

Analytical and subjective interpretation of thermal comfort in hospitals:

A case study in two sterilization services

Carlos Carvalhais^{a,b*}, Joana Santos^{a,b}, Manuela Vieira da Silva^{a,b}

^a *Environmental Health Department, School of Allied Health Technologies of Polytechnic Institute of Porto (ESTSP.IPP), R. Valente Perfeito, no. 322, 4400-330 Vila Nova de Gaia, Portugal*

Phone: +351. 22 206 10 00; Fax: +351. 22 206 10 01; Email: caa@estsp.ipp.pt / jds@estsp.ipp.pt / m.silva@eu.ipp.pt

^b *Research Centre on Health and Environment (CISA), School of Allied Health Technologies of Polytechnic Institute of Porto (ESTSP.IPP), R. Valente Perfeito, no. 322, 4400-330 Vila Nova de Gaia, Portugal*

Phone: +351. 22 206 10 00; Fax: +351. 22 206 10 01; Email: caa@estsp.ipp.pt / jds@estsp.ipp.pt / m.silva@eu.ipp.pt

* *Contact person*

Running title: Thermal comfort in hospital sterilization services

ABSTRACT

Hospital facilities are normally, very complex, which combined with patient requirements promote conditions for potential development of uncomfortable working conditions. Thermal discomfort is one such example. This study aimed to determine levels of thermal comfort, sensations and preferences, from a field investigation conducted in two sterilization services (SS), of two Hospitals from Porto and Aveiro, Portugal. The analytical determination and interpretation of thermal comfort, was based upon assumptions of ISO 7726:1998 and ISO 7730:2005. The predicted mean vote (PMV) and predicted percentage of dissatisfaction (PPD) indices were obtained by measurement and estimation of environmental and personal variables, respectively, and calculated according to ISO 7730 equations. The subjective variables were obtained from thermal sensation (subjective PMV) and affective assessment (subjective PPD), reported by questionnaire based upon ISO 10551:1995. Both approaches confirmed thermal discomfort in both SS (codified as SS1 and SS2). For all areas, PMV and PPD exceeded in all periods of the day the recommended range of -0.5 to +0.5 and <10%, respectively. No significant differences were found between day periods. The questionnaire results showed that SS2 workers reported a higher level of thermal discomfort. There were no significant differences between PMV and thermal sensations as well as between PPD and affective assessment. The PMV/PPD model was found suitable to predict thermal sensations of occupants in hospital SS located in areas with a mild climate in Portugal.

INTRODUCTION

Hospitals are particular workplaces, designed almost exclusively to the needs of users, often causing their workers to suffer from poor environmental working conditions (Carvalhais et al. 2011). Hospitals are complex facilities due to various types of uses of indoor spaces (Balaras et al. 2007). In a paradoxical way, the hospital environment has risks that may pose immediate threats, subsequently, producing sooner or later health problems to individuals who maintain direct contact and/or daily life within this environment. The work in hospitals is likely to damage health resulting in occupational accidents and diseases. It is well-established that inappropriate thermal comfort conditions in a building does not usually produce serious illness but exerts a significant impact on well-being and daily performance of its occupants (Mendes et al. 2014), leading to greater work inefficiency and higher possibility of personnel errors occurrence.

The occupants of hospitals have different thermal comfort requirements. The most important considerations are patient well-fare but others include healthcare staff and visitors. At times, any or all of these populations may occupy the same space (Lomas and Giridharan 2012). The proper setting of thermal comfort parameters provides suitable environment for personnel (Pourshaghaghay and Omidvari 2012). Some investigators examined the desired thermal conditions for hospital occupants, including patients and healthcare professionals (Fransson et al 2007; Skoog et al. 2005). To satisfy as many people as possible, common indices are used, such as the predicted mean vote (PMV) (Hoof et al. 2010; ISO 2005) and the predicted percentage of dissatisfaction (PPD) (Hoof et al. 2010; ISO 2005) being most frequently used in current standards to assess and predict general, or whole-body, thermal comfort (Hoof et al. 2010). Despite an increasing number of studies in thermal environment field, data on indoor thermal comfort conditions for hospital occupants are sparse (Khodakarami and Nasrollahi 2012). Some

studies compared questionnaire results with PMV-PPD model, and Verheyen et al (2011) noted that this model was capable of adequately predicting thermal sensation in a hospital context.

In Portugal, the parameters specified in national legislation relating to thermal environment in occupational context, are restricted to values of temperature and humidity, recommended by Decree Law No 243/86 of 20 August. Other related legislated parameters, are more focused on energy consumption as opposed to occupational comfort of occupants. It is known, that inadequate thermal environments aggravate the impact of air pollutants on occupant's health (Mendes and Teixeira 2014) and, in some cases, promote the presence of those contaminants in the air to be inhaled (Mendes et al. 2014). In hospitals, sterilization services (SS) are areas where health risks associated with mixed exposures may potentially occur, due to the use of steam, temperature, chemicals such as ethylene oxide (EO) among other methods, in the sterilization process. In addition to the legal compliance of legislated thermal parameters, this study aimed to determine levels of thermal comfort by using objective and subjective approaches, in two hospital SS.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sterilization Services (SS)

This field study was carried out in two SS of two hospitals from Porto and Aveiro districts, Portugal (SS1 and SS2), during summer seasons of 2012 and 2014, respectively. Structural and functional characterization of the SS was made. Both SS have centrally-controlled Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems. In SS1 the floor is concrete with vinyl covering, walls are covered with tiles and the roof is concrete with a plasterboard false ceiling. In SS2 the roof is concrete with a plasterboard false ceiling and the floor and walls are tiled. In both hospitals, this service centralizes the sterile processing activities, in which reusable medical devices, surgical instruments and

equipment are processed and issued for diagnostic and surgical patient care procedures. In the receiving, decontaminating and cleaning areas, all contaminated instrument sets are brought following initial cleaning and prepared for decontamination. Instruments are cleaned and prepared for final decontamination process in a washer-decontamination unit. Both SS have a pass through capability from the receiving / decontamination area into the assembly area. In the assembly area instruments are assembled into sets, placed in sterilization containers or packs and prepared for the sterilization process. In the sterilization area, packaged instrument sets from the assembly area are loaded onto sterilization transport carts, placed into sterilizer units, carts are removed from sterilizer and items are allowed to dry and cool. Then, sterile items are transported to the sterile storage area.

Both SS use steam and EO for sterilization. The use of saturated steam under pressure in an autoclave achieves the destruction of microorganisms by the irreversible denaturation of enzymes and structural proteins (Rutala and Weber 2004). The temperature at which denaturation occurs varies inversely with the amount of water present. Sterilization in saturated steam is the most frequently used sterilization method in hospitals and requires precise control of time, temperature, and pressure. Regarding EO, its efficiency depends on the concentration of gas, humidity, time of exposure, temperature, and nature of the load. In particular, it is necessary to ensure that the nature of the packaging is such that the gas exchange occurs. It is also important to maintain sufficient humidity during sterilization and also record the gas concentration, temperature and humidity for each cycle. This sterilization method is mainly used for heat-sensitive material, but due to the highly flammable and potentially explosive nature of EO in addition to toxicity and carcinogenicity (Rutala and Weber 2004) the whole process needs to be controlled and considered a specific assessment of occupational exposure.

The measurements were performed in three areas (decontaminating area (A); cleaning and assembly area (B) and sterilization area (C)), in three periods of the day (morning, afternoon and night). Those areas were chosen because workers stay there most of their work time. The SS1 operates continuously and has three shifts (8 a.m-2p.m.; 2p.m-10p.m. and 10p.m.-8a.m.); SS2 has two shifts (8 a.m-2p.m. and 2p.m-10p.m.).

Analytical assessment of thermal comfort

For the calculation of PMV index (which predicts the mean response of a larger group of people according to 7-point thermal sensation scale) and PPD index (a quantitative measure of thermal comfort of a group of subjects at a particular thermal environment) (ISO 2005), environmental and personal parameters were determined (by measurement and estimation, respectively) at the same time, following ISO 7730:2005 and ISO 7726:1998. The areas as a homogeneous and steady-state environment were tested according ISO 7726:1998 (ISO 1998) specifications with a TSI 8345-M-GB thermo-anemometer. Based on this analysis of environments classification, measurements of environmental variables followed the recommendations of ISO 7726:1998 for positioning of measuring equipment. Moderate environments (class C comfort standard) were considered. In SS1, measurements of the environmental variables were conducted with a Delta Ohm HD32.1 data logger that measured: air velocity (v_{ar}), relative humidity (RH), dry bulb temperature (t_a), and globe temperature (t_g) and in SS2 were used a TSI 8345-M-GB thermo-anemometer (v_{ar}) and a Quest Area Heat Stress Monitor model HS-32 (t_a , t_g , RH). All the equipment was calibrated in an accredited calibration lab and the criteria specified in ISO 7726:1998 accomplished. The equipment was placed taking into account the activities performed in each area at a height of 0.6 m above the floor (sitting, abdomen level) or 1.1 m (standing, abdomen level), with the sampling points no closer than 1 m to a wall, a window or a door. After 20 min of equipment stabilization in each area,

measurements were recorded over 10 min. The personal parameters were estimated according to ISO 7730:2005 (ISO 2005) and confirmed by observation. Occupants' daily activity was considered to be a metabolic rate (M) of 1.6 met.

In a hospital environment, staff clothing is pre-defined and thus presumed similar. Their clothing was considered to have a thermal insulation (I_{cl}) of 0.7 clo (underpants, working uniform (shirt and trousers) socks, shoes). PMV, PPD indices, and mean radiant temperature (t_r) were calculated by a validated computer program for calculating PMV and PPD, based on Annex D of the ISO 7730:2005 (ISO 2005).

Subjective assessment of thermal comfort

Assessment of subjective variables was based on responses to a questionnaire survey, which was administered simultaneously with the environmental variables measurements. A total of 37 respondents participated in the survey in both hospitals (all healthcare staff that was developing their activities during the monitoring period, corresponding to a response rate of 100%). Subjective data were recorded using a questionnaire based on ISO 10551:1995 (ISO 1995). The questionnaire developed for this survey was divided into three main sections containing a total of 11 questions: (1) demographic information; (2) judgment of personal thermal state (thermal sensation, thermal preference and affective assessment); and (3) judgment of thermal ambience (personal acceptability and personal tolerance). The dominant gender of the sample was female (56.76%). The average age of the sample was 44.68 years.

Statistical Analysis

All tests considered a 95% confidence interval. The normality Shapiro-Wilk test, the Student's t test for paired samples and analysis of variance (ANOVA), were applied. The software IBM SPSS™ (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 20th version and MS Excel® 2013 were used for the analysis.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the calculated values of PMV and PPD indices and other thermal parameters by day period in both SS. t_a values ranged between 23.4 °C (morning) to 25.4 °C (night) in SS1 and between 24.8 °C (night) to 25.6 °C (afternoon) in SS2. Regarding RH values, in SS1 ranged between 51.7 (afternoon) to 58.6 % (morning) and in SS2 between 53.9 (night) to 58.5% (morning). v_{ar} values varied from 0.03 to 0.19 m/sec in SS1 and from non-detect to 0.09 m/sec in SS2.

Results regarding PMV/PPD, ranged between 0.77/17.6 % (morning) to 1.08/29.8 % (morning) in SS1 and between 1/26.1 % (afternoon) to 1.18/34.4 % (morning) in SS2. By utilizing 7 sensation scale, the predicted thermal sensation through the analytical approach in both SS was “slightly warm”. There were no significant differences between day periods for all environmental variables and PMV/PPD indices given in Table 1. Regarding the subjective approach, Figures 1 and 2, show the thermal sensations and thermal preferences, referred by participants in both SS, respectively. Concerning thermal sensation, Figure 1 demonstrated that workers tend to feel more comfortable in SS1 than SS2 (46.1 SS1 vs none % SS2). Although, “slightly warm” sensation was reported more often by SS2 workers (31.8 SS1 vs 44.5% SS2) followed by “warm” sensation (11.1 SS1 vs 44.4% SS2). In relation to the thermal preferences during the same period, the majority of SS2 workers, preferred to change the environment to “slightly cooler” (31.9 SS1 vs 55.6% SS2). In SS1, 40.1% of the participants would not change anything in their environment (neither cooler nor warmer). The questionnaire analysis yielded other results, regarding personal acceptability, personal tolerance and affective assessment, which are presented in Figure 3. In general SS1 workers tolerate, accept and are more satisfied with their thermal environment than SS2 staff. The majority of SS1 workers considered the environment “acceptable” (81.7%), “perfectly bearable” (71.1%) and

“comfortable” (56.4%). Regarding SS2, the majority of workers classified the environment as “unacceptable” (54.5%), “fairly difficult to bear” (45.5%) and “uncomfortable” (36.4%), respectively. In comparing both approaches results are displayed in Figures 4 and 5, data indicated that in general workers felt uncomfortable. Despite SS2 workers reporting a higher level of thermal discomfort, there were no significant differences between PMV and thermal sensations, as well as between PPD and affective assessment.

DISCUSSION

For both SS, t_a values were higher than those recommended by national legislation in all areas and day periods. This might be produced by an inefficient operation of the HVAC system (Balaras et al. 2007). On the other hand, the obtained RH values comply with legal requirements, as well as v_{ar} . Air movement within a space may lead to draught sensation, but may also yield improved comfort under warm conditions. Thus if in cool environments some restrictive requirements of air velocity are necessary to avoid the sensation of draught, in warm environments it may be beneficial for human comfort (Olesen and Parsons 2002).

PMV and PPD indices, exceeded in all periods of the day the recommended range of -0.5 to +0.5 and <10%, respectively (Category B) (International Organization for Standardization 2005). Similar results were reported by Pourshaghaghay and Omidvari (2012), who determined that PMV was higher than 0.5 in all sections of the hospital building studied both in winter and summer seasons. Although there were no marked differences between SS, it seems that in general, SS2 displayed the poorest thermal conditions according to the data obtained (higher PMV). In general, in this study the objective approach gave systematically higher discomfort levels than the subjective approach, which is in agreement with adaptive theory (Azizpour et al. 2013; Carvalhais

et al. 2011). However, Verheyen et al. (2011) noted the opposite trend where PMV index was lower than reported thermal sensation, may be due to the fact that the subjects under examination study was not young and healthy. A possible misinterpretation of the questionnaires also needs to be taken into account and may have influenced the results. Fransson et al (2007) showed that the best way to determine and predict thermal sensation was to combine measurement of environmental and subjective variables. Differences between the two approaches might be justified by the inaccuracy of the estimation of personal parameters such metabolic rate and thermal insulation. Part of the inaccuracy of the methods for metabolic rate determination, is produced by the limited task description (Havenith et al. 2002). However, several extensive field studies summarized by Dear and Brager (1998) showed that in buildings running with centrally-controlled HVAC systems, the PMV-model approximates the observed thermal comfort of occupants quite closely.

CONCLUSIONS

There were no significant differences between PMV/PPD indices in SS1 and SS2 and between thermal sensations and affective assessment reported by workers. In both SS the PMV index predicted the sensation as “slightly warm”. However, the real sensations noted by workers indicated that they felt “warm” in SS2. The assessment and interpretation of the thermal environment by analytical and subjective approaches revealed that in general occupants felt uncomfortable with respect to thermal conditions. The PMV/PPD model was found suitable to predict thermal sensations of occupants in hospital SS located in a typical Mediterranean climate. In sensitive areas such as SS), other risk factors for not feeling well may also occur. It would be an interesting study to examine the relation of thermal parameters with microbiological contamination or even

with chemical exposure associated with the use of volatile compounds in the sterilization process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the assistance given by the Occupational Health Services of both Hospitals and by the student Vítor Barbosa, who helped with the measurements.

REFERENCES

- Azizpour, F., S. Moghimi, E. Salleh, S. Mat, C. H. Lim, and K. Sopian. 2013. Thermal comfort assessment of large-scale hospitals in tropical climates: A case study of university Kebangsaan Malaysia medical centre (UKMMC). *Energ Build* 64: 317-322.
- Balaras, C. A., E. Dascalaki, and A. Gaglia. 2007. HVAC and indoor thermal conditions in hospital operating rooms. *Energ Build* 39: 454–470.
- Carvalhais, C., J. Santos, I. Lourenço, J. P. Teixeira, and J. S. Baptista. 2011. Thermal comfort in hospital environment - The case of sterilization service. In *SHO2011: International Symposium on Occupational Safety and Hygiene*, edited by Arezes, P., Baptista, J. S., Barroso, M. P., Carneiro, P., Cordeiro, P., Costa, N., Melo, R., Miguel, A. S., and Perestrelo, G. Guimarães, Portugal: Portuguese Society of Occupational Safety & Hygiene. pp. 189-193.
- Dear, R. De, and G. S. Brager. 1998. Developing an adaptive model of thermal comfort and preference. *ASHRAE Transact* 104: 19.
- Decree-Law No. 243/86 of 20th August. 2013. *Diário da República*, 1.a série, No. 190. Portugal.
- European Committee for Standardization. 1998. CR 1752 - Ventilation for Buildings: Design Criteria for the Indoor Environment.
- Fransson, N., D. Västfjäll, and J. Skoog. 2007. In search of the comfortable indoor environment: A comparison of the utility of objective and subjective indicators of indoor comfort. *Build Environ* 42: 1886–1890.
- Havenith, George, Ingvar Holmér, and Ken Parsons. 2002. Personal factors in thermal comfort assessment: Clothing properties and metabolic heat production. *Energ Build* 34: 581–591.

- Hoof, J. v., M. Mazej, and J. L. M. Hensen. 2010. Thermal comfort: Research and practice. *Front Biosci* 15: 765–88.
- ISO (International Organization for Standardization). 1995. ISO 10551 Ergonomics of the Thermal Environment - Assessment of the Influence of the Thermal Environment Using Subjective Judgement Scales. *ISO Standard*, 1–28.
- ISO (International Organization for Standardization). 1998. ISO 7726 Ergonomics of the Thermal Environment — Instruments for Measuring Physical Quantities. *ISO Standard*, 1–56.
- ISO (International Organization for Standardization). 2005. ISO 7730: Ergonomics of the Thermal Environment - Analytical Determination and Interpretation of Thermal Comfort Using Calculation of the PMV and PPD Indices and Local Thermal Comfort Criteria. *ISO Standard*, 1-60.
- Khodakarami, Jamal, and Nazanin Nasrollahi. 2012. Thermal comfort in hospitals - A literature review. *Renew Sust Energ Rev* 16: 4071-4077.
- Lomas, K. J., and R. Giridharan. 2012. Thermal comfort standards, measured internal temperatures and thermal resilience to climate change of free-running buildings: A case-study of hospital wards. *Build Environ* 55: 57–72.
- Mendes, A., and J. Teixeira. 2014. Sick building syndrome. In *Encyclopedia of Toxicology*, edited by P. Wexler, 3rd edition, section 4:. Elsevier Inc. Academic Press. pp. 256-260
- Mendes, A., D. Aelenei, A. L. Papoila, P. Carreiro-Martins, L. Aguiar, C. Pereira, P. Neves, S. Azevedo, M. Cano, C. Proenca, J. Viegas, S. Silva, D. Mendes, N. Neuparth and J.P. Teixeira 2014. Environmental and ventilation assessment in child day care centers in Porto: The ENVIRH project. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 77: 931–943.

- Olesen, B. W., and K. C. Parsons. 2002. Introduction to thermal comfort standards and to the proposed new version of EN ISO 7730. *Energ Build* 34: 537–548.
- Pourshaghaghay, A., and M. Omidvari. 2012. Examination of thermal comfort in a hospital using PMV-PPD model. *Appl Ergonom* 43: 1089–1095.
- Rutala, W. A., and D. J. Weber. 2004. Disinfection and sterilization in health care facilities: What clinicians need to know. *Clin Infect Dis* 39: 702–709.
- Skoog, J., N. Fransson, and L. Jagemar. 2005. Thermal environment in Swedish hospitals: Summer and winter measurements. *Energ Build* 37: 872–877.
- Verheyen, J., N. Theys, L. Allonsius, and F. Descamps. 2011. Thermal comfort of patients: Objective and subjective measurements in patient rooms of a Belgian healthcare facility. *Build Environ* 46: 1195–1204.

TABLE 1. Environmental parameters and PMV/PPD indices by hospitals and areas.

Area	Day Period	Air Temperature (°C)		Relative Humidity (%)		Air Velocity (m/s)		PMV		PPD (%)	
		SS1	SS2	SS1	SS2	SS1	SS2	SS1	SS2	SS1	SS2
		Mean ± SD*									
A	Morning	23.70±0.20	24.92±0.15	55.4±1.20	58.5±0.96	0.17±0.16	0.03±0.05	0.83	1.10	19.5	30.3
B		23.40±0.10	25.51±0.04	58.6±0.60	57.3±1.09	0.16±0.12	0.02±0.03	0.77	1.18	17.6	34.4
C		25.50±0.10	25.00±0.11	53.3±0.90	57.8±0.97	0.03±0.05	0.01±0.02	1.08	1.08	29.8	29.6
A	Afternoon	24.40±0.50	25.60±0.20	51.8±2.30	56.9±1.48	0.16±0.12	0.06±0.07	0.86	1.17	20.6	33.6
B		24.30±0.30	25.52±0.09	51.7±1.20	56.4±0.67	0.16±0.14	0.05±0.06	0.87	1.16	21.0	33.3
C		24.20±0.10	25.41±0.85	54.8±0.50	57.7±0.48	0.09±0.04	0.09±0.12	1.00	1.00	26.2	26.1
A	Night	25.40±0.10	25.19±0.03	56.3±1.10	53.9±0.76	0.13±0.08	0.06±0.05	0.98	1.10	25.3	30.6
B		24.00±0.20	24.81±0.03	57.3±1.10	54.6±0.80	0.19±0.17	0.04±0.06	0.84	1.15	20.0	33.0
C		24.80±0.40	25.52±0.40	55.6±1.60	56.8±1.59	0.11±0.09	0.00±0.00	0.93	1.17	23.2	33.9
<i>Difference Between Day periods</i>		<i>Not Significant (p=0.775)</i>		<i>Not Significant (p=0.297)</i>		<i>Not Significant (p=0.700)</i>		<i>Not Significant (p=0.962)</i>		<i>Not Significant (p=0.963)</i>	
<i>Evaluation criteria</i>		18 - 22 ^a (25 ^{**})		50 - 70 ^a		< 0.20 ^b		-0.5 to +0.5 ^c		< 10 ^c	

^a DL no. 246/1986 20th August (Portuguese Legislation)

^b CR 1752 (European Committee for Standardization 1998)

^c ISO 7730:2005 (Category B) (International Organization for Standardization 2005)

*SD – Standard Deviation

** Under specific climatic conditions