 resistant bacteria isolated from the surfaces of smartphones, an inquiry based

- 437 laboratory exercise in a genomics undergraduate course at the rochester institute
438 of technology. *Journal of genomics*. 2019;7:26.
- 439 16. Pal S, Juyal D, Adekhandi S, Sharma M, Prakash R, Sharma N, et al. Mobile
440 phones: Reservoirs for the transmission of nosocomial pathogens. *Advanced
441 biomedical research*. 2015;4.
- 442 17. Galazzi A, Panigada M, Broggi E, Grancini A, Adamini I, Binda F, et al.
443 Microbiological colonization of healthcare workers' mobile phones in a tertiary-
444 level Italian intensive care unit. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*. 2019;52:17-
445 21.
- 446 18. Pillet S, Berthelot P, Gagneux-Brunon A, Mory O, Gay C, Viallon A, et al.
447 Contamination of healthcare workers' mobile phones by epidemic viruses. *Clinical
448 Microbiology and Infection*. 2016;22(5):456. e1-. e6.
- 449 19. Tannhäuser R, Nickel O, Lindner M, Bethge A, Wolf J, Borte S, et al. Bacterial
450 contamination of the smartphones of healthcare workers in a German tertiary-care
451 hospital before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *American journal of infection
452 control*. 2021.
- 453 20. Tambe NN, Pai C. A study of microbial flora and MRSA harboured by mobile
454 phones of health care personnel. *Int J Rec Tre Sci Tech*. 2012;4:14-8.
- 455 21. Nwankwo EO, Ekwunife N, Mofolorunsho KC. Nosocomial pathogens associated
456 with the mobile phones of healthcare workers in a hospital in Anyigba, Kogi state,
457 Nigeria. *Journal of epidemiology and global health*. 2014;4(2):135-40.
- 458 22. Asfaw T, Genetu D. High Rate of Bacterial Contamination on Healthcare Worker's
459 Mobile Phone and Potential Role in Dissemination of Healthcare-Associated
460 Infection at Debre Berhan Referral Hospital, North Shoa Zone, Ethiopia. *Risk
461 management and healthcare policy*. 2021;14:2601.
- 462 23. Haghmad A. Prevalence of Bacterial Contamination on Mobile Phones of
463 Medical Staff in Shendi Hospitals-Sudan. 2021.
- 464 24. Araya S, Desta K, Woldeamanuel Y. Extended-Spectrum Beta-Lactamase-
465 Producing Gram-Negative Bacteria on Healthcare Workers' Mobile Phones:
466 Evidence from Tikur Anbessa Specialized Hospital, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Risk
467 management and healthcare policy*. 2021;14:283-91.

- 468 25. Mushabati N, Samutela M, Yamba K, Ngulube J, Nakazwe R, Nkhoma P, et al.
469 Bacterial contamination of mobile phones of healthcare workers at the University
470 Teaching Hospital, Lusaka, Zambia. *Infection Prevention in Practice*.
471 2021;3(2):100126.
- 472 26. Omran A, Taha MS. Bacterial contamination of mobile phones among health care
473 workers: A meta-analysis study. *Journal of Medicine in Scientific Research*.
474 2020;3(2):87.
- 475 27. Pérez-Cano H, Santos MR, Moreno BC. Microbiota in mobile phones of medical
476 ophthalmologists. *Archivos de la Sociedad Española de Oftalmología (English*
477 *Edition)*. 2019;94(2):55-9.
- 478 28. Curtis A, Moore Z, Patton D, O'Connor T, Nugent L. Does using a cellular mobile
479 phone increase the risk of nosocomial infections in the Neonatal Intensive Care
480 Unit: A systematic review. *Journal of Neonatal Nursing*. 2018;24(5):247-52.
- 481 29. Leong XYA, Chong SY, Koh SEA, Yeo BC, Tan KY, Ling ML. Healthcare workers'
482 beliefs, attitudes and compliance with mobile phone hygiene in a main operating
483 theatre complex. *Infection Prevention in Practice*. 2020;2(1):100031.
- 484 30. Bhardwaj N, Khatri M, Bhardwaj SK, Sonne C, Deep A, Kim KH. A review on
485 mobile phones as bacterial reservoirs in healthcare environments and potential
486 device decontamination approaches. *Environmental research*. 2020;186:109569.
- 487 31. Nejad SB, Allegranzi B, Syed SB, Ellis B, Pittet D. Health-care-associated
488 infection in Africa: a systematic review. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*.
489 2011;89:757-65.
- 490 32. Pasquarella C, Pitzurra O, Savino A. The index of microbial air contamination.
491 *Journal of hospital infection*. 2000;46(4):241-56.
- 492 33. Website. Your Cell Phone Is 10 Times Dirtier Than a Toilet Seat [Internet, Time
493 (2021) <http://timecom/4908654/cell-phone-bacteria/>. Mar, 2019 16.
- 494 34. Simmonds R, Lee D, Hayhurst E. Mobile phones as fomites for potential
495 pathogens in hospitals: microbiome analysis reveals hidden contaminants.
496 *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2020;104(2):207-13.
- 497 35. Beer D, Vandermeer B, Brosnikoff C, Shokoples S, Rennie R, Forgie S.
498 BACTERIAL CONTAMINATION OF HEALTH CARE WORKERS'PAGERS AND

- 499 THE EFFICACY OF VARIOUS DISINFECTING AGENTS. The Pediatric infectious
500 disease journal. 2006;25(11):1074-5.
- 501 36. Huffman S, Webb C, Spina SP. Investigation into the cleaning methods of
502 smartphones and wearables from infectious contamination in a patient care
503 environment (I-SWIPE). American journal of infection control. 2020;48(5):545-9.
- 504 37. Stern C, Lizarondo L, Carrier J, Godfrey C, Rieger K, Salmond S, et al.
505 Methodological guidance for the conduct of mixed methods systematic reviews.
506 JBI evidence synthesis. 2020;18(10):2108-18.
- 507 38. Getachew H, Derbie A, Mekonnen D. Surfaces and air bacteriology of selected
508 wards at a referral hospital, Northwest Ethiopia: A cross-sectional study.
509 International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;101:44-5.
- 510 39. Wayne P. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute: Performance Standards for
511 Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing: Informational Supplement, M100. Clinical and
512 Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI); 2018.
- 513 40. Moola S. Chapter 7: systematic reviews of etiology and risk in: Aromataris E,
514 Munn Z, eds Joanna Briggs institute reviewer's manual. The Joanna Briggs
515 Institute, 2017.
- 516 41. Higgins J, Altman D, Gøtzsche P, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman A, et al. Cochrane
517 bias methods group; cochrane statistical methods group. The Cochrane
518 Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials BMJ.
519 2011;343(7829):d5928.
- 520 42. Daka D. Antibiotic-resistant Staphylococcus aureus isolated from mobile phone
521 and hands of Health care workers in the Hawassa referral Hospital, South
522 Ethiopia. Journal of Microbiology and Antimicrobials. 2014;6(4):72-8.
- 523 43. Ayalew W, Mulu W, Biadlegne F. Bacterial contamination and antibiogram of
524 isolates from health care workers' fomites at Felege Hiwot Referral Hospital,
525 northwest Ethiopia. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2019;33(2).
- 526 44. Misgana GM, Abdissa K, Abebe G. Bacterial contamination of mobile phones of
527 health care workers at Jimma University Specialized Hospital, Jimma, South West
528 Ethiopia. International Journal of Infection Control. 2015;11(1).

- 529 45. Gashaw M, Abteu D, Addis Z. Prevalence and antimicrobial susceptibility pattern
530 of bacteria isolated from mobile phones of health care professionals working in
531 Gondar town health centers. *International Scholarly Research Notices*.
532 2014;2014.
- 533 46. Bodena D, Teklemariam Z, Balakrishnan S, Tesfa T. Bacterial contamination of
534 mobile phones of health professionals in Eastern Ethiopia: antimicrobial
535 susceptibility and associated factors. *Tropical medicine and health*. 2019;47:15.
- 536 47. Mohamedin A, Elsayed A, Nashnoush HA. Bacterial Contamination of Mobile
537 Phones Healthcare Versus Non-Healthcare Workers at Mansoura City, Egypt.
538 *Journal of Plant Protection and Pathology*. 2019;10(2):101-9.
- 539 48. Elgabeery RE. Healthcare Workers' Mobile Phones as a Possible Vehicle of
540 Nosocomial Pathogens and the Role of Different Disinfectants in their
541 Decontamination. *Egyptian Journal of Medical Microbiology*. 2021;30(3):29-36.
- 542 49. Selim HS, Abaza AF. Microbial contamination of mobile phones in a health care
543 setting in Alexandria, Egypt. *GMS hygiene and infection control*. 2015;10:Doc03-
544 Doc.
- 545 50. Shahaby A, Awad N, El-Tarras A, Bahobial A. Mobile phone as potential
546 reservoirs of bacterial pathogens. *African Journal of Biotechnology*.
547 2012;11(92):15896-904.
- 548 51. Yar DD, Francis G, Roland K, Collins O-A, Balali GI, Kuffour RA, et al. Mobile
549 Phones of Healthcare Workers are Possible Source of Nosocomial Infections:
550 Evidence from Asante-Mampong Municipal Government Hospital, Ghana.
- 551 52. Fandoh ME. Mobile Phone Use and Associated Bacterial Contamination in the
552 Neonatal Intensive Care Unit of the Korle-Bu Teaching Hospital: University Of
553 Ghana; 2018.
- 554 53. Mohamadou M, Kountchou L, Mbah C, Bamia A, Abdouraman B, Ngoutane A.
555 Social Habits of Health Professionals and their Mobile Phones as Source of MDR
556 Nosocomial Bacteria in Cameroon, Sub Saharan Africa. *J Infect Dis Prev Med*.
557 2021;9:214.
- 558 54. Daoudi A, Nadia El Idrissi S, Bennaoui F, Alaoui M, Soraa N, Fadl Mrabih Rabou
559 M. Study of Bacterial Contamination of Mobile Phones and Stethoscopes in

- 560 Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. International journal of pediatrics (Mashhad).
561 2017;5(11):6139-42.
- 562 55. Akinyemi KO, Atapu AD, Adetona OO, Coker AO. The potential role of mobile
563 phones in the spread of bacterial infections. The Journal of Infection in Developing
564 Countries. 2009;3(08):628-32.
- 565 56. Bobat R, Archary M, Lawler M, Mawlana S, Naidoo KL, Maphumulo S, et al. The
566 presence and spectrum of bacteria colonising mobile phones of staff and
567 caregivers in high disease burden paediatric and neonatal wards in an urban
568 teaching hospital in Durban, South Africa. Southern African Journal of Infectious
569 Diseases. 2017;32(1):9-11.
- 570 57. Osman M, Omer S, Almugadam B, Ahmed H. Frequency of MRSA isolates in
571 mobile phones, ears and hands of healthcare workers. J Antimicrob Agents.
572 2018;4(161):2472-1212.1000161.
- 573 58. Tusage Fred. Bacterial Contamination of Healthcare worker's Mobile Phones; a
574 Case Study at Two Referral Hospitals in Uganda. 2021.
- 575 59. Christelle KM, Hendrick ML, Henri MT. Microbial Ecology of Mobile Phones Staff
576 Maternity Hospital Public Lubumbashi, DR Congo. Microbiol Infect Dis.
577 2019;3(3):1-4.
- 578 60. Goldblatt JG, Krief I, Klonsky T, Haller D, Milloul V, Sixsmith DM, et al. Use of
579 cellular telephones and transmission of pathogens by medical staff in New York
580 and Israel. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology. 2007;28(4):500-3.
- 581 61. Kirkby S, Biggs C, Ikuta L, Zukowsky K. Cell phones in the neonatal intensive
582 care unit. Advances in Neonatal Care. 2016;16(6):404-9.
- 583 62. Koroglu M, Gunal S, Yildiz F, Savas M, Ozer A, Altindis M. Comparison of
584 keypads and touch-screen mobile phones/devices as potential risk for microbial
585 contamination. Journal of infection in developing countries. 2015;9(12):1308-14.
- 586 63. Shakir IA, Patel NH, Chamberland RR, Kaar SG. Investigation of cell phones as a
587 potential source of bacterial contamination in the operating room. JBJS.
588 2015;97(3):225-31.
- 589 64. Loyola S, Gutierrez LR, Horna G, Petersen K, Agapito J, Osada J, et al.
590 Extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae in cell phones of

- 591 health care workers from Peruvian pediatric and neonatal intensive care units.
592 American journal of infection control. 2016;44(8):910-6.
- 593 65. Shahlol A, Khalifallah H, Shahlol E, Dastidar R, Halder M, Lamichhane G.
594 Bacterial contamination of mobile phones and hands of health care workers in
595 Sabha Medical Center Hospital, Fazzan area in southwestern of LIBYA.
596 International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences. 2015;1(4):1-8.
- 597 66. Morvai J, Szabó R. The role of mobile communication devices in the spread of
598 infections. Orvosi Hetilap. 2015;156(20):802-7.
- 599 67. Brady RR, Chitnis S, Stewart RW, Graham C, Yalamarathi S, Morris K. NHS
600 connecting for health: healthcare professionals, mobile technology, and infection
601 control. Telemedicine journal and e-health : the official journal of the American
602 Telemedicine Association. 2012;18(4):289-91.
- 603 68. Al Momani W, Khatatbeh M, Altaany Z. Antibiotic susceptibility of bacterial
604 pathogens recovered from the hand and mobile phones of university students.
605 Germs. 2019;9(1):9.
- 606 69. Organization WH. Antimicrobial resistance: global report on surveillance: World
607 Health Organization; 2014.
- 608 70. Control CfD, Prevention. Antibiotic resistance threats in the United States, 2013
609 Atlanta. GA: CDC. 2013.

610

611





Figure 1: Flow chart of study selection for systematic review and meta-analysis of bacterial contamination of mobile phones among healthcare workers in Africa.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.27.22275700>; this version posted May 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

Figure 2: Forest plot of pooled bacterial contamination rate of mobile phones used by healthcare workers in Africa.

Authors(year)


Effect (95% CI)



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

Figure 3: Forest plot of pooled contamination rate of mobile phones of healthcare workers by coagulase-negative staphylococci in Africa.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.27.22275700>; this version posted May 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

Figure 4: Forest plot of pooled contamination rate of mobile phones of healthcare workers by *Staphylococcus aureus* in Africa.




Figure 5: Forest plot of pooled contamination rate of mobile phones of healthcare workers by Escherichia Coli in Africa.

Meta-analysis estimates, given named study is omitted

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.27.22275704>; this version posted May 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Figure 6: Sensitivity analysis of mobile phones bacterial contamination removed at a time: contamination rate and 95% confidence interval among healthcare workers in Africa.

Funnel plot




Figure 7: Funnel plot with 95% confidence limits of the pooled bacterial contamination rate of mobile phones used by healthcare workers in Africa.

Funnel plot




Figure 8: Funnel plot trim fill analysis with 95% confidence limits of the pooled bacterial contamination rate of mobile phones used by healthcare workers in Africa.