

1 **Water, sanitation, and hygiene in selected health facilities in Ethiopia: risks for healthcare**  
2 **acquired antibiotic resistant infections**

3

4 Teshome Bekele<sup>1</sup>, Abebe Assefa<sup>2</sup>, Lavuun Verstraete<sup>3</sup>, Adey Feleke Desta<sup>4</sup>, Taha Al-Mulla<sup>5</sup>, Kitka  
5 Goyol<sup>3</sup>, Kaleab Baye<sup>1,6\*</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup>Center for Food Science and Nutrition, College of Natural and Computational Sciences Addis Ababa University,  
8 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

9 <sup>2</sup> Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

10 <sup>3</sup> Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), UNICEF, Ethiopia

11 <sup>4</sup>Department of Microbial, Cellular and Molecular Biology, College of Natural and Computational Sciences, Addis  
12 Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

13 <sup>5</sup> Health section, UNICEF, Ethiopia

14 <sup>6</sup> Research center for Inclusive Development in Africa, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

15

16 **Correspondence:** Kaleab Baye (PhD), Center for Food Science and Nutrition, Addis Ababa University, Arat Kilo  
17 Campus. Box, 1176, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, [kaleab.baye@aau.edu.et](mailto:kaleab.baye@aau.edu.et)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 **Water, sanitation, and hygiene in selected health facilities in Ethiopia: risks for healthcare**  
33 **acquired antibiotic resistant infections**

34

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background**

37 Inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in health facilities and the low adherence to  
38 infection control protocols can increase the risk of hospital-acquired (nosocomial) infections,  
39 which in turn can increase morbidity and mortality, health care cost, but also contribute to  
40 increased microbial resistance.

41 **Objectives**

42 The study aimed to assess WASH facilities and practices, and levels of nosocomial pathogens in  
43 surface and water samples collected from selected health facilities in Oromia Region and  
44 Southern, Nations and Nationalities and Peoples Region (SNNPR).

45 **Methods**

46 WASH in health care facilities in Bulle and Doyogena (SNNPR) and Bidre (Oromia) were  
47 assessed through interviews and direct observations (n= 26 facilities). Water and surface samples  
48 were collected from major hospitals and health centers. A total of 90 surface swabs and 14 water  
49 samples were collected from which a number of bacteria (n=224) were identified, characterized  
50 and tested for antimicrobial susceptibility.

51 **Results**

52 Water supply, toilet facilities, and waste management procedures were suboptimal. Only 11/26  
53 of the health facilities had access to water at the time of the survey. The lowest hand-hygiene  
54 compliance was for Bidre (4%), followed by Doyogena (14%), and Bulle (36%). Over 70% of  
55 the identified bacteria were from four categories: *Staphylococcus* spp, *Bacillus* spp, *E. coli*, and  
56 *Klebsiella* spp. These bacteria were also found in high risk locations including neonatal intensive  
57 care units, delivery and surgical rooms. Antimicrobial susceptibility was detected in  $\geq 50\%$  of  
58 the isolates for penicillin, cefazolin, ampicillin, oxacillin, and cotrimoxazole, and  $\geq 50\%$  of the  
59 isolates displayed multi-drug resistance.

60

61 **Conclusion**

62 Investing in WASH infrastructures, promotion of handwashing practices, implementing infection  
63 prevention and control (IPC) measures and antibiotic stewardship is critical to ensure quality  
64 care in these settings.

65 **Keyword:** water, sanitation, hygiene, infection prevention, antimicrobial resistance, nosocomial  
66 infections, health facilities, Ethiopia

67

68

## 69 1. Background

70 Hospital-acquired infections can increase morbidity and mortality, increase health care cost due  
71 to prolonged stay, and also contribute to increased microbial resistance due to the widespread  
72 occurrence of multi-drug resistant pathogens in health facilities. Approximately, one-third of  
73 neonatal deaths annually (680,000) are caused by infections (UNIGME, 2021). The share of  
74 hospital-acquired infection to this remains uncertain, but earlier studies have shown that rates of  
75 neonatal infections among hospital-born children in low income countries are 3-20 times higher  
76 than those in higher income countries (Zaidi et al., 2005). Most of these infections were present  
77 soon after birth and were resistant to antibiotics. Inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene  
78 (WASH) and the low adherence to infection control protocols, unsafe waste management,  
79 exacerbated by the overcrowding of health facilities increase the risk for hospital-acquired  
80 infections (Guo et al., 2017; Schwab et al., 2012).

81 Recent estimates suggest that hospital-acquired infections affect about 8% of patients in regular  
82 wards and more than half of patients admitted in intensive care units in low income settings  
83 (Vincent et al., 2009; Alp et al., 2019). A recent study from Jimma University Medical Center  
84 reported a prevalence of hospital-acquired infection of 19%, and the risk was significantly higher  
85 in those that received surgical procedures (Ali et al., 2018). A study conducted in rural health care  
86 facilities in Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, Uganda and Zambia, reported that less than  
87 50% of the surveyed facilities had access to: improved water sources on their premises,  
88 improved sanitation, hand washing facilities with constant access to water and soap (Guo et al.,  
89 2017). In Ethiopia, only an estimated 30% of health facilities have access to basic water services.  
90 However, such data is scarce for lower level health facilities such as *woreda* (district) health  
91 centers and health posts, where the problem may be even more significant.

92 Understanding the magnitude of nosocomial pathogens and their antimicrobial resistance would  
93 help design interventions that improve WASH and infection prevention control in health care  
94 facilities, but will also contribute to improving the quality of health care delivered. Therefore, the  
95 present study aimed to assess WASH facilities and practices, and levels of nosocomial pathogens  
96 in hand-touch sites in selected health facilities in Oromia and SNNPR.

## 97 **2. Methods**

### 98 **Study area and design**

99 This study is reporting on a baseline assessment conducted in health facilities in Bidre town in  
100 Bale zone in Oromia Region, Bulle town in Gedeo zone in SNNPR region and Doyogena in  
101 Kembata-Tembaro zone in SNNPR region. The WASH assessments included all health facilities  
102 that were functional at the time of the survey (i.e. health post, health centers, and hospitals).  
103 Surface and water sample were primarily collected from hospitals and health centers.

### 104 **Assessment of WASH in health facilities**

105 A WASH observational checklist was developed based on international standards—  
106 WHO/UNICEF core questions for water and sanitation, IPC and WASH common indicators  
107 (WHO, 2019). All questionnaires and checklists were translated into Amharic/Oromifaa and  
108 were pretested prior to the interviews. The checklist allowed the collection of information on the  
109 prevailing sanitary conditions, access to water and hand-washing facility, as well as hand-  
110 washing and waste disposal practices. The WHO protocol on monitoring fulfilment of  
111 opportunities for hand-hygiene was used to assess the health personnel's adherence to hand-  
112 hygiene guidelines (WHO, 2009).

### 113 **Surface and water sample collection**

114 Sample collection was performed following the United States Center for Disease Control and  
115 Prevention (CDC) and Public health England guidelines (CDC, 2017; Willis et al., 2013).  
116 Surface sample collection was performed using sterile cotton swabs. The swabs were first moist  
117 in sterile normal saline solution. The samples were collected from surfaces including beds, door  
118 handles, walls, gowns, autoclaves, tables, and chairs. The sampling areas included out-patients  
119 departments, different wards, pharmacy, laboratories, receptions, toilets and cafeterias in the  
120 health facilities.

121 Water samples were collected from sources from which the health facilities obtain water for  
122 washing, drinking and other activities in the healthcare settings. A total of 15 hospital water  
123 samples were collected from delivery wards, medical ward, tanker, and bore-hole and rainwater  
124 collection systems. Overall, 59 water samples were collected from all health facilities, including  
125 health centers and health posts.

### 126 **Sample handling and transportation**

127 The collected surface samples were immediately put in Amies transport media and kept in pre-  
128 cooled ice box and transported to SNNP region's Public Health Institute laboratory. On arrival at  
129 the laboratory, the surface samples were transferred to the nutrient broth and enriched overnight  
130 at 37 °C. After an overnight incubation, the samples were inoculated on blood agar and  
131 MacConkey agar plates and put overnight at 37°C. In case of no growth after an overnight  
132 culture, the plates were incubated for an additional 24 hours.

133 The water samples were assessed for their safety using modified Method 9215 to enumerate  
134 heterotrophic bacteria and membrane filtration technique for Gram-negative bacteria (APHA,

135 2005). To enumerate heterotrophic bacteria, one ml of each water sample was pipetted into a  
136 sterile petri dish. After thoroughly mixing, the melted MacConkey agar was poured into the dish.  
137 The melted medium was mixed thoroughly with the sample and solidified. The plates were  
138 incubated for 48 hours at 37°C.

139 The Gram-negative bacteria were counted by filtrating 100 ml water samples through 0.45 µm  
140 pore size-47 mm, and cellulose nitrate membranes using the modified ISO 9308-1 protocol (ISO,  
141 2014). The samples were incubated on MacConkey agar for 24 hours at 37°C. All results of  
142 Gram-negative bacteria were expressed as colony forming units per 100 mL water. The bacterial  
143 colonies were collected and put in Trypticase Soy Broth containing 20 % glycerol and were  
144 transported to the National bacteriology and mycology Reference Laboratory (NRL) at the  
145 Ethiopian Public Health Institute, where they were stored in deep-freeze until further analyses.

#### 146 **Bacterial isolation and identification**

147 The bacteria were refreshed by culturing on three different culture media: i) 5% sheep blood agar  
148 plate, ii) MacConkey agar plate, and iii) Mannitol salt agar plate. Colony appearance on culture  
149 plates, microscopic examination, and biochemical tests were used to identify Gram-positive and  
150 Gram-negative bacteria.

#### 151 *Identification of Gram-positive cocci*

152 The common Gram-positive cocci are *Staphylococcus spp* and *Streptococcus spp*. We used  
153 Blood agar and Mannitol salt agar media for isolation of *Staphylococcus spp*: The culture plates  
154 were incubated in air at 37°C for 24 hour. Colony morphology on culture plates and microscopic  
155 examination for Gram-positive cocci in clusters were used for initial *Staphylococcus spp*  
156 identification. Catalase and coagulase tests were used to classify *Staphylococcus spp* into

157 *Staphylococcus aureus* and coagulase negative *Staphylococcus*. All *Staphylococci* are Catalase  
158 positive and only *S. aureus* is coagulase positive.

159 *Streptococcus* spp were identified based on colony morphology on: i) blood agar plates (beta  
160 hemolytic, alpha hemolytic and non-hemolytic), ii) microscopic examination for Gram-positive  
161 in chin, and iii) different biochemical tests. Negative catalase test differentiated *Streptococcus*  
162 spp from *Staphylococci* *Bacillus* spp.

163 Blood agar with 5 % sheep blood media was used for the bacteria isolation. Colony morphology  
164 on the culture plates and gram stain were used for the bacterial identification. To differentiate  
165 *Bacillus cereus* from other *Bacillus* species we used citrate test which is only positive for *B.*  
166 *cereus*.

#### 167 **Identification of Gram-negative bacilli**

168 The common gram negative bacteria are generally divided into two major categories: Fermenters  
169 and non-fermenters. Fermenters gram-negative bacilli utilize lactose and become pink color  
170 colonies on MacConkey agar while non-fermenters cannot utilize lactose and they are colorless  
171 colonies on MacConkey agar plate. Biochemical tests such as Triple Sugar Iron Agar (TSI), urea,  
172 citrate, Sulfide Indole Motility (SIM) medium, growth in Lysine Iron Agar (LIA), and oxidase  
173 were additionally used to identify Gram-negative bacteria.

#### 174 **2.4 Antimicrobial susceptibility testing**

175  
176 The antimicrobial Susceptibility Tests (AST) were performed based on the Kirby–Bauer disk  
177 diffusion method on Mueller-Hinton agar (MHA) as recommended by clinical and laboratory  
178 standard Institute (CLSI) for all Gram-negative bacteria and *Staphylococcus* species (CLSI,  
179 2017). Well-isolated three to four colonies were emulsified in a tube containing sterile normal

180 saline and the turbidity adjusted to 0.5 McFarland standards. The emulsified bacterial suspension  
181 was uniformly streaked on MHA plates using sterile cotton swabs, on which the antibiotic disks  
182 were applied and incubated for 18-24 hours at 37 °C. The antibiotic agents tested in this study  
183 were ampicillin (10 µg), amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (20/10 µg), piperacillin/ tazobactam,  
184 cefazolin (30 µg), cefuroxime (30 µg), cefotaxime (30 µg), ceftazidime (30 µg), cefepime (30  
185 µg), ceftazidime (30 µg), ciprofloxacin (5 µg), amikacin (30 µg), meropenem (10 µg),  
186 chloramphenicol, tetracycline, cotrimoxazole, and penicillin. Penicillin and ceftazidime were tested  
187 only for *Staphylococcus* species and the result of oxacillin was determined from ceftazidime  
188 breakpoint. Antibiotic susceptibility results were interpreted according to the CLSI zone size  
189 interpretive standards (CLSI, 2017). Intermediate results were considered to be resistant.

190 Multidrug resistance (MDR) was defined according to guidelines compiled by the European  
191 Center for Disease prevention and Control (ECDC) and the Centers for Disease Control and  
192 Prevention (CDC) (Magiorakos et al., 2012). Accordingly, bacterial isolates that were resistant to  
193 at least one agent in three different antimicrobial categories were considered as MDR.

## 194 **2.5 Quality Assurance**

195  
196 All media, biochemical reagents, gram stain reagents and antibiotic disks were checked for their  
197 quality using standards ATCC strains. Standard ATCC quality strains used for this study were *S.*  
198 *aureus* ATCC<sup>®</sup> 25923, *E. coli* ATCC<sup>®</sup> 2592, *P. aeruginosa* ATCC 27853.

## 199 **2.6 Data analysis**

200  
201 The data were entered and cleaned using Microsoft Excel and were exported to SPSS version  
202 20.0 for further analyses. The frequencies of bacterial isolates and antimicrobial susceptibility  
203 were calculated. Mean and frequencies (percentage) were used to present descriptive data.



## 204 **2.7 Ethics**

205 Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the College of Natural  
206 and Computational Sciences of Addis Ababa University. Informed consent was obtained prior  
207 collection of data.

## 208 **3. Results**

209 WASH assessments were conducted in 26 health facilities in Bulle and Doyogena (SNNP  
210 Region) and in Bidre (Oromia Region). The assessments included hospitals (n=3), health posts  
211 (n=13), clinics (n= 8), and health centers (n=2; **Table 1**). A great majority of the health facilities  
212 relied on tanker trucks for their water supply (**Table 2**). At the time of the survey, piped water  
213 supply was available in only 11 of the 26 health facilities. Open pit latrines (14/26) were the  
214 commonest type of toilet and only in 8 out of the 26 facilities, the toilets were accessible for  
215 people with limited mobility. Infectious waste was primarily dumped into an open/protected pit,  
216 incinerated, and added to other wastes. Sharp waste was mostly collected for off-site disposal,  
217 autoclaved, or incinerated. Only 10 of the 26 assessed health facilities had guidelines on standard  
218 precautions for infection prevention control (IPC). Only six had cleaning protocols available, and  
219 only in one health facility, the staff responsible for cleaning received training. Environmental  
220 disinfectant was only available in only 8 of the 26 health facilities.

221 Hand-hygiene opportunities were directly observed ( $1194 \pm 326$  min) and evaluated using the  
222 WHO checklist to assess compliance (**Table 2**). Hand-hygiene opportunities were: i) before  
223 touching a patient; ii) before a procedure; iii) after body fluid exposure/risk; iv) after touching a  
224 patient; v) after touching a patient's surrounding. Hand-hygiene compliance was overall low, but

225 varied by site. The lowest compliance was for Bidre (4%), followed by Doyogena (14%), and  
226 Bulle (36%).

227 A total of 90 surface swabs and 14 water samples were collected from which a number of  
228 bacteria (n=224) were identified (**Table 3**). Over 70% of the identified bacteria were from four  
229 categories: *Staphylococcus* spp, *Bacillus* spp, *E. coli*, and *Klebsiella* spp. These bacteria were the  
230 most widely distributed and were also found in high risk locations including neonatal intensive  
231 care units, delivery and surgical rooms (**Table 4**). More details on the identified bacteria by study  
232 sites, location and sample source can be found in the **supplemental table S1-S3 and figure S1**.

233 **Figure 1** presents the antimicrobial resistance of the identified bacterial isolates. Antimicrobial  
234 susceptibility was detected in 50% or more of the isolates for penicillin, cefazolin, ampicillin,  
235 oxacillin, and cotrimoxazole. More than 50% of the isolates displayed multi-drug resistance,  
236 defined as resistant to at least one agent in three different antimicrobial categories.

#### 237 **4. Discussion**

238 Water supply, availability of clean and accessible toilets, as well as infection prevention  
239 measures were found suboptimal. Hand hygiene practice by health workers was very low.  
240 Consequently, surface swabs and water samples revealed high bacterial contamination, with  
241 some of the identified bacteria known for their pathogenicity. These bacteria were also found in  
242 highly sensitive areas like surgical rooms, delivery rooms, and neonatal intensive care units  
243 (ICUs).

244 Our findings highlight the need to invest in safely managed water supply, provision of safely  
245 managed sanitation services, but also strict hygiene and environmental cleaning in health  
246 facilities. Earlier studies assessing 1,318 health facilities in multiple African countries including  
247 Ethiopia showed that less than 50% of the facilities had access to improved water sources on

248 premises, improved sanitation, and consistent access to water and soap for handwashing (Guo et  
249 al. 2017). A recent meta-analyses of studies on health workers' handwashing practice in Ethiopia  
250 also estimated that 57.87% (95% CI: 44.14–71.61) practiced hand-washing (Gedamu et al.,  
251 2021), a figure that is higher than estimates from the current study. This difference may be  
252 explained by the rather rigorous evaluation of hand-hygiene practice in this study assessed using  
253 the more systematic WHO's protocol of hand-hygiene opportunities. It can as well suggest that  
254 the selected sites have more significant WASH constraints, further justifying their selection for  
255 WASH and IPC improvements by the planned intervention.

256 The poor WASH and IPC conditions observed in the health facilities can greatly impact the  
257 quality of the health care provided. First, satisfaction with WASH and IPC conditions can be  
258 associated with lower job satisfaction as reported from a recent multi-country study (Fejfar et al.,  
259 2021). Second, health facilities with suboptimal WASH and IPC procedures increase the risk for  
260 nosocomial infections. Indeed, a recent meta-analyses pooling results from 18 studies in Ethiopia  
261 (Alemu et al., 2020), estimated the prevalence of nosocomial infections to be as high as 17%  
262 (95% CI 14.10–19.82). This prevalence can be even higher when considering vulnerable sub-  
263 groups like neonates, infants and young children. Indeed, studies have shown that hospital-  
264 acquired infections contribute significantly to neonatal infections and mortality in low income  
265 countries like Ethiopia (Zaidi et al., 2005).

266 A number of pathogenic bacteria associated with nosocomial infections have been identified  
267 from highly sensitive locations like surgical rooms, delivery room, and neonatal ICU. *Klebsiella*  
268 *spp*, *E. coli*, *Acinetobacter spp*, *bacillus spp* and *Staphylococcus spp* were identified in high  
269 number of samples collected from various locations. Poor hand-hygiene and bacterial  
270 contamination with antimicrobial resistance was a common features of health facilities in all the

271 three sites. More concerning is that a large number of the identified bacteria displayed antibiotic  
272 resistance and these same species were reported to be the major pathogens identified in  
273 bloodstream isolates (n=11,471) of hospital-acquired neonatal infections (Zaidi et al., 2005). A  
274 recent global study showed that most of the bacterial isolates identified in our study were  
275 responsible for high rates of deaths associated with antimicrobial resistance, particularly in sub-  
276 Saharan African countries (Murray et al., 2022).

277 The present study has a number of limitations that need to be considered when interpreting our  
278 findings. First, this is a cross-sectional study and thus only provides a snapshot of the situation at  
279 the time of the survey. Second, the survey happened during the COVID-19 pandemic that in  
280 principle would have increased awareness on hand-hygiene because of the nation-wide  
281 campaigns. Third, this is a baseline assessment of health facilities selected for WASH/IPC  
282 intervention and thus may not be representative. However, evidence from our WASH data is in  
283 line with previous assessments and thus can be indicative of situations in similar settings in  
284 Ethiopia.

## 285 **5. Conclusion**

286 The health facilities assessed were confronted with serious problems related to WASH.  
287 Compliance to hand-hygiene practice by the health care workers was very low. Analyses of  
288 environmental and water samples revealed high levels of bacterial contamination. Most of the  
289 identified bacteria displayed antimicrobial resistance. Beyond increasing access to health  
290 coverage, emphasis should be put to improving infrastructure and services. This requires safely  
291 managed water supply, provision of safely managed sanitation services, but also strict hygiene  
292 and environmental cleaning in health facilities. Ensuring the supply chain of critical consumables  
293 such as soap, chlorine and decontaminants or disinfectants is key, but this will also need to be

294 accompanied by behavioral change on hand hygiene and environmental cleaning practices. A  
295 critical element of strengthening health systems should also focus on antibiotic stewardship.

## 296 **Acknowledgments**

297 The facilitation offered by the health bureau and the Hospitals of Bidre, Doyo Gena and Bulle is duly  
298 acknowledged.

299 **Funding:** Funding for this study was received from UNICE Ethiopia

300 **Competing interests:** None

301 **Data availability statement:** additional data related to this study can be made available upon reasonable  
302 request

303

## 304 **References**

305 Alemu, A. Y., Endalamaw, A., & Bayih, W. A. (2020). The burden of healthcare-associated  
306 infection in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Tropical Medicine and Health*,  
307 48(1), 1–11.

308 Ali, S., Birhane, M., Bekele, S., Kibru, G., Teshager, L., Yilma, Y., Ahmed, Y., Fentahun, N.,  
309 Assefa, H., & Gashaw, M. (2018). Healthcare associated infection and its risk factors  
310 among patients admitted to a tertiary hospital in Ethiopia: longitudinal study. *Antimicrobial  
311 Resistance & Infection Control*, 7(1), 1–9.

312 Alp, E., Cookson, B., Erdem, H., Rello, J., Akhvlediani, T., Akkoyunlu, Y., Amela, D. L., Aqel,  
313 A., Bagirova, F., & Carevic, B. (2019). Infection control bundles in intensive care: an  
314 international cross-sectional survey in low-and middle-income countries. *Journal of  
315 Hospital Infection*, 101(3), 248–256.

316 APHA. (2005). Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater. *American Public  
317 Health Association (APHA): Washington, DC, USA*, 21.

318 Carter, J. T., Rice, E. W., Buchberger, S. G., & Lee, Y. (2000). Relationships between levels of  
319 heterotrophic bacteria and water quality parameters in a drinking water distribution system.  
320 *Water Research*, 34(5), 1495–1502.

321 CDC. (2017). Guidelines for environmental infection control in health-care facilities. In *CDC*.  
322 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US).

323 CLSI. (2017). Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing. In *CLSI supplement  
324 M100*. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute Wayne, PA.

325 Fejfar, D., Guo, A., Kelly, E., Tidwell, J. B., Ochieng, O., & Cronk, R. (2021). Healthcare  
326 provider satisfaction with environmental conditions in rural healthcare facilities of 14 low-

- 327 and middle-income countries. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*,  
328 236, 113802.
- 329 Gedamu, H., Tesfa, G., Tafere, Y., & Genet, M. (2021). Hand washing practice among health  
330 care workers in Ethiopia: systemic review and meta-analysis, 2020. *Heliyon*, 7(5), e06972.
- 331 Giraldi, G., Montesano, M., Napoli, C., Frati, P., La Russa, R., Santurro, A., Scopetti, M., &  
332 Orsi, G. B. (2019). Healthcare-associated infections due to multidrug-resistant organisms: a  
333 surveillance study on extra hospital stay and direct costs. *Current Pharmaceutical*  
334 *Biotechnology*, 20(8), 643–652.
- 335 Guo, A., Bowling, J. M., Bartram, J., & Kayser, G. (2017). Water, sanitation, and hygiene in  
336 rural health-care facilities: a cross-sectional study in Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique,  
337 Rwanda, Uganda, and Zambia. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*,  
338 97(4), 1033.
- 339 ISO. (2014). *Water Quality-Enumeration of Escherichia Coli and Coliform Bacteria*. ISO.
- 340 Magiorakos, A.-P., Srinivasan, A., Carey, R. B., Carmeli, Y., Falagas, M. E., Giske, C. G.,  
341 Harbarth, S., Hindler, J. F., Kahlmeter, G., & Olsson-Liljequist, B. (2012). Multidrug-  
342 resistant, extensively drug-resistant and pandrug-resistant bacteria: an international expert  
343 proposal for interim standard definitions for acquired resistance. *Clinical Microbiology and*  
344 *Infection*, 18(3), 268–281.
- 345 Murray, C. J. L., Ikuta, K. S., Sharara, F., Swetschinski, L., Aguilar, G. R., Gray, A., Han, C.,  
346 Bisignano, C., Rao, P., & Wool, E. (2022). Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial  
347 resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis. *The Lancet*.
- 348 Schwab, F., Meyer, E., Geffers, C., & Gastmeier, P. (2012). Understaffing, overcrowding,  
349 inappropriate nurse: ventilated patient ratio and nosocomial infections: which parameter is  
350 the best reflection of deficits? *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 80(2), 133–139.
- 351 UNIGME -United Nations Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation- (2021), Levels &  
352 Trends in Child Mortality: Report 2021. New York, NY. Available online  
353 at: <https://data.unicef.org/topic/child-survival/neonatal-mortality/>
- 354 Vincent, J.-L., Rello, J., Marshall, J., Silva, E., Anzueto, A., Martin, C. D., Moreno, R., Lipman,  
355 J., Gomersall, C., & Sakr, Y. (2009). International study of the prevalence and outcomes of  
356 infection in intensive care units. *Jama*, 302(21), 2323–2329.
- 357 WHO. (2009). *Hand hygiene technical reference manual: to be used by health-care workers,*  
358 *trainers and observers of hand hygiene practices*.
- 359 WHO. (2019). *WASH in health care facilities: global baseline report 2019*.
- 360 Willis, C., Nye, K., Aird, H., Lamph, D., & Fox, A. (2013). Examining food, water and  
361 environmental samples from healthcare environments. Microbiological Guideline. *Pub*  
362 *Health England Pp*, 1–48.
- 363 Zaidi, A. K. M., Huskins, W. C., Thaver, D., Bhutta, Z. A., Abbas, Z., & Goldmann, D. A.  
364 (2005). Hospital-acquired neonatal infections in developing countries. *The Lancet*,  
365 365(9465), 1175–1188.



367 **Tables and figures**

368 **Table 1** Characteristics of the health facilities

	<b>N (%)</b>
<b>District</b>	
Bule (SNNPR)	9 (34.6)
Doyogena (SNNPR)	11(42.3)
Bidre (Oromia)	6 (23.1)
<b>Type of Facility</b>	
District Hospital	3 (11.5)
Health Center	2 (7.7)
Clinic	8 (30.8)
Health Post	13 (50)
<b>Governance of the Facility</b>	
Government/Public	18 (69.2)
NGO/not for profit	1 (3.8)
Private	7 (26.9)

369

370



371 **Table 2** Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene of the assessed health facilities

	n (%)
<b>Water supply</b>	
Tanker truck	8 (30.8)
rain water collection	4 (15.4)
protected spring	2 (7.7)
unprotected dug well	2 (7.7)
pipled supply inside health facility	2 (7.7)
<b>Toilet facility</b>	
Pit latrine without slab/open pit	14 (53.8)
Pit latrine with slab Composting toilet	5 (19.2)
At least one toilet usable (available, functional, and private)?	10 (38.5)
Are accessible for people with limited mobility	8 (30.8)
<b>Treatment of infectious waste</b>	
Not treated, but buried in lined, protected pit	26 (100)
Not treated, but open burning and added to general waste	13 (50)
Incinerated (other)	4 (15.4)
<b>Treatment/disposal sharp waste</b>	
Not treated, but collected for medical waste disposal off-site	4 (15.4)
Autoclaved	3 (11.5)
Incinerated (other)	5 (19.2)
Facility has guidelines on standard precautions for IPC	3 (11.5)
<b>Health worker hand washing compliance*</b>	
Bulle	36%
Doyogena	14%
Bidre	4%

372 Calculated based on observations of hand-washing actions taken against overall hand-washing opportunities

373

374

375

376

377

378

379 **Table 3** Identification of bacteria from surface swabs and water samples

Bacteria Isolates	Bulle	n (%)		Total N (%)
		Doyogena	Bidre	
<i>E. hermani</i>	1(1.4)	-	-	1 (0.4)
<i>Providencia</i> spp	-	1 (1.3)	-	1 (0.4)
<i>Proteus mirabilis</i>	1(1.4)	-	-	1 (0.4)
<i>Enterococcus</i> spp	-	-	2(2.5)	2 (0.9)
<i>Morganella</i> spp	-	2 (2.7)	-	2 (0.9)
<i>Pseudomonas</i> spp	-	6 (8.0)	1(1.3)	7 (3.1)
<i>Alcaligenes</i> spp	-	8 (10.7)	-	8 (3.5)
<i>Citrobacter</i> spp	2(2.9)	5 (6.7)	2(2.5)	9 (4.0)
<i>Enterobacter</i> spp	1(1.4)	3 (4.0)	6(7.6)	10 (4.5)
<i>Acinitobacter</i> spp	7 (10.0)	5 (6.7)	6 (7.6)	24 (10.7)
Rare Non- fermenters	7 (10.0)	-	17 (21.5)	24 (10.7)
<i>Klebsiella</i> spp	12 (17.1)	9 (12.0)	9(11.6)	30 (13.4)
<i>E. coli</i>	12 (17.1)	15 (20.0)	8 (10.1)	35 (15.6)
<i>Bacillus</i> spp	13(18.6)	14 (18.7)	9(11.6)	36 (16.1)
<i>Staphylococcus</i> spp	12 (17.1)	7 (9.3)	19 (24.1)	38 (17.0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>70 (100)</b>	<b>75 (100)</b>	<b>79 (100)</b>	<b>224 (100)</b>

380

381 **Table 4** Identified bacteria by sample source/location

	<i>Acinetobacter</i>	<i>Alcaligenes</i>	<i>Bacillus</i>	<i>Citrobacter</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	<i>Edwardians</i>	<i>Enterobacter</i>	<i>Klebsiella</i>	<i>Non-lactose fermenter</i>	<i>Pseudomonas</i>	<i>Staphylococcus</i>	<i>Morganella</i>	<i>Providencia</i>	<i>S. aureus</i>	N of different pathogenic bacteria found	N of samples
Adult OPD							x	x			x	x			4	4
ANC (Health center)		x													1	3
Autoclave											x				1	1
Card room		x	x		x										3	1
Delivery room	x	x	x	x			x				x			x	7	5
Door handle	x	x	x	x	x						x				6	5
Emergency	x	x	x	x	x		x			x	x		x	x	10	6
Family planning		x	x							x					3	2
Female medical ward		x	x		x		x				x				5	2
Female surgical							x	x			x				3	1
Gynecology				x	x						x				3	2
HC Adult OPD									x		x				2	2
HC ART clinic									x						1	1
HC Emergency OPD									x						1	2
HC EPI									x		x				2	2
HC laboratory	x		x		x						x			x	5	2
HC water									x						1	1
Hospital water															0	1
Laboratory										x					1	3
Male surgical ward			x	x	x		x	x	x	x					7	3
Medical ward			x		x								x		3	1
Neonatal ICU			x										x		2	2
Observation room	x	x	x				x	x							5	2
Obstetric room							x	x			x				3	1
Operation room			x		x		x				x				4	1
Pediatric isolation room			x				x		x		x				4	2
Pediatric OPD			x						x		x				3	5
Pediatric ward					x		x	x	x	x				x	6	4
Pharmacy			x		x				x						3	3
Post-natal			x		x		x				x			x	5	3
Pre-term					x	x									2	1
Procedure room	x				x								x		3	3
Psychiatric room											x				1	1
Rain water										x					1	1
Reception			x						x		x				3	4
Stabilization phase I			x					x	x		x			x	5	3
Staff cafeteria							x								1	1
Sterilization room														x	1	1
Surgical ward			x		x									x	3	2
Table HP		x	x	x	x		x								5	2
Tanker 1 water				x	x					x					3	1
Toilet door handle					x										1	2
Under 5 OPD HC												x			1	6
Under five emergency			x												1	1
Wards door								x	x		x				3	1
Will chair					x										1	1


382 ART, antiretroviral therapy; EPI, expanded programme on immunization; HC, health center; ICU, intensive care unit; OPD,  
 383 outpatient department

384

385

386

387



388

389 **Figure 1** Antibiotic susceptibility profile and multidrug resistance of the identified bacteria

390 Percentage of resistance of bacterial isolates identified from healthcare surface environmental and water samples according to the CLSI disk  
391 diffusion breakpoints. Resistance was defined as isolates with intermediate resistance and complete resistance inhibition zone size. Antibiotics  
392 tested were ampicillin (AMP), amoxicillin-clavulanate (AMC), peparicillin with tazobactum (PTZ), cefazolin (CZO), cefuroxime (CXT),  
393 ceftazidime (CAZ), cefepime (CEF), cefotaxime (CTX), ciprofloxacin (CIP), nalidixic acid(NA), chloramphenicol (CHL), Cotrimoxazole (COT)  
394 Amikacin (AMK), Meropenem (MER),tetracycline (TTC), Penicillin (PEN) and oxacillin (OXA). MDR is to indicate the rate of Multidrug  
395 resistant bacterial isolates.

396

397

398