Evidence summary tables: NIPCM literature identified January to March 2019

Titles and abstracts are reviewed for subject relevance. Additional exclusion criteria are also applied as per the NIPCM methodology.

Literature review	Papers identified	Summary of scientific findings	Impact on recommendations
Hand Hygiene:	Comparative Antimicrobial Efficacy of Two	This randomised double-blind trail compared the	None.
Hand Hygiene	Hand Sanitizers in Intensive Care Units	efficacy of two alcohol-based hand rubs (ABHR);	
Products	Common Areas: A Randomized, Controlled	one containing 70% ethanol, and one containing	
	Trial. Deshpande A, Fox J, Wong KK,	61% ethanol plus 1% chlorhexidine gluconate,	
	Cadnum JL, Sankar T, Jencson A,	when used in an intensive care unit (ICU). The	
	Schramm S, Fraser TG, Donskey CJ and	recovery of aerobic colony forming units (CFUs)	
	Gordon S. Infection Control & Hospital	was significantly lower with the chlorhexidine ABHR	
	Epidemiology 39(3): 267-271, 2018.	both immediately after use (p=0.035) and after	
		spending time in ICU common areas (p<0.0001).	
		Further research involving patient rooms and	
		assessing rate of healthcare-associated infections	
		is required.	
	Bactericidal and Virucidal Activity of	This study compared efficacy of povidone-iodine	None.
	Povidone-Iodine and Chlorhexidine	(PVP-I) and chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG)	
	Gluconate Cleansers in an In Vivo Hand	cleansers. Test series were performed for	Adds to evidence base.
	Hygiene Clinical Simulation Study. Eggers	bactericidal and virucidal testing of CHG and PVP-I.	
	M, Koburger-Janssen T, Ward LS, Newby C	After pre-washing, hands were artificially	
	and Muller S. Infectious Diseases &	contaminated with either Escherichia coli or murine	
	Therapy 7(2): 235-247, 2018.	norovirus (MNV). Volunteers used 3 and 5 ml of	
		each product for contact times of 15, 30 and 60	
		seconds. Number of organisms released from	
		fingertips into sampling fluids was assessed before	
		and after hand washing and mean log ₁₀ reduction	
		factors (RFs) were calculated. Both PVP-I 7.5% and	
		CHG 4% cleansers passed EN1499 requirements	
		against <i>E. coli</i> and had significantly greater (p≤0.01)	
		mean log ₁₀ RFs when compared with the reference	
		soft soap across all tests. Mean log ₁₀ RFs of MNV	
		were significantly greater for PVP-I when compared	
		with the reference soap. However CHG gave lower	
		mean log ₁₀ RFs than the reference soap across all	
		tests.	

Standard Infection Control Precautions:

Hand Hygiene: Surgical Hand Antisepsis in the Clinical Setting	Comparison of efficacy of chlorhexidine alcohol scrub and povidone iodine scrub in hand cleansing in elective clean surgery. Takalkar YP, Garale MN, Somasundaram S, Venkataramani K, Gothwal KN and Pandrowala SA. <i>International Surgery</i> <i>Journal</i> 3(4): 1937-1941, 2016.	This double blind prospective interventional study assessed the surgical site infection (SSI) rate in patients aged 12 years and over undergoing elective clean surgeries (n=399). Surgeons were randomly assigned to use either povidone-iodine 7.5% surgical scrub or chlorhexidine gluconate 2.5% (70% alcohol) before surgery. Patients who developed SSIs were expressed as a percentage of the total. Both groups were comparable for most variables. It was observed that normal-weight and overweight patients in the chlorhexidine group had more infection while moderately obese patients in the povidone-iodine group had more infection. Povidone-iodine 7.5% and chlorhexidine gluconate 2.5% were found to be equally effective surgical scrubs in this setting.	None.
	Operating Room Hand Preparation: To Scrub or to Rub? Fry DE. <i>Surgical</i> <i>Infections</i> 20(2): 129-134, 2019.	This review of published literature was undertaken to determine the best method of hand preparation before surgical procedures with focus on conventional surgical scrubbing compared with alcohol rubbing. Bacteriological studies of the hands following conventional scrubbing versus alcohol rubbing showed consistently comparable or superior bacterial reduction following alcohol rubbing. Four clinical studies that compared scrubbing versus rubbing in terms of frequency of surgical site infections found no difference between hand antisepsis methods. The authors conclude that alcohol rub for surgical hand antisepsis has comparable results to the conventional surgical scrub.	None.
Hand Hygiene: Skin Care	Self-report occupational-related contact dermatitis: prevalence and risk factors among healthcare workers in Gondar town, Northwest Ethiopia, 2018-a cross-sectional study. Mekonnen TH, Yenealem DG and Tolosa BM. <i>Environmental Health &</i> <i>Preventive Medicine</i> 24(1): 11, 2019.	A total of 422 participants completed the standardised Nordic Occupational Skin Questionnaire through interview. A binary logistic regression analysis was conducted. Overall prevalence of self-reported occupational contact dermatitis within the previous 12 months was 31.5% (133 individuals). Most common symptoms were redness (29.5%) and burning (17.3%). Hands were	None. Adds to evidence base.

		the most affected body site (22%). Frequency of	
		hand washing, pairs of hand gloves used per day,	
		personal history of allergy and lack of health and	
		safety training were all factors associated with	
		contact dermatitis.	
Personal	Wearing long sleeves while prepping a	This study investigated the effects on airborne	None.
Protective	patient in the operating room decreases	contamination when wearing long sleeves in the	
Equipment (PPE):	airborne contaminants. Markel TA. Gormley	operating room. A mock patient skin prep was	
Aprons/Gowns	T. Greelev D. Ostoiic J and Wagner J.	performed in 3 different operating rooms. A long-	
•	American Journal of Infection Control 46(4):	sleeved gown and gloves, or bare arms were used	
	369-374, 2018.	to perform the procedure. Particle counts were used	
		to assess airborne particulate contamination, and	
		active and passive microbial assessment was	
		achieved through air samplers and settle plate	
		analysis. There was a decrease in 5.0um particle	
		size with the use of sleeves in one operating room:	
		in the remaining 2 operating rooms there was a	
		decrease in the total microbes only with the use of	
		sleeves. There was no difference in the average	
		number of total microbes for all operating rooms	
		assessed. Further research is required.	
Routine Cleaning	Evaluation of Bacterial Contamination on	This quasi-experimental study with a before-and-	None.
of the Care	Prehospital Ambulances Before and After	after design assessed the effectiveness of a	
Environment	Disinfection, Farhadloo R. Goodarzi Far J.	disinfectant on the rate of microbial contamination	
	Azadeh MR. Shams S and Parvaresh-	of ambulances in Iran. The disinfectant (Sava sept-	
	Masoud M. Prehospital & Disaster Medicine	HP-2%) contained guaternary ammonium	
	33(6): 602-606, 2018.	compounds and polyhexamethylene biguanide.	
		Contamination rates before and after use of	
		disinfection solutions were 52% and 8%,	
		respectively. Coagulase-negative staphylococci	
		were the most commonly isolated bacterial agent	
		from the ambulance equipment. In all equipment,	
		there was a significant reduction in the	
		contamination level after applying disinfectant.	
Routine Cleaning	Back to Basics: Environmental Cleaning	Education document from AORN outlining basic	None.
of the Care	Spruce L and Wood A. ORNAC Journal.	principles for environmental cleaning in the	
Environment	34(4): 58-63, 2016.	perioperative setting. This document highlights that	Adds to evidence base.
		the environment plays a role in healthcare	
		associated infections (HAIs) including surgical site	
		infections. AORN advise frequent cleaning of high-	

		touch surface areas to prevent the spread of infections and routine cleaning and disinfecting of the patient's environment to reduce level and frequency of contamination and the risk of HAIs. They suggest using a bundled approach to perform a standardised cleaning routine and implementing a successful monitoring programme. Further recommendations are included within the document.	
	Degree of Bacterial Contamination of Mobile Phone and Computer Keyboard Surfaces and Efficacy of Disinfection with Chlorhexidine Digluconate and Triclosan to Its Reduction. Koscova J, Hurnikova Z and Pistl J. International Journal of Environmental Research & Public Health 15(10), 2018.	This study evaluates the use of disinfection wet wipes for reduction of microbial contamination of mobile phones and computer keyboards. Bacteriological swabs were taken before and after disinfection with wipes containing both active ingredients chlorhexidine digluconate and triclosan. The incidence and type of microorganisms isolated before and after disinfection was evaluated and the difference expressed as a percentage of contamination reduction. Results indicated a high degree of surface contamination with pathogens, some of which are opportunistic for humans. Before disinfection, common skin commensal bacteria like coagulase-negative staphylococci were identified most frequently from surfaces, mobile phones and keyboards. On keyboards <i>Enterobacteriacae</i> were abundant. Swabs 5 minutes after disinfection showed that simple wiping with antibacterial wet wipe led to a significant reduction of microbial contamination of surfaces with effect ranging from 36.8 to 100%.	None.
Management of Patient Care Equipment	Mycobacterium chimaera in heater-cooler units used during cardiac surgery - growth and decontamination. Bengtsson D, Westerberg M, Nielsen S, Ridell M and Jonsson B. <i>Infectious Diseases</i> 50(10): 736-742, 2018.	This study tested the occurrence of Mycobacterium <i>chimaera</i> in heater-cooler units (HCUs) directly (15 minutes) after disinfection with a silver-ion cleaning routine and later on 3 occasions (3, 6, 10 weeks). The silver-ion cleaning routine was insufficient and <i>M. chimaera</i> was found in all HCUs. Tap water samples were negative for mycobacteria suggesting residual water and biofilm in the HCUs may be of importance.	None.

Transmission Based Precautions:

Literature review	Papers identified	Summary of scientific findings	Impact on recommendations
	None identified.		