

1 **Full title:** Current international tools and guidance for the implementation of hand hygiene recommendations  
2 in community settings: a scoping review

3

4 **Short title:** Scoping review of implementation guidance and tools for hand hygiene in community settings

5

6 **Authors**

7

8 Clara MacLeod<sup>1,\*</sup>, Joanna Esteves Mills<sup>2</sup>, Bethany A Caruso<sup>3</sup>, Claire Chase<sup>4</sup>, Kondwani Chidziwisano<sup>5</sup>, Jenala

9 Chipungu<sup>6</sup>, Robert Dreibelbis<sup>1</sup>, Regina Ejemot-Nwadiaro<sup>7</sup>, Bruce Gordon<sup>2</sup>, Ann Thomas<sup>8</sup>, Oliver Cumming<sup>1</sup>,

10 Laura Braun<sup>1</sup>

11

12 **Affiliations**

13

14 <sup>1</sup>Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Faculty of Infectious and  
15 Tropical Diseases, London, UK

16 <sup>2</sup>Water, Sanitation, Hygiene and Health Unit, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

17 <sup>3</sup>Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

18 <sup>4</sup>Water and Sanitation Program, World Bank Group, Washington, District of Columbia, USA

19 <sup>5</sup>Department of Environmental Health and WASHTED, Malawi University of Business and Applied Sciences,  
20 Blantyre, Malawi

21 <sup>6</sup>Social and Behavioural Science Department, Center for Infectious Disease Research in Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

22 <sup>7</sup>Department of Public Health, College of Medical Sciences, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria

23 <sup>8</sup>United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), New York, New York, USA

24

25 \* Correspondence to Clara MacLeod: [clara.macleod@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:clara.macleod@lshtm.ac.uk)

26

27

28

29 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30 **Abstract**

31

32 **Background:** Hand hygiene is an important measure to prevent disease transmission. This scoping review  
33 identifies and summarises current tools and guidance for the implementation of hand hygiene  
34 recommendations in community settings.

35

36 **Methods:** We conducted a scoping review following the Arksey and O'Malley framework. To identify relevant  
37 documents, we searched: 1) a grey literature database, 2) Google search engine, and 3) the websites of  
38 international organisations in August 2023. We included tools and implementation guidance relevant to hand  
39 hygiene in community settings, categorised as domestic, public, or institutional, and published in English by  
40 international organisations between January 1990 and August 2023. Tools and implementation guidance were  
41 mapped to an existing conceptual framework adapted for this review that includes a six-step implementation  
42 approach.

43

44 **Results:** We included a total of 35 documents, comprising 30 implementation guidance documents and 5 stand-  
45 alone tools. Among these 35 documents, we identified 207 implementation recommendations and a total of 21  
46 tools for the six implementation steps. The 21 tools include 5 stand-alone tools and 16 tools embedded within  
47 guidance documents. Most implementation guidance was mapped to steps 1 (prepare for action), 2 (analyse the  
48 situation), 3 (develop an action plan), and 5 (monitor, evaluate, and course correct) of the conceptual  
49 framework, with limited guidance for step 4 (executing the action plan) and step 6 (cross-cutting themes). Over  
50 half of identified tools are for step 2 (analyse the situation) and primarily for undertaking a situation analysis.  
51 Only two documents provided guidance or a tool across the six steps.

52

53 **Conclusion:** Implementation guidance is available, yet inconsistently spread across the different implementation  
54 steps. There is also a limited number of tools to support implementation. Future work should focus on  
55 developing comprehensive practical tools for the implementation of hand hygiene recommendations in  
56 community settings, in line with international guidelines.

57

58

59

## 60 Introduction

61

62 Hand hygiene, which includes handwashing with soap and the use of alcohol-based hand rub (ABHR), is an  
63 important public health measure for the control and prevention of infectious diseases (1–3). Handwashing with  
64 soap has been found to be a cost-effective intervention that can reduce the risk of both diarrhoeal disease and  
65 acute respiratory infections by over 20% (4–7). Despite the international recognition of hand hygiene as a critical  
66 public health measure, there continues to be insufficient access to products and basic services in community  
67 settings, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (8–10). A recent global hygiene assessment found that  
68 most surveyed countries had national policies for hand hygiene, but over a third did not have a financial plan for  
69 implementing them (11).

70

71 While clear and robust recommendations developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) exist for hand  
72 hygiene in health care settings, there are gaps in global normative guidance on hand hygiene in settings where  
73 health care is not routinely delivered (12). A recent scoping review of current international guidelines for hand  
74 hygiene in community settings – categorised as non-healthcare settings – highlighted a lack of consistent and  
75 evidence-based recommendations across four key areas: (1) what constitutes effective hand hygiene, (2)  
76 minimum requirements for practicing hand hygiene, (3) effective behaviour change approaches to sustain hand  
77 hygiene, and (4) the role of government (12). As part of its mandate to address demand for guidance on public  
78 health topics where there is uncertainty and demand from governments, WHO is developing Guidelines for hand  
79 hygiene in community settings, with a series of systematic reviews underway to inform this effort (13). The  
80 Guidelines will provide evidence-based recommendations on how to improve hand hygiene in non-healthcare  
81 settings, collectively referred to as community settings (including domestic, public and institutional settings)  
82 (14).

83

84 Implementation guidance and tools are critical for the uptake of the guidelines, as well as for translating  
85 recommendations into practice for guideline users. The WHO Guidelines will also include practical guidance on  
86 how to implement the guideline recommendations. This will be provided through step-by-step guidance and a  
87 set of accompanying tools to support adaptation of global recommendations into national action plans for hand  
88 hygiene in community settings (15). For the hand hygiene in health care guidelines, for example, WHO has

89 published a guide to the implementation of the WHO multimodal hand hygiene improvement strategy. The  
90 guide is accompanied by several tools, including a planning and costing tool to help health-care facilities  
91 determine the feasibility of implementing alcohol-based handrub (16). Yet for the community setting, it is  
92 unclear what implementation guidance and tools currently exist. To our knowledge, this is the first review to  
93 summarise current tools and guidance for the global implementation of recommendations for hand hygiene in  
94 community settings. This review will provide a repository of tools and implementation guidance that can be used  
95 to address hand hygiene in community settings as part of WHO's forthcoming Guidelines, as well as identify gaps  
96 for future work.

97

## 98 **Aim**

99

100 The aim of this scoping review is to identify and summarise current implementation guidance and tools on hand  
101 hygiene in community settings to support the implementation of international recommendations.

102

## 103 **Methods**

104

105 This review follows the six stages of the Arksey and O'Malley methodological framework for scoping reviews  
106 (17). Our review is described according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-  
107 Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) and a PRISMA-ScR checklist is included in the  
108 Supplementary Information Table S1. The protocol was preregistered with OSF Registries (18).

109

### 110 **Identifying the research question (stage 1)**

111

112 Our primary research question is: "What current implementation guidance and tools are available to support  
113 the implementation of international recommendations for hand hygiene in community settings?"

114

### 115 Hand hygiene

116 For this review, hand hygiene refers to any hand cleansing undertaken for the purpose of removing or  
117 deactivating pathogens from hands and thereby limiting diseases transmission (19). The review considers

118 implementation tools for planning, designing, executing, and monitoring and evaluating various aspects of hand  
119 hygiene interventions or programmes.

120

### 121 Implementation guidance and tools

122 We define an implementation guide as a document, such as a manual, handbook, or guide, that provides  
123 practical recommendations on how governments, non-governmental, and private sector actors can improve the  
124 uptake of hand hygiene in community settings in line with global guidelines (20). For this review, tools are  
125 defined as documents, such as checklists, worksheets, advocacy materials, costing spreadsheets, and education  
126 and training materials, that guideline users can use to practically implement guideline recommendations to  
127 improve hand hygiene in community settings (20). Tools are intended to provide users with a structured  
128 approach and decision-making support to ensure that recommended practices are effectively implemented. For  
129 example, there are several available tools related to planning, costing, and monitoring to guide users on the  
130 implementation of the guidelines on hand hygiene in health care (16,22,23). The WHO multimodal hand hygiene  
131 improvement strategy is another example of a tool to support the guideline implementation of hand hygiene in  
132 the healthcare setting (21). A tool may be included as part of a toolkit, here defined as a set of practical tools  
133 and resources to support hand hygiene improvement and sustainability, or a stand-alone tool. A stand-alone  
134 tool refers to a document that operates independently and is not integrated as part of a toolkit or broader  
135 document. Stand-alone tools provide targeted support for improving hand hygiene in community settings.

136


### 137 Community settings

138 This scoping review focuses on settings where health care is not routinely delivered (24), broadly spanning all  
139 places where people ‘learn, play, work and love’, referred to as ‘community settings’ (25). For this review,  
140 ‘community settings’ include: 1) domestic, 2) public, and 3) institutional settings globally (e.g., high-, medium-,  
141 and low-income countries). The domestic setting refers to households. The public setting includes markets,  
142 public transportation hubs, parks, squares, and other public spaces, such as shops and restaurants. The public  
143 setting also includes spaces that vulnerable populations, such as people experiencing homelessness, may  
144 occupy. Institutional settings include the workplace, schools and universities, places of worship, and prisons and  
145 places of detention (12).

146

147 Conceptual framework

148 To map the identified guidance and tools, we developed a conceptual framework, which includes a six-step  
149 approach to support the implementation of recommendations for hand hygiene in community settings (Figure  
150 1). The conceptual framework also categorises community settings by domestic, public, and institutional setting.  
151 The six implementation steps (17,18) were adapted from the five-step approach from Burke et al. (2012) (26)  
152 and WHO (2009) (27) to include a cross-cutting sixth step. This approach has been utilised among WHO  
153 guidelines (28) based on the Centre for Effective Services (CES) Guide to Implementation (26). Step 1 (prepare  
154 for action) ensures the overall preparedness to design, implement and monitor a hand hygiene improvement  
155 plan. This includes appointing a lead ministry, identifying ministries responsible for each community setting of  
156 interest, establishing a coordination mechanism, and funding the development of a hand hygiene improvement  
157 plan. Step 2 (analyse the situation) aims to understand the national hand hygiene landscape for each community  
158 setting. This includes, where possible, information on hand hygiene practice, access to the minimum  
159 requirements, behaviour change programmes, and the enabling environment. Step 3 (develop an action plan)  
160 involves developing, costing, and financing a community setting-specific plan to implement a hand hygiene  
161 improvement programme based on findings from step 2. Step 4 (execute the action plan) ensures the  
162 implementation of the action plan. Step 5 (monitor, evaluate, and course correct) aims to ensure that the lead  
163 ministry monitors the action plan for each community setting, evaluates the impact of the plan, and coordinates  
164 cyclical review and analysis (29). Step 6 (cross-cutting themes) refers to topics such as equity, gender, inclusion,  
165 and non-discrimination, that should be integrated throughout the five previous steps, rather than addressed as  
166 stand-alone topics. The specific parameters for each step are defined in the Supplementary Information (Table  
167 S5).



168

169 **Figure 1.** Conceptual framework developed for this scoping review that includes a six-step approach to support  
170 the implementation of recommendations for hand hygiene in community settings. The framework was adapted  
171 from the 5-step approach from Burke et al. (2012) (26) and WHO (2009) (27) to include a cross-cutting sixth step.

172

### 173 **Identifying relevant studies (stage 2)**

174

175 The search strategy queried (1) Google search engine, (2) websites of international organisations known to work  
176 on hand hygiene (Table S2), and 3) (Healthcare Management Information Consortium) (HMIC), a grey literature  
177 database. The electronic database search was conducted using keyword searches and MeSH terms (Table S3).  
178 Each search term, with synonyms, variations, and subject headings, was combined and truncated to capture all  
179 possible variations of relevant terms. The search in Google was carried out using the anonymous function in the  
180 web browser (Chrome) to reduce the influence of the reviewer's (CM) individual search history. Search strings  
181 were constructed by using multiple combinations of search terms from Supplementary Information Table S3.  
182 For each combination of search terms, the first 10 pages of Google were reviewed by one reviewer (CM) (30).  
183 The reference lists of included documents were also hand-searched for any additional relevant documents. The  
184 search was limited to English and publication date was restricted to 1 January 1990 onwards to capture current  
185 tools and implementation guidance (31).

186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214

**Study selection (stage 3)**

Documents were included if they met all of the following criteria: (1) international tool or guidance document, (2) is relevant to one of the six implementation steps in the conceptual framework, (3) targets at least one community setting, as defined in the conceptual framework, (4) published by an international non-governmental organisation (NGO), multilateral agency or public health agency, (5) published in English, and (6) published between 1 January 1990 and 1 August 2023.

Training handbooks and training modules related to hand hygiene were excluded from this review as they are intended for teaching and learning step-by-step procedures. Tools published as an application software were also excluded. In addition, we excluded tools for humanitarian settings as internationally agreed guidance on hand hygiene in humanitarian settings or complex emergencies is available through the Sphere standards for water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) promotion (32). Implementation guidance documents and tools that have a more recent edition available and country- or region-specific implementation tools were excluded as they do not support the global implementation of recommendations for hand hygiene.

All documents retrieved from electronic searches were transferred to EndNote. Screening was completed in two stages: (1) title and document objective were screened for eligibility by one reviewer (CM); and (2) full texts of all potentially eligible documents were retrieved and independently assessed for inclusion by two reviewers (CM and LB). Disagreement between reviewers on inclusion was resolved through arbitration by a third reviewer (OC).

**Charting the data (stage 4)**

Tool characteristics and implementation recommendations from included documents were independently double extracted by two reviewers (CM and LB) using a standardised data extraction template in MS Excel (Table S4) and then cross-checked for accuracy. As with inclusion, a third reviewer (OC) provided arbitration if agreement on extraction could not be reached. The data extraction form included information on document



215 characteristics, such as author, year of publication, target setting, as well as on specific parameters related to  
216 the six implementation steps for hand hygiene in community settings described in the conceptual framework  
217 (figure 1). Definitions of the parameters are included in the Supplementary Information (Table S5).  
218 Implementation guidance for each parameter was extracted from included documents where possible.

219

## 220 **Collating, summarising, and reporting the results (stage 5)**

221

222 To synthesise evidence, implementation guidance and tools were first mapped against the six implementation  
223 steps, then summarised for each implementation step. We also summarised the number of documents that  
224 provided guidance or tools across all six steps. Finally, we identified steps with little or no implementation  
225 guidance or tools.

226


## 227 **Results**

228

### 229 **Search results**

230

231 Electronic searches were conducted in August 2023, identifying 2,990 records (2,000 from Google, 957 from  
232 organisation websites, and 33 from reference screening). No documents were retrieved from the grey literature  
233 database. 100 documents were sought for retrieval for full-text screening. Finally, 35 documents with  
234 implementation guidance and tools are included in the review (Figure 2). The 65 documents excluded during  
235 full-text review are listed in the Supplementary Information (Table S6) with reasons for exclusion.



236


237 **Figure 2.** PRISMA flow diagram.

238

239 **Description of included studies**

240

241 We included 35 documents in the review, consisting of 30 implementation guidance documents and 5 stand-  
 242 alone tools. Among the 30 implementation guidance documents, 22 provide implementation guidance only and  
 243 8 include implementation guidance and at least one tool (a total of 16 tools are extracted from the 8 documents  
 244 with tools) (Figure 3). Among these implementation guidance documents, we extracted 207 implementation  
 245 recommendations (Figure 3). 162 implementation recommendations were extracted from the 22  
 246 implementation guidance documents and 45 recommendations were extracted from the 8 documents with  
 247 implementation guidance and tools. We also included a total of 21 tools in the review, including 5 stand-alone  
 248 tools and 16 tools extracted from 8 documents with implementation guidance and tools.



249

250 **Figure 3.** Diagram of included documents that are categorised as tools (n= 5) or implementation guidance  
 251 documents (n= 30). Of the 30 implementation guidance documents, 22 include implementation guidance only  
 252 and 8 include implementation guidance and at least one tool (a total of 16 tools are extracted from the 8  
 253 documents with tools). We identified 5 documents as stand-alone tools.

254

255 48% percent of included documents are published by multilateral agencies (WHO, UNICEF), 34% by international  
 256 NGOs, 9% by global partnerships (e.g., Global Handwashing Partnership), 6% by academic institutions, and 3%  
 257 by development agencies. Most included documents are WASH-related (77%, n= 27), while 23% (n= 8) are hand  
 258 hygiene specific. There are no documents with a broader aim that provide implementation guidance or tools on  
 259 hand hygiene (e.g., cholera guidance that include hand hygiene tools). Most documents are for the programme  
 260 level (66%, n= 23), while 34% (n= 12) are for national-level planning and implementation. Documents for the  
 261 programme level are typically widely applicable to any programme related to hand hygiene, though the  
 262 applicability may vary by community setting. Similarly, national-level documents are applicable widely across  
 263 countries. Almost half of included documents target the institutional setting (40%, n= 14), one targets the

264 domestic setting (3%), and none target the public setting. The remaining documents do not specify the targeted  
265 community setting (57%, n= 20). Among documents for the institutional setting, 12 concern schools and 2  
266 concern the workplace. The included documents are for high-, medium-, and low-income settings and applicable  
267 across these settings. All documents were published between 2005 and 2023. Full details of included documents  
268 can be found in the Supplementary Information (Table S7).

269

### 270 **Implementation guidance and tools for hand hygiene in community settings**

271

272 There is guidance for the implementation of hand hygiene recommendations in community settings, but there  
273 is a limited number of available tools (Figure 4). The 207 implementation recommendations and 21 tools were  
274 mapped against the six implementation steps for hand hygiene in community settings. Most guidance and tools  
275 are for the middle and end of the implementation cycle. Specifically, these are for step 5 (monitoring, evaluation,  
276 and course correction) (27%, 62/228), followed by step 2 (analyse the situation) (23%, 52/228), step 3 (develop  
277 an action plan) (22%, 50/228), and step 1 (prepare for action) (16%, 37/228) (Figure 4). There is little guidance  
278 and tools for step 4 (execute the action plan) (7%, 16/228) and step 6 (cross-cutting) (5%, 11/228). Only five  
279 documents provided guidance or a tool across the first five implementation steps. Of these documents, only two  
280 also provided guidance or a tool for the sixth implementation (cross-cutting) (Table S8).



281  
 282 **Figure 4.** Sunburst diagram of implementation guidance documents and toolkits for the six implementation  
 283 steps, in addition to cross-cutting issues. For each key parameter, light shading indicates tools and dark  
 284 shading indicates implementation guidance.

285  
 286 **Implementation guidance for hand hygiene in community settings**

287  
 288 The 207 implementation recommendations were mapped across key parameters for the six implementation  
 289 steps (Table 1). Overall, most implementation guidance was for ‘tracking progress’ and ‘cyclical review and  
 290 analysis’ (n= 19 and 18, respectively), both part of step 5. The pieces of guidance ranged from 3 to 16 for all

291 other steps. The least guidance was provided for ‘identifying situation analysis tools’ (step 2, n= 3), ‘key  
 292 leadership’ (step 1, n= 4) and ‘stakeholder review of baseline data’ (step 3, n= 4).

293  
 294

**Table 1.** Implementation guidance for hand hygiene in community settings.

Implementation phase	Key parameter	Implementation guidance (% , n)	References
<b>Step 1:</b> prepare for action	Key leadership	2% (4)	IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2016 (34); UNICEF, 2019 (35); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Stakeholder engagement	6% (12)	World Bank, 2005 (37); World Bank & UNICEF, 2005 (38); IRC, 2007 (33); Live & Learn, 2011 (39); UNICEF, 2012 (40); UNICEF, 2016 (34); Rotary International, 2017a (41); Rotary International 2017c (42); WaterAid, 2017 (43); GHP, 2018 (44); UNICEF, 2019 (35); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Allocation of resources for planning	2% (5)	World Bank, 2005 (37); IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2012 (40); UNICEF, 2019 (35); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Coordination mechanisms	3% (7)	World Bank, 2005 (37); IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2012 (40); Rotary International, 2017a (41); Rotary International 2017c (42); UNICEF, 2019 (35); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Potential barriers and challenges	3% (7)	UNICEF, 2012 (40); UNICEF, 2016 (34); Rotary International, 2017a (41); UNICEF, 2017 (43); WaterAid, 2017 (43); UNICEF, 2021 (45); World Vision, 2021 (46)
<b>Step 2:</b> analyse the situation	Identification of tools for situation analysis	1% (3)	Rotary International, 2017a (41); Concern Worldwide, 2021 (47); World Vision, 2021 (46)
	Data collection	7% (14)	World Bank, 2005 (37); IRC, 2007 (33); WBCSD, 2014 (48); PPPHW, 2015 (49); EAWAG, 2016 (50); UNICEF, 2016 (34); LSHTM, 2017 (51); Rotary International, 2017b (52); WaterAid, 2017 (43); UNICEF, 2019 (35); Concern Worldwide, 2021 (47); UNICEF, 2021 (45); World Vision, 2021 (46); World Vision, 2022 (53)
	Data analysis	3% (6)	PPPHW, 2015 (49); UNICEF & WHO, 2016 (54); Rotary International, 2017a (41); UNICEF, 2021 (45); WaterAid, 2017 (43); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Presentation of results	4% (9)	WBCSD, 2014 (48); PPPHW, 2015 (49); UNICEF & WHO, 2016 (54); LSHTM, 2017 (51); Rotary International, 2017a (41); WaterAid, 2017 (43); UNICEF, 2019 (35); UNICEF, 2021 (45); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Enabling environment	4% (8)	IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2016 (55); UNICEF, 2016b (55); LSHTM, 2017 (51);

			Rotary International, 2017a (41); Rotary International, 2017c (42); SWA, 2020 (56); World Vision, 2022 (53)
<b>Step 3: develop an action plan</b>	Stakeholder review of baseline data	2% (4)	World Bank, 2005 (37); IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2012 (40); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Action plan development	7% (15)	World Bank, 2005 (37); World Bank & UNICEF, 2005 (38); IRC, 2007 (33); Live & Learn, 2011 (39); GIZ, 2013 (57); WBCSD, 2014 (48); UNICEF, 2016 (34); LSHTM, 2017 (51); Rotary International, 2017a (41); Rotary International, 2017c (42); GHP, 2018 (44); UNICEF, 2019 (35); Concern Worldwide, 2021 (47); UNICEF, 2022 (36); World Vision, 2021 (46)
	Action plan support and approval	3% (7)	World Bank, 2005 (37); IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2012 (40); Rotary International, 2017a (41); UNICEF, 2019 (35); UNICEF, 2022 (36); World Vision, 2022 (53)
	Action plan costing	6% (12)	World Bank, 2005 (37); World Bank & UNICEF, 2005 (38); IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2012 (40); GIZ, 2013 (57); UNICEF, 2016 (34); Rotary International, 2017a (41); Rotary International, 2017c (42); UNICEF, 2019 (35); Concern Worldwide, 2021 (47); UNICEF, 2022 (36); World Vision, 2022 (53)
	Action plan resources	4% (9)	World Bank & UNICEF, 2005 (38); IRC, 2007 (33); GIZ, 2013 (57); LSHTM, 2017 (51); Rotary International, 2017a (41); Rotary International, 2017c (42); SWA, 2020 (56); UNICEF, 2022 (36); World Vision, 2022 (53)
<b>Step 4: execute plans</b>	Roles and responsibilities	5% (10)	World Bank, 2005 (37); World Bank & UNICEF, 2005 (38); IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2012 (40); GIZ, 2013 (57); UNICEF, 2016 (34); LSHTM, 2017 (51); Rotary International, 2017c (42); UNICEF, 2022 (36); World Vision, 2022 (53)
	Action plan completion timeline	3% (6)	World Bank, 2005 (37); IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2016 (34); Rotary International, 2017c (42); UNICEF, 2019 (35); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
<b>Step 5: monitor, evaluate, and course correct</b>	Tracking progress	9% (19)	World Bank, 2005 (37); IRC, 2007 (33); World Bank, 2010 (58); Live & Learn, 2011 (39); UNICEF, 2011 (59); UNICEF, 2012 (40); UNICEF, 2013 (60); WBCSD, 2014 (48); PPPHW, 2015 (49); UNICEF, 2016 (34); LSHTM, 2017 (51); Rotary International, 2017a (41); UN-Water, 2017 (61); GHP, 2018 (44); UNICEF, 2019b (62); Concern Worldwide, 2021

			(47); UNICEF, 2021 (45); World Vision, 2021 (46); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Cyclical review and analysis	9% (18)	World Bank, 2005 (37); IRC, 2007 (33); Live & Learn, 2011 (39); UNICEF, 2011 (59); UNICEF, 2012 (40); UNICEF, 2013 (60); UNICEF, 2016a (34); UNICEF, 2016b (55); UNICEF & WHO, 2016 (54); LSHTM, 2017 (51); Rotary International, 2017a (41); WaterAid, 2017 (43); UNICEF, 2019 (35); UN-Water, 2017 (61); Concern Worldwide, 2021 (47); UNICEF, 2021 (45); World Vision, 2021 (46); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
	Stakeholder engagement	8% (16)	World Bank & UNICEF, 2005 (38); IRC, 2007 (33); Live & Learn, 2011 (39); UNICEF, 2011 (59); UNICEF, 2012 (40); UNICEF, 2013 (60); WBCSD, 2014 (48); UNICEF, 2016 (34); LSHTM, 2017 (51); Rotary International, 2017a (41); WaterAid, 2017 (43); UNICEF, 2019 (35); Concern Worldwide, 2021 (47); UNICEF, 2021 (45); World Vision, 2021 (46); World Vision, 2022 (53)
	Scaling up	3% (6)	IRC, 2007 (33); Live & Learn, 2011 (39); UNICEF, 2012 (40); UNICEF, 2016 (55); World Vision, 2021 (46); UNICEF, 2022 (36)
<b>Step 6: Cross-cutting</b>	Equity, gender, inclusion, and non-discrimination	5% (10)	World Bank & UNICEF, 2005 (38); IRC, 2007 (33); UNICEF, 2012 (40); PPPHW, 2015 (49); Rotary International, 2017a (41); WaterAid, 2017 (43); UNICEF, 2019 (35); Concern Worldwide, 2021 (47); UNICEF, 2021 (45); World Vision, 2022 (53)
<b>Total</b>		100% (207)	30 documents

295

296 **Tools for hand hygiene in community settings**

297

298 In total, we included 21 individual tools (5 stand-alone and 16 tools extracted from 8 implementation guidance  
299 documents). Most tools are for step 2 (analysing the situation) (57%, 12/21). Of these, most are for undertaking  
300 a situation analysis (75%, 9/12) (Table 2). Other tools were commonly mapped to step 3 (develop an action plan)  
301 (14%, 3/21) and step 5 (monitoring, evaluating, and course correcting) (14%, 3/21). There is only one tool for  
302 step 1 (prepare for action) and for step 6 (cross-cutting issues). There are no tools available for step 4 (executing  
303 the action plan). The tools ranged from checklists to surveys, self-assessment tools, planning and costing tools,  
304 and a list of monitoring questions (Table 3). Of the 5 stand-alone tools, only one is specific to hand hygiene only,



305 which is to cost interventions for improving hand hygiene in the domestic setting (63). The other 4 stand-alone  
306 tools are part a wider tool relevant to WASH (64–67).

**Table 2.** Tools to support the implementation of hand hygiene recommendations in community settings (one document can contain multiple tools).

Implementation phase	Key actions	# of tools	Relevant tool(s)	Objective	References
<b>Step 1:</b> prepare for action	Stakeholder engagement	1	Tool to advocate for hygiene	To make the case for hand hygiene	(PPPHW, 2015) (49)
	Potential barriers and challenges	3	SWOT analysis	To identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) for a handwashing programme	(World Bank, 2005) (37)
			SWOT external analysis	To identify external factors that may influence the handwashing programme	(World Bank, 2005) (37)
			WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool (BAT)	To help formulate costed and prioritized Action Plans to remove the bottlenecks that constrain the WASH sector and hinder the delivery of sustainable WASH services.	(UNICEF, 2011) (67)
<b>Step 2:</b> analyse the situation	Identification of tools for situation analysis	16	SWOT external analysis	To identify external factors that may influence the handwashing programme	(World Bank, 2005) (37)
			School WASH survey (page 24)	To conduct a thorough needs assessment of a school for improving school WASH conditions	(Peace Corps, 2017) (66)
			Barrier analysis tool	To identify the barriers that prevent people experiencing marginalisation from accessing WASH on an equal basis with others	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)
			Gender analysis tool	To understand how a particular situation affects women and men differently	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)
			Stakeholder analysis tool	To map current stakeholders and assess the role they play, particularly in helping you to achieve inclusive WASH	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)

			Power analysis tool	To identify who has formal power over an issue, who has informal power, and who can influence those with power	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)
			Disability self-assessment tool	To identify specific actions that can be taken to increase the inclusion of disabled people in programmes	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)
			Political economy analysis tool	To provide a structured approach for analysing how change happens, from the national to the local level	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)
			WASH assessment tool: self-assessment & employee survey	To measure the current WASH status of an organisation or business	(WaterAid, 2021) (65)
			Tool for identifying persons with disabilities	To identify persons with disabilities and disaggregate WASH data by disability	(UNICEF, 2021) (45)
			Self-assessment tool to understand current practices	To understand the current level of WASH provisions business-wide	(WBCSD, 2014) (48)
			Core hygiene questions	To support increased monitoring of hand hygiene in schools	(UNICEF & WHO, 2016) (54)
			Observation checklist for WASH in schools	To understand observed existing WASH infrastructure at the school	(Rotary International, 2017a) (52)
			School WASH survey	To understand WASH practices and education at the school	(Rotary International, 2017a) (52)
			Focus group discussion questions	To understand the challenges regarding WASH at the school	(Rotary International, 2017a) (52)
			WASH in schools target challenge measurements	To gather baseline measurements on WASH in schools targets	(Rotary International, 2017a) (52)
	Data collection	1	WASH assessment tool (tab 3 and 5b)	To measure the current WASH status of an organisation or business	(WaterAid, 2021) (65)
	Data analysis	1	WASH assessment tool (tabs 4 and 5d)	To measure the current WASH status of an organisation or business	(WaterAid, 2021) (65)

	Presentation of results	1	WASH assessment tool (tabs 4 and 5d)	To measure the current WASH status of an organisation or business	(WaterAid, 2021) (65)
<b>Step 3:</b> develop an action plan	Stakeholder review of baseline data	1	WASH assessment tool (tab 5a)	To measure the current WASH status of an organisation or business	(WaterAid, 2021) (65)
	Action plan development	1	WASH assessment tool (tab 6)	To measure the current WASH status of an organisation or business	(WaterAid, 2021) (65)
	Action plan costing	1	Costing tool for estimating the cost of interventions to improve hand hygiene in the domestic settings	This tool aims to provide country-specific cost estimates for achieving universal hand hygiene in households by 2030	(WHO and UNICEF, 2021) (68)
<b>Step 5:</b> monitor, evaluate, and course correct	Tracking progress	2	Participation ladder	To monitor participation in a programme over time	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)
			Washington Group questions for collecting data on disability	A set of questions designed to identify people with a disability, such as difficulty performing basic universal activities such as walking, seeing, hearing, cognition, self-care, and communication	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)
	Cyclical review and analysis	2	Hand hygiene acceleration framework tool	To track the process that a government has undergone to develop and implement a plan of action for hand hygiene improvement and assesses the quality of that plan	(WHO, UNICEF, and WaterAid, 2023) (64)
			WASH assessment tool	To measure the current WASH status of an organisation or business	(WaterAid, 2017) (43)
<b>Step 6:</b> cross-cutting	Equity, gender, inclusion, and non-discrimination	1	Questions on accessibility for children with physical disabilities	To assess the accessibility of facilities and hygiene education programmes for children with physical disabilities	(UNICEF, 2011) (59)

309 **Discussion**

310

311 This scoping review includes 35 documents, comprising 30 implementation guidance documents and 5 stand-  
312 alone tools published between 2005 and 2023. Most documents are for all community settings, suggesting these  
313 are intended to be generalisable across the different community settings. The only exception is that 12  
314 documents focused exclusively on school settings. In addition, the included documents are for high-, medium-,  
315 and low-income settings and applicable across country settings. While the included documents have a global  
316 focus, most implementation guidance and tools will require some form of adaptation to specific country contexts  
317 where implementation modalities and options can vary significantly. Most documents were published by  
318 multilateral agencies, such as UNICEF and WHO, and NGOs, such as WaterAid and World Vision, that have  
319 experience designing and implementing WASH or hand hygiene programmes.

320

321 Across the 35 included documents, we identified a total of 21 tools and 207 implementation recommendations,  
322 highlighting a discrepancy between available implementation guidance and tools to accompany the guidance.  
323 The 21 tools include 5 stand-alone tools and 16 tools embedded within broader WASH or hand hygiene guidance  
324 documents. The implementation guidance and tools were mapped to a six-step implementation conceptual  
325 framework for hand hygiene in community settings, which was adapted from an existing one that was also used  
326 by WHO for the hand hygiene in healthcare settings guidelines. WHO also used a similar six-step approach for  
327 the sustainable implementation of national action plans on antimicrobial resistance (69). However, no other  
328 review has mapped implementation guidance or tools to the 5-step approach adapted for this review.

329

330 The amount of available implementation guidance varied across the implementation steps, as well as amongst  
331 parameters within each step. Most implementation guidance was mapped to steps 1 (prepare for action), 2  
332 (analyse the situation), 3 (develop an action plan), and 5 (monitor, evaluate, and course correct) of the  
333 conceptual framework, with limited guidance for step 4 (executing the action plan) and step 6 (cross-cutting  
334 issues). This might be expected, as each implementation step may not require the same amount of guidance.  
335 For example, more guidance for steps 1-3 and 5, compared to step 4, is expected as it relates to supporting end-  
336 users to prepare an action plan and monitor its implementation. However, for steps 1-3 and 5, where guidance  
337 is available, more guidance may also be required for specific parameters, such as 'identifying key leadership' and

338 'allocation of resources for planning' under step 1, 'data analysis' and 'enabling environment' under step 2,  
339 'stakeholder review of baseline data' under step 3, and 'scaling up' under step 5. Further implementation  
340 guidance is needed for step 6 (cross-cutting themes). While cross-cutting themes were classified under step 6 of  
341 the implementation framework, in practice they should be integrated across the previous five steps to enhance  
342 equitable guideline uptake. In addition, this scoping review highlights the fragmentation of guidance and tools  
343 across the implementation cycle. Only two included documents provided guidance across the six steps,  
344 suggesting that guidance among each included document is rarely comprehensive.

345

346 The limited number of relevant tools suggests that more comprehensive or implementation step-specific tools  
347 may be needed to support the implementation of hand hygiene recommendations. Only 1 tool of the 5 stand-  
348 alone tools was developed for hand hygiene specifically, further suggesting the limited number of tools tailored  
349 for hand hygiene in community settings. Like implementation guidance, the tools were inconsistently available  
350 across the implementation steps. Over half of identified tools are for step 2 (analyse the situation) and primarily  
351 for one sub-step (undertaking a situation analysis). The identified tools varied in terms of content and purpose  
352 and can support various data collection and decision-making efforts for a more systematic and tailored adoption  
353 of guideline recommendations. However, more tools are needed to effectively be used as a guideline knowledge  
354 translation strategy to facilitate the implementation of recommendations into action, such as tools to support  
355 the costing of national action plans. In addition, further research can assess whether and how the tools translate  
356 into the implementation of recommendations. Tools can act as an important link between guideline  
357 recommendations and the development of national policies and programmes for hand hygiene in community  
358 settings. This is especially crucial for moving from emergency response, such as during the COVID-19 pandemic,  
359 to building sustainable and equitable services (71).

360

361 Despite gaps, the identified tools and implementation guidance can be used for the uptake of guidelines for  
362 hand hygiene in community settings to further contextualise and adapt recommendations. Resources have been  
363 published in other public health areas for the implementation of guideline recommendations. For example, WHO  
364 published a set of documents to support the implementation of recommendations for the hand hygiene in health  
365 care guidelines (72). These resources are intended to guide healthcare facilities to develop action plans for hand  
366 hygiene. Similarly, WHO published implementation guidance to advise countries on how to develop and

367 implement national malaria strategic plans (69), recommended as part of the guidelines for malaria (73). While  
368 gaps remain, the implementation guidance and tools identified in this review can be leveraged to support the  
369 upcoming WHO guidelines on hand hygiene in community settings.

370

### 371 **Limitations**

372

373 This scoping review has several limitations. First, most documents were retrieved through the Google search  
374 engine and the websites of organisations known to work on hand hygiene. Implementation guidance documents  
375 and tools may have been missed if the publishing organisation's website was not searched or the content was  
376 not indexed by Google. In addition, the one database that was searched for grey literature did not provide any  
377 relevant results. Second, despite a comprehensive search strategy, relevant documents may not have appeared  
378 in the search results due to the lack of consistency in terminology for tools and implementation guidance  
379 amongst organisations. Third, the search was restricted to English and may have missed relevant documents  
380 published in other languages. Fourth, we excluded tools and guidance documents published by governments,  
381 which can also be used for implementing hand hygiene in specific regional or national contexts. Fourth, the  
382 analysis did not seek to comparatively and qualitatively assess the included tools and implementation guidance.  
383 Instead, specific guidance was mapped to the implementation steps to understand where guidance is available  
384 and where there are gaps. Fourth, implementation guidance and tools were not disaggregated by community  
385 settings as most guidance and tools were for all community settings, thereby limiting the use of guidance and  
386 tools for community-specific settings. Finally, we did not undertake a quality assessment of the tools nor assess  
387 whether implementation guidance was cited by evidence.

388

### 389 **Conclusion**

390

391 Overall, this scoping review identified 35 documents with both tools and implementation guidance for hand  
392 hygiene in community settings. The mapping exercise suggests that implementation guidance is available, yet  
393 inconsistently available for the different implementation steps. In addition, few implementation tools exist to  
394 support the more general guidance. Future work should focus on developing comprehensive practical tools for

395 the implementation of hand hygiene recommendations in community settings, in line with international  
396 guidelines.

397

398

399 **Funding source**

400 This research is funded by the World Health Organization and the United Kingdom's Foreign, Commonwealth  
401 and Development Office. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to  
402 publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

403

404 **Author contributions**

405 CM, LB, BAC, CC, KC, JC, RD, REN, AT, BG, JEM and OC informed the study protocol. CM carried out the database  
406 and grey literature search with input from LB, OC, and JEM. CM and LB screened the retrieved articles for  
407 inclusion and extracted the data with input from OC and JEM. CM led the data synthesis, while CM, LB, OC and  
408 JEM led the presentation of results with inputs from co-authors. CM wrote the first draft of the manuscript and  
409 all co-authors provided inputs on subsequent drafts. LB, OC, and JEM provided overall supervision, leadership  
410 and advice. CM is the guarantor.

411

412 **Author approval**

413 All authors have seen and approved the manuscript for publication.

414

415 **Conflicts of Interest**

416 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

417

418 **Data availability**

419 Data are available upon reasonable request.

420

421

422

423



424 **References**

425

- 426 1. Wolf J, Johnston RB, Ambelu A, Arnold BF, Bain R, Brauer M, et al. Burden of disease attributable to  
427 unsafe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene in domestic settings: a global analysis for selected  
428 adverse health outcomes. *The Lancet*. 2023;401(10393):2060–71.
- 429 2. Ross I, Bick S, Ayieko P, Dreifelbis R, Wolf J, Freeman MC, et al. Effectiveness of handwashing with  
430 soap for preventing acute respiratory infections in low-income and middle-income countries: a  
431 systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2023;401(10389):1681–90.
- 432 3. Wolf J, Hubbard S, Brauer M, Ambelu A, Arnold BF, Bain R, et al. Effectiveness of interventions to  
433 improve drinking water, sanitation, and handwashing with soap on risk of diarrhoeal disease in  
434 children in low-income and middle-income settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The*  
435 *Lancet*. 2022;400(10345):48–59.
- 436 4. Ross I, Esteves Mills J, Slaymaker T, Johnston R, Hutton G, Dreifelbis R, et al. Costs of hand hygiene for  
437 all in household settings: estimating the price tag for the 46 least developed countries. *BMJ Glob*  
438 *Health*. 2021 Dec;6(12):e007361.
- 439 5. Mbakaya B, Lee P, Lee R. Hand Hygiene Intervention Strategies to Reduce Diarrhoea and Respiratory  
440 Infections among Schoolchildren in Developing Countries: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public*  
441 *Health*. 2017;14(4):371.
- 442 6. Aiello AE, Coulborn RM, Perez V, Larson EL. Effect of Hand Hygiene on Infectious Disease Risk in the  
443 Community Setting: A Meta-Analysis. *Am J Public Health*. 2008;98(8):1372–81.
- 444 7. Freeman MC, Stocks ME, Cumming O, Jeandron A, Higgins JPT, Wolf J, et al. Systematic review:  
445 Hygiene and health: systematic review of handwashing practices worldwide and update of health  
446 effects. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2014;19(8):906–16.
- 447 8. WHO, UN-Water. Hygiene: UN-Water GLAAS Findings on National Policies, Plans, Targets and Finance.  
448 Geneva; 2020.
- 449 9. WHO. Progress on Drinking-Water, Sanitation and Hygiene in Schools: 2000-2021 Data Update.  
450 Geneva; 2022.
- 451 10. WHO, UNICEF. Progress on Household Drinking Water, Sanitation and Hygiene, 2000-2020: Five Years  
452 into the SDGs. Geneva; 2021.

- 453 11. World Health Organization. Strong systems and sound investments: evidence on and key insights into  
454 accelerating progress on sanitation, drinking-water and hygiene. UN-Water global analysis and  
455 assessment of sanitation and drinking-water (GLAAS) 2022 report. Geneva; 2022.
- 456 12. MacLeod C, Braun L, Caruso BA, Chase C, Chidziwisano K, Chipungu J, et al. Recommendations for hand  
457 hygiene in community settings: a scoping review of current international guidelines. *BMJ Open*.  
458 2023;13(6):e068887.
- 459 13. Caruso BA, Snyder JS, Cumming O, Esteves Mills J, Gordon B, Rogers H, et al. Synthesising the evidence  
460 for effective hand hygiene in community settings: an integrated protocol for multiple related  
461 systematic reviews. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(11):e077677.
- 462 14. World Health Organization. Hand hygiene in communities and public settings: Proposal for WHO  
463 guidelines. Geneva; 2021.
- 464 15. Esteves Mills J, Thomas A, Abdalla N, Al-Emam R, Al-Shabi K, Ashinyo ME, et al. How can global  
465 guidelines support sustainable hygiene systems? *BMJ Glob Health*. 2023;8(10).
- 466 16. World Health Organization. Alcohol-based handrub planning and costing tool. Geneva; 2010.
- 467 17. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol*.  
468 2005;8(1):19–32.
- 469 18. MacLeod C, Esteves Mills J, Caruso B, Chase C, Chidziwisano K, Chipungu J, et al. Current international  
470 tools for the implementation of hand hygiene recommendations in community settings: a scoping  
471 review. *OSF Registries*. 2023;
- 472 19. World Health Organization. WHO guidelines on hand hygiene in health care. Geneva; 2009.
- 473 20. World Health Organization. WHO handbook for guideline development (2nd edition). Geneva; 2014.
- 474 21. World Health Organization. A guide to the implementation of the WHO multimodal hand hygiene  
475 improvement strategy. World Health Organization; 2009.
- 476 22. World Health Organization. Hand hygiene knowledge questionnaire for health-care workers. Geneva;  
477 2010.
- 478 23. World Health Organization. WHO hand hygiene self-assessment framework. Geneva; 2010.
- 479 24. WHO. World Health Organization Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care. Geneva; 2009.
- 480 25. WHO. The Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion. Geneva; 1986.

- 481 26. Burke K, Morris K, McGarrigle L. An Introductory Guide to Implementation: Terms, Concepts and  
482 Frameworks. Dublin; 2012.
- 483 27. WHO. A Guide to the Implementation of the WHO Multimodal Hand Hygiene Improvement Strategy.  
484 Geneva; 2009.
- 485 28. World Health Organization. WHO guidelines on hand hygiene in health care. Geneva; 2009.
- 486 29. World Health Organization. A guide to the implementation of the WHO multimodal hand hygiene  
487 improvement strategy. Geneva; 2009.
- 488 30. Higgins J, Thomas J. Chapter 4: Searching for and selecting studies. In: Cochrane Handbook for  
489 Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Version 6.4. Chichester (UK): John Wiley & Sons; 2023.
- 490 31. WHO, UNICEF. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2020: five years  
491 into the SDGs. Geneva, Switzerland; 2021.
- 492 32. Sphere Association. The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in  
493 Humanitarian Response (Fourth Edition). Geneva; 2018.
- 494 33. IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre. Towards effective programming for WASH in schools: a  
495 manual on scaling up programmes for water, sanitation and hygiene in schools. IRC International  
496 Water and Sanitation Centre; 2007.
- 497 34. UNICEF. Toolkit for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) sector strengthening. 2016.
- 498 35. UNICEF, Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI). WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool- Country  
499 Implementation Guide. 2013.
- 500 36. UNICEF. Developing Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Finance Strategies A Guide [Internet].  
501 2022. Available from: [www.unicef.org/wash](http://www.unicef.org/wash)
- 502 37. World Bank. The Handwashing Handbook: A Guide for Developing a Hygiene Promotion Program to  
503 Increase Handwashing with Soap. 2005.
- 504 38. World Bank. Toolkit on Hygiene, Sanitation, and Water in Schools [Internet]. 2005. Available from:  
505 [www.freshschools.org](http://www.freshschools.org)
- 506 39. Live & Learn Environmental Education. Field Guide: the Three Star Approach for WASH in Schools  
507 [Internet]. 2011. Available from: [www.unicef.org/wash/schools](http://www.unicef.org/wash/schools)
- 508 40. UNICEF. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in Schools. 2012.
- 509 41. Rotary International. A Guide to WASH in Schools. 2017.

- 510 42. Rotary International. WASH in Schools Worksheets. 2017.
- 511 43. WaterAid. Toolkit: Understanding and addressing equality, non-discrimination and inclusion in water,  
512 sanitation and hygiene (WASH) work. 2017.
- 513 44. Global Handwashing Partnership. Clean Hands for All: A Toolkit for Hygiene Advocacy. 2018.
- 514 45. UNICEF. Make it Count: Guidance on disability inclusive WASH programme data collection, monitoring  
515 and reporting. 2021.
- 516 46. World Vision. Behaviour Change: Practical implementation guidance for programs. 2021.
- 517 47. Concern Worldwide. Toolkit: WASH in Schools and Learning Centres. 2021.
- 518 48. World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). Water, sanitation and hygiene  
519 implementation at the workplace: Pledge and guiding principles. 2013.
- 520 49. Global Public-Private Partnership for Handwashing (PPPHW). Post-2015 Hygiene Advocacy Toolkit.  
521 2015.
- 522 50. Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology (EAWAG). Systematic behavior change in  
523 water, sanitation and hygiene: a practical guide using the RANAS approach. Dübendorf, Switzerland;  
524 2016.
- 525 51. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM). Behaviour Centered Design: a practitioner's  
526 manual. 2017.
- 527 52. Rotary International. Understanding the School Community: Tools for Assessing Needs and Collecting  
528 Data. 2017.
- 529 53. World Vision. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Project Model. 2022;
- 530 54. World Health Organization, UNICEF. Core questions and indicators for monitoring WASH in Schools in  
531 the Sustainable Development Goals [Internet]. 2016. Available from:  
532 [http://www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright\\_form/en/](http://www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright_form/en/)
- 533 55. UNICEF. Strengthening Enabling Environment for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH): Guidance  
534 Note. 2016.
- 535 56. Sanitation and Water for All. Water and Sanitation: How to Make Public Investment Work: A Handbook  
536 for Finance Ministers [Internet]. 2020. Available from: [www.sanitationandwaterforall.org](http://www.sanitationandwaterforall.org)
- 537 57. Deutsche Gesellschaft für International Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). Field Guide: Hardware for Group  
538 Handwashing in Schools [Internet]. 2013. Available from: [www.mv-verlag.de](http://www.mv-verlag.de)

- 539 58. World Bank. Practical Guidance for Measuring Handwashing Behavior Global Scaling Up Handwashing  
540 Project [Internet]. 2010. Available from: [www.wsp.org/scalinguphandwashing](http://www.wsp.org/scalinguphandwashing).
- 541 59. UNICEF. WASH in Schools Monitoring Package. 2011.
- 542 60. UNICEF. Handwashing Promotion: Monitoring and Evaluation Module. 2013.
- 543 61. UN-Water. TrackFin Initiative: Tracking financing to sanitation, hygiene and drinking-water at the  
544 national level guidance document [Internet]. 2017. Available from: <http://apps.who.int/bookorders>.
- 545 62. UNICEF. Sustainability Checks: Guidance to Design and Implement Sustainability Monitoring in WASH.  
546 2017.
- 547 63. World Health Organization. Costing tool for estimating the cost of interventions to improve hand  
548 hygiene in the domestic settings. 2021.
- 549 64. World Health Organization. Hand hygiene acceleration framework tool. 2022.
- 550 65. WaterAid. WASH assessment tool. 2021;
- 551 66. Peace Corps. Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene in Schools Toolkit Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene in  
552 Schools Toolkit. 2017.
- 553 67. UNICEF. WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool (BAT). New York; 2011.
- 554 68. WHO. Costing tool for estimating the cost of interventions to improve hand hygiene in the domestic  
555 settings. Geneva; 2021.
- 556 69. World Health Organization. WHO implementation handbook for national action plans on antimicrobial  
557 resistance: guidance for the human health sector. Geneva; 2022.
- 558 70. World Bank. Landscape analysis of tools to address antimicrobial resistance. Washington DC; 2021.
- 559 71. Esteves Mills J, Thomas A, Abdalla N, Al-Emam R, Al-Shabi K, Ashinyo ME, et al. How can global  
560 guidelines support sustainable hygiene systems? *BMJ Glob Health*. 2023;8(10):e013632.
- 561 72. WHO. Key resources for implementation. 2024. Hand hygiene implementation tools.
- 562 73. WHO. WHO Guidelines for malaria. Geneva; 2023.
- 563 74. Tricco A, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien K, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping  
564 Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018 Oct 2;169(7):467–73.
- 565