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Summary This review gives an overview of hand hygiene in healthcare and in the community, including some aspects which have attracted little attention, such as hand drying and cultural issues determining hand hygiene behaviour. Hand hygiene is the most effective measure for interrupting the transmission of microorganisms which cause infection both in the community and in the healthcare setting. Using hand hygiene as a sole measure to reduce infection is unlikely to be successful when other factors in infection control, such as environmental hygiene, crowding, staffing levels and education are inadequate. Hand hygiene must be part of an integrated approach to infection control. Compliance with hand hygiene recommendations is poor worldwide. While the techniques involved in hand hygiene are simple, the complex interdependence of factors which determine hand hygiene behaviour makes the study of hand hygiene complex. It is now recognised that improving compliance with hand hygiene recommendations depends on altering human behaviour. Input from behavioural and social sciences is essential when designing studies to investigate compliance. Interventions to increase compliance with hand hygiene practices must be appropriate for different cultural and social needs. New strategies to promote hand hygiene worldwide include the formation of public—private partnerships.
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Introduction

Hands play a major role in the transmission of infection in healthcare institutions, in industrial settings such as the food industry and also in all community and domestic settings.1–3 The importance of hand hygiene in the control of infection cannot be underemphasised. Recognition of the importance of hand hygiene in the control of the spread of infectious diseases is reflected in the increased number of publications in the medical literature during the last few years, including major articles on hand hygiene in prominent general medical journals.4–6 Using ‘handwashing’ as a keyword in PubMed showed that from 1968–1983 there were 187 citations, compared with 1535 citations from 1990–2003.
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In spite of the increased attention directed at hand hygiene in the medical literature, many issues remain unexplored and unresolved. Although many countries have guidelines regarding hand hygiene for healthcare settings, overall compliance among healthcare workers (HCWs) remains poor. Improving hand hygiene remains a challenge for infection control practitioners in healthcare institutions and in the community. Most of the medical literature, including guidelines for hand hygiene, concerns healthcare institutions in developed countries. While the spread of infection in developed countries remains a serious problem, especially in high-risk settings such as hospitals, the threat of infectious disease in developing countries remains extremely high.

There are 2–3 million deaths worldwide each year from diarrhoeal diseases, many of which could be prevented. It has been estimated that handwashing with soap could save a million lives a year. Developing countries present extra hurdles when trying to increase handwashing. A public health infrastructure including access to basic sanitation may be limited or non-existent in a developing country. Increasing handwashing in developing countries therefore requires a different approach to that in developed countries.

There have been many public health campaigns worldwide to address hand hygiene. Few, however, have been successful. A new campaign led by the World Bank and the Water and Sanitation Programme, in collaboration with many other partners, has been set up to promote handwashing in India and Ghana. This is a global public–private partnership which aims to address the lack of success of many public health campaigns in increasing handwashing by combining both the public and the private sector. The private sector will gain from the increased use of soap.

**Aim and scope**

The aim of this paper is to review hand hygiene from a worldwide perspective, to explore some areas of hand hygiene practice which have attracted little attention so far, to focus on cultural and behavioural issues related to hand hygiene, and to highlight areas needed for further research. A detailed discussion of surgical hand antisepsis as a specialised area of hand hygiene is beyond the scope of this review.

**Historical perspectives in hand hygiene**

Although handwashing has been considered a measure of personal hygiene for centuries, the specific link between handwashing and the spread of infectious diseases has been reported only during the last 200 years. Ritual handwashing was part of religious or cultural practice but cleaning hands was concerned with aesthetics rather than the prevention of infection. Bad smells were thought to spread infections such as the plague. Interestingly, during the Black Death in the 14th century, it was noted that Jews seemed to have a lower mortality rate than other groups. The ritual handwashing of the Jewish faith probably protected Jews during the epidemic, though the focus of the ritual washing was spiritual rather than infection control. In 1846, Semmelweis reported a reduction in the number of deaths from puerperal infection by the implementation of hand hygiene. However, the establishment of handwashing as an intervention to prevent the spread of infection did not occur for many more years and it is only during the last few decades that written guidelines for hand hygiene have emerged. In 1961 in the US, there were recommendations that healthcare workers (HCWs) should wash their hands with soap for one to two minutes before and after patient contact. Formal written guidelines on handwashing practices in hospitals were published by the CDC in 1975 and 1985. Further guidelines from other professional bodies emerged. While the earlier guidelines recommended the use of soap and water in preference to waterless antiseptic solutions, recent guidelines have included more widespread use of waterless antiseptic agents in preference to handwashing with soap and water.

**Definitions**

The word hygiene is derived from the name *Hygeia*, who was the Greek goddess of healing. In modern usage hygiene usually refers to cleanliness and especially to any practice which leads to the absence or reduction of harmful infectious agents. There is great variation in the terminology used in hand hygiene and this is reflected in the various spellings of terms such as ‘handwashing’, ‘hand washing’, ‘hand-washing’ in the medical literature. Such variations may introduce inconsistencies in archiving articles. The definitions of the terms used are important because valid comparisons between studies depend on the standardisation of definitions. Also, there is evidence that precise definitions of the terms are important in facilitating the effective use of hand hygiene guidelines.

For this review the term hand hygiene includes handwashing (washing hands with non-antimicrobial soap), antiseptic handwash (washing hands with
water and soap or another detergent containing an antiseptic agent), antiseptic hand rub (rubbing hands with an antiseptic hand rub) and surgical hand antisepsis (preoperative antiseptic handwash or hand rub performed by surgical personnel.) These terms also include hand drying following hand-washing.

The hands as vectors of microorganisms

The microbial population of the skin is divided into resident flora and transient flora. The resident flora are associated with the deeper layers of the skin such as the sebaceous glands and these organisms are inaccessible to hand hygiene preparations. The resident flora consist mainly of coagulase-negative staphylococci, Corynebacterium spp. and anaerobes such as Propionibacterium spp. and are not considered part of normal flora and are therefore included as transient or contaminating flora which should be removed during hand hygiene practices.

The number of microorganisms on intact areas of skin in the same person can vary from 100–10^4/cm². The range of microorganisms can vary from person to person and HCWs may have different hand flora from ordinary members of the public and become permanently colonised with pathogenic flora acquired from the hospital environment.

Hospitalised patients can also become colonised with microorganisms which survive well in the hospital environment including Staphylococcus aureus, enterococci, and Gram-negative bacilli such as Pseudomonas spp, Klebsiella spp, and Acinetobacter spp.

There is evidence that although the skin flora vary considerably from person to person, the transient and resident flora remain uniform for an individual.

In a healthcare setting, data are limited on the types of activities which are most likely to result in the contamination of hands and the transmission of the pathogens to patients. Nosocomial pathogens can be recovered from body fluids or infected areas of skin in patients, but also from intact skin of hospitalised patients. Nurses can contaminate their hands with nosocomial flora even when performing clean procedures involving direct patient contact such as taking blood pressure or touching a patient’s hand or shoulder. Healthcare workers may also contaminate their hands by contact with a patient’s inanimate environment. The level of contamination depends on the duration and nature of the activity, though it is not known how many organisms are required for transmission or which activities are most likely to result in transmission.
become contaminated with bacteria during use, with bar soaps being associated with heavier contamination compared to liquid soaps. However, other studies have suggested that while they may become contaminated with bacteria, these bacteria are unlikely to be transferred to hands. Soap may also result in skin irritation and dryness, as mentioned previously.

The alcohols used in alcohol-based hand antiseptics are ethanol, isopropanol, and n-propanol. These have been studied alone, in combinations of two alcohols and also in combination with other disinfectants such as hexachlorophene, quaternary ammonium compounds, povidone-iodine, triclosan or chlorhexidine gluconate. The antimicrobial activity of alcohols is attributed to their ability to denature proteins. Alcohols have a wide antimicrobial spectrum including Gram-positive bacteria, Gram-negative bacteria, mycobacteria, fungi and some enveloped viruses, but poor activity against bacterial spores, oocysts and some non-enveloped viruses. Alcohols have the most rapid bactericidal activity compared with other disinfectants when applied to the skin. However, there is little residual activity. Adding a disinfectant such as chlorhexidine, triclosan, or quaternary ammonium compounds increases the persistence of antimicrobial activity on the skin.

Hand rubs with an alcohol base have recently been recommended as being more effective in reducing hand contamination compared with handwashing with an antiseptic soap, where hands are not macroscopically contaminated. Their use has been recommended for years because of their increased convenience compared with handwashing and they have become widely promoted in hand hygiene practice in clinical settings. They have a wide antimicrobial spectrum, they act rapidly, they spread easily without friction which damages skin, they evaporate rapidly, there is no need for a sink or drying facilities and they save time when compared with conventional handwashing. There is also evidence that HCWs are more likely to use them than to wash hands with soap and water. In a healthcare setting they may also be cost effective in terms of the number of nosocomial infections prevented, though further analyses are necessary to substantiate this.

Sinks and taps

Sinks contain stagnant water, which supports the growth of microorganisms. Therefore sinks themselves can be sources of pathogenic bacteria which in turn be transferred to hands during hand hygiene practices. Given the potential risks of hand contamination associated with sink contact, no-touch taps and automated sinks have become more common both in the healthcare setting and in public toilet facilities. However, while these may have the potential to improve the effectiveness of hand hygiene practices, automated sinks may still become contaminated with pathogenic organisms if not maintained properly.

Hand drying

Hand drying is an essential component of effective handwashing. It is universally accepted that the transmission of microorganisms is more effective in wet environments than in dry environments. In spite of this, guidelines generally direct little attention to the importance of hand drying when recommending handwashing and there have been very few articles in the medical literature which focus on hand drying. Hand drying should be effective in drying hands without contaminating them further. Damp hands as a result of ineffective hand drying can lead to skin excoriation which in turn leads to higher numbers of bacteria colonising the skin and facilitation of the spread of blood-borne viruses as well as other microorganisms.

There are three methods of hand drying: cloth towels, paper towels and hot air dryers. Hands can also dry by evaporation. There has been much debate regarding the efficacy of these methods in terms of hand hygiene and the results of investigations have been conflicting. One report compared four methods of hand drying: cloth towels from a roller, paper towels left on a sink, hot air dryer and leaving hands to dry by evaporation. No significant differences in the efficacies of each method were noted. However, cloth towels are not recommended for use in healthcare settings because of evidence that microorganisms are less effectively removed. There is also the risk of cross-infection.

Differing results have been obtained when comparing paper towels and hot air dryers. It has been suggested that hot air dryers may disperse microorganisms by the airborne route and hand towels are usually considered safer in a clinical area. However a recent paper did not find that hand dryers were more likely to contaminate the environment with air-borne microorganisms than drying with paper towels.

The maintenance of a clean environment around paper towels is essential for non-hazardous hand
drying. This includes the choice of dispenser allowing ease of delivery, correct use of the dispenser, jamming of the dispenser, site of dispenser in relation to sinks and splash zones. The dispenser itself may be the source of microorganisms if it becomes contaminated. Damp towels left in the dispenser may also pose an infection risk.

The quality of the paper towels is also important; poor quality towels may damage skin by abrasion and ineffective drying. Soft, absorbent paper towels are more acceptable to users and may contribute to compliance with hand hygiene recommendations.

Other issues relating to hand hygiene in the healthcare setting

Gloves

The use of gloves in healthcare settings has increased during the last two decades, particularly following the increased awareness of blood-borne viruses, especially HIV, and the subsequent promotion of universal precautions. The use of gloves is recommended to reduce contamination of the hands with flora which may be transferred to patients, to prevent the flora of HCWs from being transferred to patients and to protect HCWs from acquiring infections from patients. Evidence that gloves can prevent hands from becoming contaminated with microorganisms both from the patients and the inanimate environment is provided by several studies. It is important that hands are prevented from becoming contaminated because hand hygiene practices are not always successful in removing all pathogenic organisms when hands are heavily contaminated. Also, in the absence of macroscopically visible contamination it is not usually possible to know how many organisms have been acquired and the subsequent risk of transmission.

Gloves have been used to reduce the transmission of pathogens in clinical settings and to help control outbreaks. Glove wearing may also influence the hand hygiene behaviour of HCWs. In some studies this has meant healthcare personnel being less likely to wash their hands following patient contact. In another, glove wearing increased the compliance with hand hygiene practices. It is important to remind HCWs that hands must still be decontaminated following glove wearing as gloves do not give complete protection against contamination with patients’ flora. Gloves may in turn contribute to the spread of pathogens if not used correctly. They should be changed between patients and should not be washed or reused. Also, transmission of hepatitis B and herpes simplex to HCWs wearing gloves has been reported. The route of transmission while wearing gloves may result from contamination when removing gloves or from small defects in the gloves and subsequent loss of the integrity of the physical barrier.

It is important that the gloves are well-tolerated by the wearers and that they are strong but also give good sensitivity. Studies have shown that there is considerable variation in the gloves available for clinical use. Gloves may be made from natural latex or synthetic materials such as vinyl or nitrile and it is important that more than one type is available because latex sensitivity among HCWs is more commonly reported. There have also been differences in the reported tendency of barrier protection for vinyl gloves compared with latex gloves; vinyl gloves being less reliable than latex gloves in some studies. Double gloving is sometimes practised to increase the barrier protection. One study examined the gloves after use and tested them for leaks and found that double layers provided little advantage over a single layer, especially if latex gloves were used.

Recent developments in glove technology have included the incorporation of microspheres into gloves which release chlorine dioxide when activated by light or moisture and double-layered gloves which give extra protection while retaining sensitivity. It is not yet known what impact these innovations will have on future hand hygiene recommendations.

Hand creams and emollients

Sore, dry hands is a frequently reported problem among HCWs who are required to wash or decontaminate their hands frequently. Lipids contribute to the barrier function of the skin and skin creams, lotions and emollients may increase the skin hydration and further add to the protection of skin. A double-blind, randomised trial of a barrier cream and an oil-based lotion demonstrated that scheduled use of either preparation significantly protected the hands of HCWs who already had severe skin irritation. The same study also showed that improvement of the skin was associated with an increase in handwashing. However it is not yet known whether barrier creams make a significant contribution to the overall prevention of skin problems. There is also concern that oil-based products may inhibit the barrier function of latex gloves and the effectiveness of antimicrobial agents used in hand hygiene practices.
Rings

The skin underneath rings has more microorganisms than control sites. The number of microorganisms increases with the number of rings worn. In one study, multivariate analysis suggested that wearing rings was a major risk factor for carrying Gram-negative bacilli and *S. aureus* on hands, both being important nosocomial pathogens. There is also evidence that the organisms found under rings may be carried for many months. In an experimental model using food handlers as subjects, handwashing was slightly less effective in ring wearers, but this was in hands which were artificially contaminated, not in a real life situation. There is little evidence to suggest that handwashing is ineffective in ring wearers, with most reports showing similar bacterial counts in ring wearers and non-ring wearers. There is little evidence relating the wearing of rings to patient outcome, such as the incidence of nosocomial infection.

Wrist watches and bracelets

It seems obvious that hand hygiene practices in clinical areas cannot be adequate if a wrist watch or bracelet is worn. Most hospital infection control guidelines recommend that wrist watches and bracelets are removed before hand hygiene practices are performed. A Medline search of ‘hygiene’ and ‘wrist watches’ found only two citations concerning hand hygiene and no citations using ‘bracelet’ and ‘hygiene’ as keywords. A study investigating 20 volunteer dentists and 20 non-clinical volunteers found that skin underneath a wrist watch was more heavily colonised with microorganisms than control sites, in common with the skin underneath rings. While the microorganisms were unlikely to cause infection in a routine dental setting, they were well-recognised nosocomial pathogens. However, there is almost no other evidence to support the recommendation not to wear a wrist watch and compliance is poor.

Sleeves and cuffs

Hand hygiene policies recommend that sleeves should be rolled up before hand hygiene procedures. Most uniform policies also recommend short sleeves, though short sleeves are not usually enforced for HCWs who do not wear uniforms. It would be expected that wet sleeves, in common with any moist surface, could act as a reservoir for microorganisms, which could then be transferred to hands by direct contact. The visible macroscopic contamination of cuffs during the normal wear highlights their potential for transmitting pathogens. But evidence in the medical literature to support short sleeves is lacking.

Fingernails, nail technology and nail polish

The subungal region contains large numbers of bacteria which are largely inaccessible during hand hygiene practices and are therefore difficult to clean compared with the rest of the hands. Most infection control guidelines recommend that fingernails are kept short. This facilitates cleaning but it has also been shown that longer nails have increased numbers of microorganisms. Long nails are also more likely to tear gloves, thereby breaking the barrier.

Artificial nails are increasingly reported as having the potential to transmit infections in the healthcare setting. Artificial nails are more likely to be colonised with Gram-negative bacilli and yeasts than natural nails. In one study, although artificial nails were more likely to be colonised with Gram-negative bacteria and yeasts, the overall numbers of organisms did not differ. There were also more likely to be isolated the longer the nails were worn. There is evidence that washing artificial nails is not as effective as for natural nails. A study comparing hand hygiene using soap or an alcohol gel found that HCWs with artificial nails had more bacteria remaining after cleansing than those with natural nails.

There are several reports linking fingernails with the transmission of nosocomial infection. One study linked an outbreak of postoperative *Serratia marcescens* infection with a nurse, suggesting that artificial fingernails may have facilitated the transfer of *S. marcescens* from home. In another study, an outbreak of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in a neonatal intensive care unit was associated with two nurses with long fingernails, one artificial and one natural. An outbreak of *Candida albicans* infection following laminectomy was epidemiologically linked to an operating room technician wearing artificial fingernails. In this investigation, though *C. albicans* was not isolated from her nails, no new cases occurred following her treatment and her removal from duty. There is now sufficient evidence to recommend that artificial nails constitute an infection risk in high-risk areas and should not be worn in clinical areas, though further investigations are necessary to better define the risks involved.

Other forms of nail art and technology have become popular in many countries and have recently been reviewed in the context of hand hygiene in HCWs. Practices include applying artificial material to the nails for extensions, nail sculp-
turing, protecting nails by covering them with a protective layer of an artificial material and nail jewelry, where decorations such as stones may be applied to the nails or the nails are pierced. While there are many potential health problems, including local infection for individuals who have undergone some form of nail technology, there is also the potential risk that these practices may pose a threat to patients and in other critical areas such as the food industry. Apart from artificial nails, data linking the other forms of nail art and nail technology with hand hygiene and the spread of infection are lacking, but this may change in the future. Given the evidence accumulated so far, it would seem appropriate to restrict artificial nails and nail art from high-risk areas.

Although most hand hygiene policies recommend that nail polish is not worn in clinical areas, there has been little work to investigate the effect of nail polish on the flora of fingernails and none linking nail polish with hospital-acquired infection. A study on the fingernails of operating room nurses found increased bacterial counts associated with chipped nail polish or nail polish that had been worn for more than four days compared with fresh, intact polish. Freshly applied nail polish on natural nails did not result in increased bacterial counts compared with unpolished natural nails.

**Hand art-tattoos**

Temporary tattoos on the hands, made with henna, are very popular in the Middle East, parts of Asia and Africa and it is not unusual for female HCWs in these countries to be found wearing such hand tattoos. The practice is also becoming more widespread in western countries. No hand hygiene issues for any type of tattoos could be found in the literature.

**The importance of hand hygiene outside the healthcare setting**

Although most of the medical literature concerning hand hygiene refers to healthcare settings, the potential of hand hygiene as an achievable and viable option to reduce the global burden of infectious disease has been recognised for years. Diarrhoeal illness is common and is a major cause of death in children worldwide. Contact with human excreta is the main factor in the spread of diarrhoeal illness and washing hands after possible contact with faeces is the major intervention for breaking the chain of transmission of infectious agents. While it is known that compliance with hand hygiene guidelines is poor in a healthcare setting, it is also known from worldwide studies that hands are washed with soap less than 20% of the time. For example, workers in the UK found that in the home environment carers washed their hands on only 42% of occasions when they changed a child’s dirty nappy. Only 34% of male and 56% of female members of the public washed their hands after using a public toilet in a train station in the UK. In other countries, handwashing after cleaning a child following defecation occurred in a minority of cases. However, increasing handwashing frequency worldwide, when only 60% of the world’s population have adequate sanitation, is a major challenge.

The effectiveness of handwashing programs in reducing diarrhoeal cases in developed and developing countries has been reviewed recently. The results suggest that handwashing may reduce the incidence of diarrhoea by 42–47%, which worldwide could reduce the number of deaths by about one million. However, further studies are necessary to identify the best way to achieve this in different geographical and cultural settings. The formation of public–private partnerships is an important development.

**Scientific evidence and the organisational complexity of hand hygiene studies**

One reason cited for the lack of compliance with hand hygiene recommendations is the lack of scientific evidence for many of the issues concerned with hand hygiene practices. There are many basic questions, such as when should hands be washed, how they should be washed, which product should be used and for how long, which have not been resolved.

Hand hygiene practices are the result of a complex interaction of many factors and this makes designing methodologies for hand hygiene studies especially challenging. There are almost no standardised methods for many aspects of hand hygiene and therefore it is very difficult to make comparisons between studies. Most hand hygiene data concerning microorganisms are for bacteria. While these are among the most frequent causes of community and hospital infection, viruses are also extremely important and are far more difficult to investigate.

Studies on hand hygiene have been mainly observational and may be subject to reactive biases because of the presence of an observer. Blinding, randomisation and controlling for confounding variables may not be feasible. For example, studies
comparing handwashing and waterless hand rubs are impossible to test blind since it will always be obvious to the subject which product was being used. There is rarely just one intervention in studies of hand hygiene behaviour. Many studies involve small numbers of subjects and therefore lack statistical power. There has been little or no follow-up in hand hygiene studies and so it may not be known if any beneficial effect of an intervention to improve hand hygiene behaviour has resulted in sustained improvement with compliance.

One of the most challenging aspects of hand hygiene study design is trying to reflect what happens in a real life situation, whether it is in a ward or in the home. Experimental models are an artificial medium. It is difficult to perform investigations in a real life setting without disrupting normal practice or the smooth running of a clinical area. For example, most handwashing guidelines recommend that hands are washed vigorously for 15 seconds. In reality, in a working situation, hands are generally washed for less than 15 seconds. Most evaluations of hand rubs recommend 3 mL for 30 seconds. HCWs do not necessarily use hand rubs in this way. It is very difficult to control how much of a product is used, its contact time with the skin and the rinsing time. All of these introduce variability into hand hygiene studies.

The overall aim of hand hygiene studies is to provide evidence that adherence to hand hygiene practices results in a decrease in infection. There are few studies which have focused on patient outcomes such as surgical wound infection rates. The diagnosis of infection is limited by the recognition of symptoms and is therefore not straightforward and may be variable.

It is therefore a challenge, given all these methodological limitations, to provide convincing evidence for all the recommendations laid down in guidelines for hand hygiene. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, there is more evidence supporting the benefit of hand hygiene in breaking the chain of transmission of infection in both the healthcare setting and in the community than there is for some widely accepted clinical practices.

Compliance with hand hygiene practices — behavioural and cultural factors

It is widely known that compliance with hand hygiene recommendations is poor. Improving compliance is about altering human behaviour and therefore studying compliance with hand hygiene recommendations includes input from a wide range of disciplines, including behavioural and social sciences. Hand hygiene behaviour is a complex interaction of many factors and no one behavioural theory can reliably predict hand hygiene behaviour. Improving compliance with hand hygiene practices requires an understanding of what motivates hand hygiene behaviour and this will vary from culture to culture. The main factors affecting compliance are summarised in Table 1. Some religions recommend when washing with water should be performed. The aim of this ritual cleansing is spiritual and there is no mention of the use of cleansing agents such as soap nor is there any precise association of ritual cleansing with infectious disease.

In the healthcare setting there is a dichotomy between hand hygiene knowledge and hand hygiene behaviour. HCWs are aware of recommendations regarding hand hygiene, but knowledge and education do not in themselves motivate hand hygiene behaviour, hence the low compliance. Self-reported rates and observed rates of compliance with hand hygiene practices also differ. There is evidence that HCWs may be unaware of their poor compliance when the intention to perform hand hygiene is there but other factors result in non-adherence.

Concern for third party opinion seems to be an important factor in determining hand hygiene beha-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Factors influencing compliance with hand hygiene.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convenient and accessible hand hygiene facilities e.g. fast-drying hand rubs, no-touch sinks, hand rubs at patients’ bedsides, hand rubs outside patients’ rooms, hand rubs on the patients’ notes trolley during a ward round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparations which do not cause skin irritation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparations which are aesthetically acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural and social factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceived danger for carer of omitting hand hygiene practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceived benefit for dependent or patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concern for third party opinion e.g. peer pressure, conforming to social ideals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors in a healthcare institution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid overcrowding and understaffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rewards and sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion of a positive culture for hand hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of reminders for hand hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage active participation in the design of hand hygiene programmes at all levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from 18,20,57,100,104,107.
viour. For example, reasons given for performing handwashing following changing a soiled nappy in the UK included giving a good impression as well as aesthetics and the promotion of the well-being of the child. In Botswana and Burkino Faso, for example, conforming to social ideals is also an important motivating factor for handwashing. In the healthcare setting it is essential to have strong commitment from management and superiors to change hand hygiene behaviour.

Another approach to increasing compliance, is patient pressure. The ‘Speak Up’ campaign sponsored by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations in the US encourages patients to observe whether HCWs wash their hands and to remind them to perform hand hygiene where necessary. It will be interesting to see the effect that this programme has on hand hygiene and nosocomial infection rates in participating healthcare institutions.

While peer pressure and conforming to social ideals are important in motivating hand hygiene behaviour, a culture of hand hygiene cannot be created by force or mandate. The acceptance of a new value system is necessary and the introduction of such changes is a major challenge.

The acceptability of hand hygiene preparations to the users is important when considering compliance. Although the provision of adequate hand hygiene facilities and easy access to hand hygiene preparations and equipment, such as the number of sinks, placing alcohol hand rubs at patients’ bedside, would seem obvious in improving compliance, the effects of improving facilities have led to conflicting results on compliance with hand hygiene recommendations. A recent study found that increasing the number of sinks was not effective in increasing the frequency of handwashing when this was the only measure to improve compliance and that a key factor for adherence to hand hygiene practice was the behaviour of other HCWs, particularly superiors.

For many years, the message regarding hand hygiene has been to promote handwashing. Recently, to complicate the issue of compliance further, the message has changed to handrubbing with alcohol-based preparations.

As mentioned, what motivates hand hygiene behaviour is a complex interdependence of many factors including cultural factors. In a UK hospital trust with a sizeable number of Muslim patients and staff, the infection control team has encountered refusal from staff and patients’ families to use alcoholic hand rubs on religious grounds (personal communication, Mr Paul Hateley). Interestingly, in a tertiary referral hospital in the United Arab Emirates where more than 95% of patients are Muslim and Muslim staff form a majority, refusal to use alcohol hand rubs on religious grounds has been encountered only once in the last three years (personal communication, Ms Sue Bacon). It is not yet clear whether this represents a serious issue for the future but it does illustrate the importance of external factors in determining hand hygiene behaviour in a healthcare setting and the need for a broad-based approach involving professionals other than HCWs when trying to understand and improve compliance.

Hand hygiene as part of an integrated approach to reducing infection

It is being recognised in the healthcare setting that adequate hand hygiene as an isolated intervention will not interrupt the spread of infectious disease if other aspects of hygiene are not adequate or if there is overcrowding and understaffing. Effective hand hygiene practices are impossible without clean environmental surfaces and adequate hand hygiene facilities and this is relevant both in the healthcare setting and in the community.

Future

There are many issues concerning all aspects of hand hygiene which remain unresolved. While hand hygiene practices are simple, compliance with hand hygiene is about human behaviour and altering human behaviour is complex and constitutes an enormous challenge. This is reflected in the lack of success so far.

This promotion of hand hygiene cannot be confined to a healthcare setting. There must be the creation of a culture promoting hand hygiene at all levels of society to provide a foundation on which to establish a structure promoting compliance. It is impossible to make global recommendations regarding hand hygiene practices because what works in one culture may not work in another and all recommendations must take geographical and cultural factors into account.

There is not enough evidence to recommend one preparation over another. Standardised protocols and definitions are required both for laboratory investigations of hand hygiene preparations and for the study of hand hygiene behaviour. More well-designed studies are necessary. The establishment of the cost-effectiveness of recommendations is particularly important where resources are limited.
But the promotion of hand hygiene should not go too far and it raises the question: can clean be too clean? Exposure to environmental flora is important in the development of a normal immune system. In the domestic setting the message regarding hand hygiene practices should be focused on interrupting the transfer of microorganisms and the spread of infection rather than just killing microorganisms per se. In the high-risk healthcare setting, then the need to reduce the overall microbial load in the hospital environment becomes important.
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