

1 **Epidemiological Study and Analysis of Factors Related to Skin Lesions Caused by Medical**
2 **Disinfectants, and Personal Protective Equipment among Epidemic-Prevention Workers**
3 **During the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Pandemic Lockdown Period**

4 Jing-Yi Hu ^a, Xiu-Li Xiao ^b, Yi Lu ^b, Jian-Yong Su ^c, Yan Zhang ^b, Ting Shang ^b, Chun-Hua
5 Zhang ^b, Lian Guo ^b, Jian-Chao Wang ^b

6 ^a Chinese Medicine Department, Gaojing Town Community Health Service Center, 200439,
7 Shanghai, China; ^b Department of Dermatology, Shanghai Baoshan District Hospital of Integrated
8 Traditional and Western Medicine, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, 200199,
9 Shanghai, China; ^c Department of Medical Cosmetology, Shanghai Baoshan District Hospital of
10 Integrated Traditional and Western Medicine, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese
11 Medicine, 200199, Shanghai, China

12 **CONTACT** 1.Xiu-Li Xiao, xxl_me@163.com, Chief, Department of Dermatology, Shanghai
13 Baoshan District Hospital of Integrated Traditional and Western Medicine, Shanghai University of
14 Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, 201999, China; 2. Jing-Yi Hu, 13818879096@139.com,
15 Chinese Medicine Department, Gaojing Town Community Health Service Center, Shanghai,
16 200439,China *These authors are co-first authors and contributed equally to this work.

17 **Correspondent:** 1.Xiu-Li Xiao, xxl_me@163.com, Chief, Department of Dermatology,
18 Shanghai Baoshan District Hospital of Integrated Traditional and Western Medicine,
19 Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, 201999, China; 2. Jing-Yi
20 Hu, 13818879096@139.com, Chinese Medicine Department, Gaojing Town Community
21 Health Service Center, Shanghai, 200439,China

22 *These authors are co-first authors and contributed equally to this work.

23 **Abstract: Objective:** The aim of this study was to investigate the prevalence of and potential risk
24 factors associated with skin lesions resulting from the use of medical disinfectants and personal
25 protective equipment (PPE) among epidemic prevention workers (including healthcare
26 professionals, temporary sampling site workers, community members and volunteers) during the
27 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic lockdown period in
28 China. **Methods:** We conducted a survey to investigate the prevalence and factors associated with
29 skin lesions during SARS-CoV-2 pandemic lockdown period among epidemic prevention workers
30 in Gaojing town of Baoshan distract, Shanghai, China. **Results:** A total of 1033 questionnaires
31 were reviewed, with 995 deemed valid. Among the 995 respondents, 209 (21.01%) reported
32 comorbidities, while 786 (78.99%) were considered as controls. Autoimmune diseases, family
33 history of dermatitis, cardiovascular diseases (CVDs), palmar and plantar hyperhidrosis, allergic
34 diseases and the total time spent on skin cleansing and antisepsis procedures were identified as
35 independent risk factors for these skin lesions. **Conclusion:** During the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic
36 lockdown period, skin lesions among epidemic prevention workers was prevalent, which was
37 primarily attributed to the use of medical disinfectants and PPE. These skin lesions frequently
38 manifested as a combination of various subtypes across different areas of the body. Several
39 individual factors, along with the total time spent on skin cleansing and skin antisepsis procedures,
40 were identified as significant risk factors for the development of these skin lesions.

41 **Keywords:** Prevalence; Risk factors; Skin lesions; Medical disinfectants; Personal protective
42 equipment; SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic

43 **1. Introduction**

44 During the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, the occurrence of skin lesions resulting from medical
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

45 disinfectants and personal protective equipment (PPE), such as device-related pressure injuries
46 (DRPIs), moisture-associated skin damage (MASD) and skin tears (STs), significantly
47 affected the physical and mental well-being of individuals involved in epidemic-prevention
48 efforts. Early domestic studies published in 2020 revealed that the incidence of these skin lesions
49 ranged from 28.44% to 93.39% [3-4]. DRPIs incidence ranged from 26.58% to 57.51% [1-5]. In
50 the literature prior to 2019, the incidence of STs ranged from 1.06% to 22.00% [8-9], while the
51 incidence of MASD was 8.83% [5]. Additionally, the rates of dermal impregnation and allergic
52 contact dermatitis have increased to 62.42% and 58.91% [2], respectively.

53 Previous studies have exclusively focused on medical personnel between the ages of twenty and
54 forty years in SARS-CoV-2-designated hospitals in China [2-5]. However, during the SARS-CoV-2
55 pandemic lockdown period (January 1st, 2022 to March 31st, 2023), a substantial number of
56 SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid detection samples were collected during the outbreak of SARS-CoV-2
57 infections. Healthcare professionals, temporary sampling site workers, community members and
58 volunteers made significant effort to combat the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak. During the period
59 spanning from December 2019 to January 2022, there was a noticeable shift in public health
60 priorities, with a greater emphasis on quarantine measures and prevention strategies rather than
61 solely treating and controlling the epidemic. The increased demand for community-based
62 prevention support has led to the active involvement of various community resources (including
63 nonhealth-care workers) in epidemic prevention efforts within urban communities in China.
64 However, further investigation is required to determine whether the prevalence and characteristics
65 of skin lesions has changed over time. Furthermore, the literature has focused primarily on factors
66 such as occupation, workforce, age, sex and protection level [3-4], while personal factors such as
67 autoimmune or allergic diseases in relation to disease onset remain unexplored. Therefore, the
68 findings of this research will contribute to the clinical understanding of this issue.

69 **2. Materials and methods**

70 **2.1. Research subjects**

71 Between 1st April 2023 and 1st August 2023, a cross-sectional online survey was conducted in
72 Gaojing town, Baoshan district, Shanghai. The recruitment of potential participants was facilitated
73 through a network sampling approach, where the Ministry of Public Health and local government
74 agencies were contacted to distribute a link to the online survey to all community neighborhood
75 committees in Gaojing town and the health facilities situated in and around the aforementioned
76 area. Healthcare professionals, temporary sampling site workers, community members and
77 volunteers who were engaged Level 1-3 barrier protection measures to prevent the transmission of
78 SARS-CoV-2 were recruited on a voluntary basis. No limitations based on age, sex or nationality
79 were imposed. The exclusion criteria included incomplete or inaccurate questionnaire responses,
80 as well as data that could not be effectively analyzed or appropriately characterized.

81 **2.2. Study design, data collection, and sample size**

82 This study adopted a retrospective cross-sectional design. A survey was conducted using a
83 self-administered questionnaire and the reliability and validity of the presurvey data, which
84 exceeded 0.9, were analyzed. Data collection was facilitated through the “Sojump” website and
85 background system. Following data collection, incomplete or duplicate questionnaires were
86 removed by information technicians, and a database was established.

87 The sample size calculation was based on the calculation for estimating prevalences in
88 cross-sectional studies ($n=Z_{\sigma}^2 \times pq/d^2$). The incidence of the surveyed population was estimated

89 with 95% confidence using $Z\sigma$, which was determined to be 1.96. Previous literature indicated an
90 approximate incidence of 50% for the skin lesions evaluated, resulting in $p=50\%$ and $q=1-p=50\%$.
91 The allowable error, d , was estimated to be 0.1 times p , or 5%. Consequently, the sample size, n ,
92 was determined to be 387 for each group (the case group and the control group), resulting in a
93 total sample size of 774. Accounting for an expected invalid response rate of 10%, the total
94 sample size was adjusted to 847.

95 A total of 1033 questionnaires were recovered and collected, 31 incomplete questionnaires were
96 excluded, and 7 duplicate questionnaires were obtained, resulting in 995 valid questionnaires,
97 yielding a 96.3% completion rate.

98 2.3. Measurements

99 Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS software (version 25.0). Normally distributed data
100 are presented as $\bar{x} \pm s$. Comparisons between two groups were performed using independent
101 sample t- tests. The frequency was used to describe the count data.

102 The χ^2 test was employed to analyze the difference in prevalence between the two groups. A
103 logistic regression analysis model was used to examine potential risk factors for the occurrence of
104 these skin lesions, utilizing a significance level of $\alpha=0.05$. Nonnormally distributed data are
105 presented as the median (M), and 25th and 75th percentiles (P25 and P75, respectively). The
106 Mann-Whitney U test was utilized to compare the two groups. Results for which $P < 0.05$ were
107 determined to be statistically significant.

108 3. Results

109 3.1.1. Baseline data distribution of the survey population

110 The baseline data of the 995 subjects, including sex, age, occupation, workforce and protection
111 level, are shown in Table 1. Of the participants, 23.51% were male. All participants were aged
112 18-80 years, and the mean age of all participants was 42.98 ± 12.46 years.

113 The distributions of sex, age and proportions related to occupation, workforce and protection level
114 were tested using the chi-square test. There were no significant differences in sex, ages, or
115 protection level between the two groups, however, we noted significant differences in the
116 proportions of occupations ($\chi^2=17.899$, $P=0.003$) and workers ($\chi^2=15.935$, $P=0.001$) between the
117 two groups.

118 Table 1. Baseline data distribution of the survey population (n=995)

Variables	Control Group (n, %)	Case Group (n, %)	χ^2 value	P value
Total	786 (78.99)	209 (21.01)	-	-
Sex				
Male	188 (18.89)	46 (4.62)	0.335	0.563
Female	598 (60.11)	163 (16.38)		
Age, mean \pm SD (years)	43.55 \pm 12.46	40.84 \pm 12.22	-	-
≤ 30	105 (10.55)	35 (3.52)	5.973	0.113
31~45	402 (40.40)	118 (11.86)		
46~65	212 (21.31)	42 (4.22)		
≥ 66	67 (6.73)	14 (1.41)		

Occupation

Doctor	195 (19.60)	73 (7.34)		
Nurse	198 (19.89)	63 (6.33)		
Pharmacist	32 (3.22)	10 (1.01)		
Administrator	73 (7.34)	12 (1.21)	17.899	0.003*
Volunteer	200 (20.10)	33 (3.31)		

Community Member or Temporary Sampling Site Worker	88 (8.84)	18 (1.81)		
--	-----------	-----------	--	--

Workforce

Community Health Center	191 (19.20)	51 (5.13)		
Secondary General Hospital	169 (16.98)	52 (5.23)	15.935	0.001*
Tertiary General Hospital	138 (13.87)	56 (5.63)		
Temporary Sampling Site	288 (28.94)	50 (5.02)		

Protection level¹⁴ *

Level 3	531 (53.37)	128 (12.86)		
Level 2	185 (18.59)	53 (5.33)	4.604	0.100
Level 1	70 (7.04)	28 (2.81)		

119 Note: n, number of patients; %, proportion. *: **Level 1 protection:** Medical staff wear disposable work
 120 clothes, hats, isolation suits, gloves, and surgical masks. **Level 2 protection:** Medical staff wore
 121 medical masks, goggles or face shields, protective clothing, gloves, and shoe covers. **Level 3 protection:**
 122 Medical staff wore full face respirators or higher-level air supply in addition to the Level 2
 123 requirements.

124 **3.1.2. Personal factors and other potential risk factors**

125 Differences in personal factors and other potential risk factors, such as variations in the amount of
 126 exposure to disinfectants, the total time spent on skin cleansing and skin antiseptis procedures, the
 127 total time spent on wearing PPE and the protection level, were tested using the chi-square test
 128 (Table 2).

129 Table 2. Distribution of related personal factors among participants (n=995)

Variables	Control group (n, %)	Case group (n, %)	χ^2 value	P value
Exposure to disinfectants *				
Ethanol-based disinfectant	624 (62.71)	165 (16.58)		
Hydrogen peroxide disinfectant	341 (34.27)	117 (11.76)	4.516	0.211
Chlorine-containing disinfectant	202 (20.30)	69 (6.93)		
Peracetic acid disinfectant	36 (3.62)	11 (1.11)		
Total time spent on skin cleansing and antiseptis procedures (hours/ week), mean \pm SD	2.14 \pm 1.22	2.84 \pm 1.48		

≤1	178 (17.89)	22 (2.21)		
(1,3)	420 (42.21)	99 (9.95)	43.679	<0.001**
[3,5)	148 (14.87)	55 (5.53)		
≥5	40 (4.02)	33 (3.32)		
Total time spent on wearing PPE (hours/ week), mean ± SD	30.45±14.25	34.02±14.25		
≤20	235 (23.62)	41 (4.12)		
(20,40)	216 (21.71)	51 (5.13)	13.403	0.004*
[40,60)	311 (31.26)	108 (10.85)		
≥60	24 (2.41)	9 (0.90)		
History of allergic diseases				
Yes	160 (16.09)	86 (8.64)	38.351	<0.001**
No	626 (62.91)	123 (12.36)		
Hypertension				
Yes	83 (8.34)	23 (2.31)	0.034	0.853
No	703 (70.65)	186 (18.69)		
Diabetes				
Yes	16 (1.61)	6 (0.60)	0.533	0.466
No	770 (77.39)	203 (20.40)		
Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs)				
Yes	9 (0.9)	8 (0.8)	7.075	0.008*
No	777 (78.09)	201 (20.20)		
Autoimmune diseases				
Yes	2 (0.20)	4 (0.40)	7.585	0.006*
No	784 (78.79)	205 (20.61)		
Negative psycho-social stimuli				
Yes	409 (41.11)	126 (12.66)	4.533	0.003*
No	377 (37.89)	83 (8.34)		
Active inflammation**				
Yes	112(11.26)	35(3.51)	0.818	0.366
No	674(67.74)	174(17.49)		
History of atopic dermatitis				
Yes	10 (1.01)	28 (2.81)	66.176	<0.001**
No	777 (78.01)	181 (18.17)		
Family history of dermatitis				
Yes	11 (1.11)	37 (3.72)	95.583	<0.001**
No	775 (77.88)	172 (17.29)		
Palmar and plantar hyperhidrosis				
Yes	94 (9.45)	49 (4.92)	17.698	<0.001**
No	692 (69.55)	160 (16.08)		

130 *Note: n, number of patients; %, proportion. * The total proportion was greater than 100%. **Active inflammation*
 131 *are defined as individuals may experience concurrent upper respiratory tract infections, as well as gastrointestinal*
 132 *and urinary tract infections during the initial stages of skin lesions.*

133 Allergic diseases are systemic disorders caused by an impaired immune system. The total number
134 of patients in the case group was 86, including those with allergic dermatitis (n=31), allergic
135 rhinitis (n=35) and bronchial asthma (n=20). The total number of patients in the control group was
136 160, including those with allergic dermatitis (n=10), allergic rhinitis (n=138) and bronchial asthma
137 (n=12).

138 Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) are a collective term for heart and vascular diseases, mainly
139 including coronary heart disease, cerebrovascular diseases (such as stroke), peripheral arterial
140 diseases, congenital heart disease, deep vein thrombosis, and pulmonary embolism. The total
141 number of patients in the case group was 8, including those with cerebral infarction (n=4) and
142 coronary artery disease (n=4). The total number of patients in the control group was 9, including
143 coronary artery disease (n=9).

144 Autoimmune diseases are defined as an abnormal response of B cells and/or T cells towards
145 endogenous antigens, which in turn leads to self-directed immunity and eventually presents as
146 either localized tissue damage or as a systemic disease. The total number of patients in the case
147 group was 4, which included patients with Sjögrens syndrome (n=1), Hashimoto's thyroiditis
148 (n=1), IgA nephropathy (n=1) and psoriatic arthritis (n=1). There were 2 patients in the control
149 group is, one with IgA nephropathy (n=1) and one with Hashimoto's thyroiditis (n=1).

150 Negative Psychosocial Stimuli: The total number of patients in the case group was 126, including
151 those with stress (n=26), insomnia (n=33), depression (n=29) and anxiety (n=38). There were 409
152 individuals in the control group, including those with stress (n=89), insomnia (n=73), depression
153 (n=98) and anxiety (n=149). Family history of dermatitis: The total number of patients in the case
154 group was 37, including those with atopic dermatitis (n=31), psoriasis (n=4), exfoliative keratosis
155 (n=1) and seborrheic dermatitis (n=1). There were 11 individuals in the control group, including
156 those with atopic dermatitis (n=10) and seborrheic dermatitis (n=1).

157 There were no significant differences in exposure to disinfectants and the prevalence of
158 hypertension, diabetes or active inflammation between the two groups. However, we noted
159 significant differences between the two groups in the total time spent on skin cleansing and skin
160 antiseptic procedures ($\chi^2=43.679$, $P<0.001$) and the total time spent on wearing PPE ($\chi^2=13.403$,
161 $P=0.004$). Furthermore, the prevalence of these skin lesions among participants with allergic
162 diseases was significantly greater than that among participants without allergic diseases
163 ($\chi^2=38.351$, $P<0.001$). The prevalence of these skin lesions among participants with
164 cardiovascular diseases, autoimmune diseases, a history of atopic dermatitis, a family history of
165 dermatitis and palmar & plantar hyperhidrosis was also greater than that among participants
166 without diseases (All $P<0.05$). In addition, those who experienced negative psychosocial stimuli
167 or a family history of dermatitis were more likely to have greater incidence of these skin lesions.
168 ($\chi^2=4.533$, $P=0.003$ and $\chi^2=95.583$, $P<0.001$, respectively).

169 Of the 209 participants with comorbidities, 13 (31.0%) exhibited DRPIs, 165 (78.95%) had
170 MASD, and twenty (9.57%) experienced both DRPIs and MASD. Additionally, one patient
171 (0.48%) experienced both DRPIs and STs and another patient (0.48%) had both MASD and STs.
172 Furthermore, nine participants (4.30%) presented with all three types of skin lesions.

173 **3.2 Type-specific distribution patterns**

174 There were 363 skin lesions in total, among which forty-three were DRPIs, and the head-face and
175 neck areas were two of the most prevalent locations. Three hundred and seven out of 363 patients
176 had MASD, the hand, neck and forearm and wrist area were the most vulnerable areas, in order of

177 highest prevalence. Thirteen of 363 patients had STs, and the head-face area was the most
 178 common location (Table 3).
 179 Table 3. Type-specific distribution patterns of skin lesions caused by medical disinfectants and
 180 personal protective equipment (n=363)

Type of skin lesions	Count (n, %)	Scalp (n, %)	Head& face (n, %)	Neck (n, %)	Axillae (n, %)	Groin (n, %)	Forearm & wrist (n, %)	Dorsum of Hand (n, %)	Palm (n, %)	Ankle (n, %)	Foot (n, %)
DRPIs	43(100)	0(0)	36 (83.72)	7(16.28)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
MASD	307(100)	14(4.56)	17(5.54)	26 (8.47)	3(0.98)	5(1.63)	25(8.14)	136 (44.30)	69(22.48)	7(2.27)	5(1.63)
STs	13(100)	0(0)	10 (76.93)	1(7.69)	0(0)	1(7.69)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(7.69)	0(0)
Total	363(100)	14(3.86)	63 (17.36)	34(9.37)	3(0.83)	6(1.65)	25(6.88)	136 (37.47)	69(19.00)	8(2.20)	5(1.38)

181 **3.3 Distribution of onset time**

182 This temporal analysis reveals two peaks between January 2022 and March 2023. The first peak
 183 occurred in June 2022, followed by a second larger peak from December 2022 through January
 184 2023, which demonstrated that the early summer of 2022 and winter and early spring of 2023
 185 were high-incidence seasons. This result is consistent with the fact that the lockdown was initiated
 186 in Shanghai in March 2022 and gradual reopening started in December 2022 (Figure 1).

187 Figure 1. Temporal Distribution of the Onset of Skin Lesions Caused by Medical Disinfectants
 188 and Personal Protective Equipment (Histogram) (n=209)

189 **3.2. Related factors**

190 The potential independent variables included in logistic regression analysis are shown in Table 4.
 191 The variables “occupation”, “workforce”, “total time spent on wearing PPE”, “history of atopic
 192 dermatitis” and “negative psychosocial stimuli” were examined in the multivariate model, which
 193 revealed no statistically significant associations with the onset of skin lesions. Thus, the risk
 194 factors for the skin lesions examined included the total time spent on skin cleansing and antiseptic
 195 procedures, cardiovascular diseases, autoimmune diseases, allergic diseases, family history of skin
 196 dermatitis and palmar and plantar hyperhidrosis.

197 The odds ratio(ORs) calculated were as follows: Cardiovascular diseases (OR=5.173; 95%
 198 CI=1.610 to 16.624; P=0.006), autoimmune diseases (OR=11.405; 95% CI=1.383 to 94.034;
 199 P=0.024), allergic diseases (OR=1.755; 95% CI=1.205 to 2.556; P=0.003), family history of skin
 200 dermatitis (OR=35.255; 95% CI=3.850 to 322.845; P=0.002) and palmar and plantar
 201 hyperhidrosis (OR=1.816; 95% CI=1.169 to 2.823; P=0.008). Factors associated with greater
 202 likelihood of suffering from skin lesions were the total time spent on skin cleansing and antiseptic
 203 procedures (P<0.001). Multivariable Logistic Regression demonstrated a statistically significant
 204 differences in total duration as follows: ≥5 hours and ≤1 hour (OR=0.156; 95% CI=0.076 to 0.320;
 205 P<0.001), 1-3 hours (OR=0.333; 95% CI=0.188 to 0.591; P<0.001), and 3-5 hours (OR=0.476;
 206 95% CI=0.256 to 0.883; P=0.019), suggesting an increased risk of disease incidence with
 207 exposure.

208

209 Table 4. Factors associated with skin lesions caused by medical disinfectants and personal
210 protective equipment according to multivariate logistic regression

Variables	<i>Multivariate</i>				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>P value</i>
Occupation					0.656
Workforce					0.366
Total time spent on skin cleansing and antiseptic procedures (hours/ week)					<0.0001**
≤1	-1.861	0.367	0.156	(0.076,0.320)	<0.0001**
(1,3)	-1.099	0.292	0.333	(0.188,0.591)	<0.0001**
[3,5)	-0.743	0.315	0.476	(0.256,0.883)	0.019
≥5	0.000				
Total time spent on wearing PPE (hours/ week)					0.471
History of atopic dermatitis	1.302	1.192	3.677	(0.355, 38.051)	0.275
CVDs	1.643	0.596	5.173	(1.610,16.624)	0.006*
Autoimmune diseases	2.434	1.076	11.405	(1.383,94.034)	0.024*
Allergic diseases	0.563	0.192	1.755	(1.205,2.556)	0.003*
Family history of skin dermatitis	3.563	1.130	35.255	(3.850,322.845)	0.002*
Negative psychosocial stimuli	0.185	0.183	1.204	(1.169, 2.823)	0.311
Palmar and plantar hyperhidrosis	0.597	0.225	1.816	(1.169,2.823)	0.008*

211 Note: * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.001$. SE, standard error. OR, odds ratio. 95% CI, 95% confidence
212 interval.

213 4. Discussion

214 4.1 Characteristics and prevalence

215 Overall, surveys from 995 patients were examined and a chi-square test was used to compare
216 demographic data between the two groups. The results revealed statistically significant differences
217 in occupation and workforce, but no significant differences were observed in sex, age or
218 protection level ($P > 0.05$). These findings are in contrast with existing literature published between
219 2019 and 2020 [2-5], which primarily examined healthcare personnel between the ages of 20 to 40
220 years working in SARS-CoV-2-designated hospitals in China. These studies revealed
221 unexpectedly high females to males ratios, along with a significant proportion of individuals using
222 level 3 barrier PPE for protection and an imbalanced age distribution [2-5]. However, during
223 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic lockdown period, various stakeholders, including healthcare professionals,
224 temporary sampling site workers, community members and volunteers, made substantial efforts to
225 combat the SARS-CoV-2 virus. The disaggregation of data on sex and age became more detailed,
226 and the distribution of protection levels became more equitable.

227 The prevalence of DRPIs and the proportion of participants exhibiting two or three types of skin
228 lesions observed in the current study was less when compared to previous domestic literature
229 covering the period from 2019 to 2020 [2-5], but align with earlier studies [1,6-8]. Several potential
230 hypotheses can be proposed to explain these results. First, it is plausible that the total duration of
231 skin cleansing and PPE use among temporary sampling site workers, community members and
232 volunteers was shorter than that among medical staff. This practice effectively mitigated the risk
233 of developing DRPIs or the cooccurrence of other types of skin lesions, preventing simple skin
234 lesions from becoming more severe. Second, the findings of this study exhibited a greater degree
235 of generalizability when applied to a larger population. Third, variations in temperature, humidity
236 and other climatic factors could account for the observed differences between these variables.

237 A total of 363 skin lesions were observed, forty-three of which were identified as DRPIs,
238 primarily affecting the head-face and neck regions. The majority of the lesions (307 out of 363)
239 were classified as MASD, with a higher prevalence observed in the hand and neck areas.
240 Additionally, thirteen lesions were categorized as STs, predominantly occurring in the head-face
241 region. These findings align with previous research studies [1-7]. Notably, the occurrence of DRPIs
242 lesions were primarily attributed to friction and shear stress resulting from the use of nasal and
243 facial masks or protective eyewear. Failure to address these stress-related issues may cause skin
244 tearing. Hence, while STs are commonly associated with DRPIs, the two do not occur
245 concurrently.

246 MASD occurs in regions characterized by excessive sweating and elevated levels of skin humidity,
247 such as palms, soles, and axillae [6-7]. Notably, this study revealed a greater incidence in the palms
248 and head and face area compared to previous studies [6]. This observation aligns with observations
249 made in clinical practice. Since protective measures primarily include nasal and facial protection,
250 as well as hand cleansing and disinfection, the vulnerability of the palms and head and face area is
251 accentuated.

252 **4.2 Analysis of related factors**

253 Risk factors and skin lesions caused by medical disinfectants and PPE were identified through
254 multivariable logistic regression. Autoimmune disease, a family history of skin dermatitis, CVDs,
255 palmar and plantar hyperhidrosis, and allergic diseases were found to be independent risk factors
256 for these skin lesions. Variables mentioned above may be linked to genetic diversity and the
257 immune microenvironment in vivo. However, these hypotheses need further confirmation.
258 Therefore, in future research, we intend to increase the sample size and evaluate the levels of
259 immune-inflammatory cells and immune-inflammatory factors, including tumor necrosis factor
260 (TNF) and interleukin (IL).

261 The statistical analysis revealed that workforce, protection level, total time spent on wearing PPE,
262 or psychosocial factors were not significantly associated with the onset of skin lesions ($P>0.05$).

263 Factors such as total duration of wearing PPE, history of atopic dermatitis and negative
264 psychosocial stimuli might offer some protection, but further analysis revealed no significant
265 difference between groups. Nevertheless, this speculation requires confirmation by additional
266 studies with larger sample sizes.

267 However, the total time spent on skin cleansing and antiseptis procedures were identified as risk
268 factors for these skin lesions. The findings of this study demonstrated a positive association
269 between the duration of exposure and the ORs calculated, suggesting an increased risk of disease
270 incidence. These estimates align with the observed patterns in real-world scenarios.

271 Occupation was not significantly associated with the onset of skin lesions. This finding differed
272 from previous literature from 2019-2020 that studied healthcare workers in China^[2-5]. It is
273 speculated that the limited working hours of volunteers, community members or temporary
274 sampling site workers might reduce the duration of exposure to medical disinfectants and PPE
275 compared to that of medical staff, while doctors, nurses, pharmacists and administrators, might
276 demonstrate a greater level of awareness regarding skin protection and are more likely to employ
277 effective measures to prevent skin lesions. Therefore, occupation emerged as a confounding
278 variable in relation to other factors within the framework of national epidemic prevention and
279 control.

280 **5. Conclusions**

281 During the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic lockdown period, skin lesions among epidemic prevention
282 workers was prevalent, which was primarily attributed to the use of medical disinfectants and PPE.
283 These skin lesions frequently manifested as a combination of various subtypes across different
284 areas of the body. The prevalence and characterization of these skin lesions varied over time.

285 Throughout the third year of the pandemic, SARS-CoV-2 and other pathogens circulated at
286 relatively low levels. These skin lesions have the potential to persist long term and significantly
287 impact quality of life. Drawing upon evidence from the literature, it is recommended that
288 individuals who engage in skin cleansing and skin antiseptic protocols for extended periods,
289 particularly after working in level three barrier protection for more than five hours, should take
290 mandatory breaks or shifts.

291 Several individual factors, along with the total time spent on skin cleansing and antiseptic
292 procedures, were identified as significant risk factors for the development of skin lesions. We
293 suggest the use of a comprehensive screening scale to identify individuals at high risk for skin
294 lesions, with the aim of implementing targeted interventions to prevent their occurrence. These
295 interventions involve the early application of dressings, topical agents, and antiallergic
296 medications to mitigate skin friction and moisture. Additionally, it is imperative to mobilize
297 collective action in the field of public health to promote education on skin barrier protection as an
298 essential preventive measure.

299 **Acknowledgment:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study. This
300 study was reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Wusong Hospital,
301 Zhongshan Hospital, Fudan University (IRB No.2022-SYY-15).

302 **Author contributions:** Jing-Yi Hu, Xiu-Li Xiao: conceptualization, methodology, validation,
303 investigation, data curation, writing-review and editing of the manuscript draft. Jing-Yi Hu:
304 formal analysis, writing-original draft. Xiu-Li Xiao, Yi Lu, Jian-Yong Su: project administration.
305 Jing-Yi Hu, Xiu-Li Xiao: funding acquisition. Xiu-Li Xiao: supervision. Yan Zhang, Ting Shang,
306 Chun-Hua Zhang, Lian Guo and Jian-chao Wang: writing, reviewing and editing the draft. All
307 authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

308 **Disclosure statement:** No potential conflicts of interest were reported by the author(s).

309 **Funding:** This research was supported by the Science and Technology Commission Project (STC)
310 of Shanghai Baoshan district (2023-E-54) and the Fifth Batch of National Excellent Clinical
311 Talents Training Program for Traditional Chinese Medicine [National Traditional Chinese
312 Medicine Education Letter (2022) No.1].


313 **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available from
314 the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

315 **Abbreviations:**

- 316 1. SARS-CoV-2: Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
317 2. CVDs: Cardiovascular diseases
318 3. DRPIs: Device-related pressure injuries
319 4. MASD: moisture-associated skin damage
320 5. STs: skin tears
321 6. TNF: tumor necrosis factor
322 7. IL: interleukin
323 8. B: coefficient of regression β (beta)
324 9. SE: standard error
325 10. OR: odds ratio
326 11. 95% CI: 95% confidence interval.
327 12. PPE: personal protective equipment

328 **References:**

- 329 [1] BARAKAT-JOHNSON M, BARNETT C, WAND T, et al. Medical device-related pressure
330 injuries : an exploratory descriptive study in an acute tertiary hospital in Australia . J Tissue
331 Viability. 2017; 26(4):246-253. DOI: 10.1016/j.jtv.2017.09.008.
332 [2] Xia J, Duan X, Cao XC, et al. Observation on the prevention effect of pressure injury on the
333 nose and face of nurses responsible for preventing and controlling the novel coronavirus
334 pneumonia. Journal of Nursing Administration. 2020; 20(4) : 276-279 . DOI: 10.3969 / j.issn.
335 1671-315X. 2020. 04. 012
336 [3] DAI YJ, GAO R, LAO DB, et al. Investigation on Medical Staff's Skin Injuries during the
337 Outbreak of Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia and Its Influencing Factors. Nurs J Chin PLA.
338 2020;37(4) : 46-50. DOI: 10.3969/j. issn.1008-9993.2020.04.0011
339 [4] JIANG QX, LIU YX, WEI W, et al. The Incidence and epidemic characteristics of medical
340 staff's skin injuries caused by personal protective equipment for fighting against SARS-CoV-2
341 infection . Chinese General Practice. 2020;23(9): 1083-1090 . DOI :
342 10.12114/j.issn.1007-9572.2020.00.315.
343 [5] Zheng J, Cai CC, Li C, et al. Analysis of related factors of head and face pressure injury caused
344 by protective equipment in medical staffs of epidemic prevention hospitals in Huangshi. Pract
345 Geriatr. 2020;34(7): 750-752. doi: 10. 3969 /j. Issn. 1003-9198.2020.07.032
346 [6] WOO KY, BEECKMAN D, CHAKRAVARTHY D. Management of moisture-associated skin
347 damage : a scoping review[J] . Adv Skin Wound Care. 2017;30(11): 494-501 . DOI :
348 10.1097/01.ASW. 0000525627. 54569. da.
349 [7] European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel. National Pressure Injury Advisory Panel and Pan
350 Pacific Pressure Injury Alliance. Prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers/injuries: clinical
351 practice guideline. The international guideline[EB/OL]. [2023-06-29]. [http://www. Internationa
352 lguideline. com /guideline.](http://www.Internationalguideline.com/guideline)
353 [8] ZULKOWSKI K. Understanding moisture-associated skin damage, medical adhesive-related
354 skin injuries , and skin tears . Adv Skin Wound Care. 2017;30(8): 372-381 . DOI :
355 10.1097/01.ASW.0000521048.64537.6e.
356 [9] JIANG QX, JIANG ZX, ZHENG MC, et al. Multicenter crosssectional survey on prevalence
357 and epidemiologic features of skin tears in hospitals. Chinese Nursing Management. 2017; 17(5):
358 631-636. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-1756.2017.05.014.



Figure