

1

## 2 **Perceived Challenges of COVID-19 Infection Prevention and Control**

### 3 **Preparedness: A Multinational Survey**

4 Ermira Tartari<sup>1,2,3¶</sup>; Joost Hopman<sup>4¶</sup>; Benedetta Allegranzi<sup>2,5</sup>; Bin Gao<sup>6,7</sup>; Andreas

5 Widmer<sup>8</sup>; Vincent Chi-Chung Cheng<sup>9,10</sup>; Shuk Ching Wong<sup>10</sup>; Kalisvar

6 Marimuthu<sup>11,12,13</sup>; Folasade Ogunisola<sup>14,15</sup>; Andreas Voss<sup>4,16,17\*</sup>; on behalf of the

7 International Society of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy Infection and Prevention

8 Control (ISAC-IPC) Working Group^

9

10 <sup>1</sup> Infection Control Program and WHO Collaborating Centre on Patient Safety,

11 Geneva University Hospitals and University of Geneva Faculty of Medicine, Geneva,

12 Switzerland

13 <sup>2</sup> Institute of Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva,

14 Switzerland

15 <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Malta, Msida, Malta

16 <sup>4</sup> Radboudumc Center for Infectious Diseases, Department of Medical Microbiology,

17 Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

18 <sup>5</sup> Infection Prevention and Control Technical and Clinical Hub, Department of

19 Integrated Health Services, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

20 <sup>6</sup> Infectious Disease Unit, Tianjin 4<sup>th</sup> Centre Hospital, Tianjin, China

21 <sup>7</sup> Graduate School, Tianjin Medical University, Tianjin, China

22 <sup>8</sup> Division of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital

23 Basel, Switzerland

24 <sup>9</sup> Department of Microbiology, Queen Mary Hospital, The University of Hong Kong,  
25 Hong Kong, Special Administrative Region, China

26 <sup>10</sup> Infection Control Team, Queen Mary Hospital, Hong Kong West Cluster, Hospital  
27 Authority, Hong Kong, Special Administrative Region, China

28 <sup>11</sup> Department of Infectious Diseases, Tan Tock Seng Hospital, Singapore, Singapore

29 <sup>12</sup> National Centre for Infectious Diseases, Singapore, Singapore

30 <sup>13</sup> Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore,  
31 Singapore

32 <sup>14</sup> Department of Medical Microbiology and Parasitology, College of Medicine of the  
33 University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria

34 <sup>15</sup> Infection Control Africa Network

35 <sup>16</sup> Department of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, Canisius-  
36 Wilhelmina Hospital (CWZ), Nijmegen, The Netherlands

37 <sup>17</sup> REshape Center for Innovation, Radboudumc, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

38

39 ¶¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

40 ^Membership of the ISAC-IPC Working Group is listed in the Acknowledgments.

41

42 *Word count:* 3603; 3 Tables; 2 Figures

43 *Corresponding author:*

44 Ermira Tartari, MSc

45 Infection Prevention and Control,

46 University Hospitals of Geneva

47 Rue Gabrielle-Perret-Gentil, 4

48 CH-1211 Geneva 14, Switzerland

49 Tel. +356-99873798 ; E-mail ermira.tartari@gmail.com

50

51

52 **Abstract**

53

54 **Objectives:** Implementation of effective infection prevention and control (IPC)

55 measures is needed to support global capacity building to limit transmission of

56 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and mitigate its impact on health systems. We

57 assessed the perceptions of healthcare workers on the current global IPC preparedness

58 measures for COVID-19.

59 **Methods:** A cross-sectional survey using an electronic survey was circulated between

60 February 26, 2020, and March 20, 2020, to IPC professionals during COVID-19

61 pandemic. The survey addressed the presence of COVID-19 guidelines as well as

62 specific IPC preparedness activities in response to the outbreak.

63 **Findings:** In total, 339 IPC professionals spanning 63 countries in all 6 World Health

64 Organization (WHO) regions, mostly from tertiary care centres participated. Of all

65 participants, 66.6% were aware of the existence of national guidelines to prevent

66 COVID-19. A shortage of PPE supplies was reported by 48% (ranging from 64.2% in

67 low-income countries to 27.4% in high-income countries); 41.5% of respondents

68 considered that the media had an impact on guideline development and 63.6%

69 believed that guidelines were based on maximum security rather than on evidence-

70 based analyses. 58.5% and 72.7% of participants believed that healthcare facilities

71 and community settings respectively were not sufficiently prepared.

72 **Conclusion:** Results revealed lack of guidelines and concerns over insufficient PPE

73 supply in both high- and low-income countries. Our findings should alert national

74 health authorities to ramp up the implementation of IPC measures and focus on long-

75 term preparedness and readiness for future pandemics, likely requiring government  
76 funds rather than reliance on healthcare institutions.

77 **Keywords:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; 2019-nCoV; coronavirus disease 2019

78 infection prevention and control; personal protective equipment; PPE; media

79

## 80 **Introduction**

81 The emergence of the unprecedented novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)  
82 outbreak in China[1,2] and its rapid spread worldwide is of major global concern to  
83 public health and national economies.[3] On January 30, 2020, the World Health  
84 Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 as a public health emergency of  
85 international concern under the International Health Regulations (2005)[4] and on  
86 March 11, 2020, COVID-19 was declared a global pandemic.[5] As of 19 April,  
87 2020, over 7 390 702 cases and 417 731 deaths have been reported across the  
88 globe.[3]

89

90 Acknowledgment of the major threat represented by this new virus prompted WHO to  
91 convene a global research roadmap forum on 11/12 February 2020 with leading  
92 health experts to assess the evidence about COVID-19 disease, identify gaps and  
93 prioritize research needed in a number of critical areas, to make rapid progress in the  
94 fight against the virus.[6] Infection prevention and control (IPC) is one of the critical  
95 areas identified as a priority for rapid research action. Since the beginning of the  
96 outbreak, WHO's leadership recommended all countries to rapidly develop national  
97 preparedness capacities for the detection, investigation and management of suspected  
98 or confirmed COVID-19 cases and to implement the WHO infection prevention and  
99 control (IPC) core components in order to respond effectively.[7]

100

101 Previous experience of outbreaks due to the severe acute respiratory syndrome  
102 coronavirus (SARS-CoV), Ebola, and the Middle East respiratory syndrome  
103 coronavirus (MERS-CoV) including the ongoing large-scale outbreak of COVID-19,  
104 has shown a high incidence of transmissibility of health care-associated infections and  
105 outbreaks affecting healthcare workers (HCWs) who are at the forefront of these  
106 crises, illustrating the importance of being prepared.[8–11] Up to 24 February 2020  
107 (day 56), the National Health Commission of the People’s Republic of China reported  
108 that 3387 HCWs were infected with COVID-19, resulting in 22 (0.6%) deaths.[12] In  
109 Italy, according to the estimates of the National Public Health Institute, as of April 15,  
110 out of a total of 155 467 positive cases, 16 650 were HCWs,[13] with the numbers  
111 increasing over time.

112

## 113 **Methods**

### 114 **Objectives**

115 The main objectives of the study were to gain a rapid insight into the preparedness of  
116 healthcare facilities and investigate current global practices and perceptions among  
117 IPC professionals concerning the prevention and control of COVID-19 so as to  
118 identify opportunities for improving practices globally.

119

### 120 **Setting and participants**

121 From February 26 through March 20, 2020, the International Society of Antimicrobial  
122 Chemotherapy (ISAC) Working Group for IPC in partnership with Infection Control  
123 Africa Network (ICAN) launched a cross-sectional, self-administered web-based  
124 survey of IPC specialists working in healthcare facilities to explore IPC measures for

125 COVID-19 preparedness. ISAC Working Group for IPC has affiliated members and  
126 IPC representatives from 57 countries worldwide. The IPC Working Group has been  
127 initiated to support international research projects and for standardization of  
128 guidelines and IPC measures across countries worldwide. To achieve coverage across  
129 low- and middle-income countries, agreement was reached to form a working party  
130 with ICAN. An online link to the electronic questionnaire was distributed through  
131 ISAC and ICAN members and networks and also via social media platforms inviting  
132 IPC experts from each continent and country to participate. The link to the web-based  
133 survey was made accessible on the societies' websites. IPC specialists including  
134 microbiologists, infectious diseases physicians, nurses, antimicrobial pharmacists and  
135 other specialists working in healthcare facilities preparing for the detection,  
136 investigation and management of confirmed and suspected COVID-19 patients were  
137 invited to participate. Participants were enrolled through a non-random, convenience  
138 sampling method. Due to the non-probabilistic sampling nature, it was not possible to  
139 determine the statistical representatives of the sample.

140 The participants enrolled by a web-survey where information about the study's  
141 purpose was provided. Participants were informed that the purpose of the survey was  
142 intended to help inform the current progress of countries with IPC measures and  
143 preparedness plans for preventing COVID-19. There were no exclusion criteria.  
144 Participation in this study was voluntary and anonymous. Participants completed a  
145 web-based questionnaire tool, generated using Survey Monkey platform  
146 (SurveyMonkey®, San Mateo, CA, USA). Pre-testing of the platform was performed  
147 with 20 users from all six regions to evaluate usability and detect technical failures.

148

149 The study was exempted by the Radboud University Medical Center (The  
150 Netherlands) as it did not fall within the remit of the Medical Research Involving  
151 Human Subjects Act (NL2020-6262). The study follows the Strengthening the  
152 Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guideline  
153 (Supplementary file 1).

154

### 155 **Survey design, administration and analysis**

156 The survey instrument was a self-designed questionnaire, compiled by IPC scientists  
157 and experts participating in the WHO COVID-19 global research and innovation  
158 roadmap forum and based on the priorities and thematic areas identified at the  
159 forum.[6] After assessing content validity, the instrument was pilot tested among 10  
160 IPC opinion leaders in six countries, in three WHO regions (Europe, Africa and  
161 South-East Asia) to evaluate its acceptance and reproducibility. The questionnaire  
162 was created in English to gain insight into the preparedness of healthcare facilities.  
163 Two study investigators translated the English version of the instrument to Chinese.  
164 To confirm that the Chinese translation was reliable, the instrument was back  
165 translated to English. The final instrument (Supplementary file 2) was available in  
166 English and Chinese. The questionnaire included 47 items in total covering six  
167 dimensions addressing: 1) geographic location, demographics and healthcare facility  
168 characteristics; 2) the presence of national/regional/local COVID-19 guidelines; 3)  
169 personal protective equipment (PPE) type and supplies in healthcare facilities; 4) the  
170 role of environmental contamination; 5) preparedness for COVID-19 activities; and 6)  
171 the influence of media on preparedness plans. The instrument included dichotomous  
172 (yes/no) closed-ended questions and for one section participants were asked to  
173 provide their degree of agreement with each item (Agree and Disagree). All responses

174 to questions were allocated a numerical score on the survey platform. Submission of  
175 responses via the online platform (SurveyMonkey®, San Mateo, CA, USA) indicated  
176 agreement to participate. It was decided to use all entries that contained information  
177 about COVID-19 IPC measures and activities, even if there were missing responses  
178 for some of the items. Entries with no demographic information were excluded.

179

## 180 **Statistical Analysis**

181 Descriptive statistics were used to analyse the survey data. For descriptive purposes,  
182 medians with IQR, cumulative frequencies or 95% confidence intervals (CI) were  
183 calculated where appropriate. Means and ranges were aggregated at UN regional level  
184 (Africa, the Americas, Eastern Mediterranean, Europe, Southeast Asia, Western  
185 Pacific) and country income group according to the World Bank classification (high-  
186 income, upper-middle-income, lower-middle-income and low-income).[14] A p-value  
187 of less than 0.05 was considered significant. Analyses were performed using R  
188 version 3.5.1 (R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical  
189 computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria; 2017;  
190 <https://www.R-project.org/>).

## 191 **Results**

### 192 **Characteristics of Survey Respondents**

193 A total of 349 responses were received; 10 were excluded as no demographic  
194 information was provided. A sample of 349 participants selected from the two  
195 organizations which include approximately 800 IPC specialists guarantees a  
196 maximum margin of error of 3.94% assuming a 95% confidence level. The 339  
197 eligible responses were coming from 63 countries across the 6 regions: Africa, 113;  
198 Europe, 92; Southeast Asia, 72; the Americas, 33; Eastern Mediterranean, 15;



199 Western Pacific, 14). They represented 113 responses from high-income countries  
200 (HICs), 99 from upper-middle-income countries (UMICs), 71 from lower-middle-  
201 income countries (LMICs) and 56 from low-income countries (LICs). Response rate  
202 by profession included 190 IPC physicians (56.0%); 113 IPC nurses (33.3%) and 36  
203 other professionals, including pharmacists and public health specialists. Healthcare  
204 facilities represented in the survey were mostly tertiary care centres (46%) (Table 1).

205

### 206 **COVID-19 Guidelines**

207 Respondents reported that either national (226/339; 66.6%; 95% CI, 61.6-71.6), local  
208 or regional (182/339; 53.6%; 95% CI, 48.3-59) guidelines on the prevention and  
209 management of COVID-19 were available, but with a significant variation according  
210 to region/income level, e.g. HICs (65.5%; 95% CI, 48.2-82.8) were more likely to  
211 have national guidelines available than LICs (7.6%; 95% CI, 0-22.1) ( $P < .01$ ) (figure  
212 1; Table 2). When guidelines were not available, respondents mainly adopted  
213 international guidelines (72/106; 67.9%). Adopted guidelines were based on those  
214 from WHO (42.4%), the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control  
215 (ECDC) 4.7%, Public Health England (PHE) 4.7%, the US Centers for Disease  
216 Control and Prevention (CDC) (3.7%) and a combination of WHO, ECDC, CDC  
217 and/or PHE (12.2%). The remaining respondents did not know. Almost all  
218 respondents (259/269; 96.2%; 95% CI, 94-98.5) affirmed that guidelines included  
219 hand hygiene as an important measure (Fig.1, Table 2).

220

### 221 **Personal Protective Equipment**

222 More than half (214/339; 63.1%; 95% CI, 57.9-68.2) of respondents reported that  
223 guidelines for healthcare facilities addressed PPE use, with a significant variation by  
224 region/income level. (Fig. 1, Table 2).

225

#### 226 *Facemasks*

227 Participants reported that national or local COVID-19 guidelines recommended  
228 mainly the use of N95/FFP2 respirators (120/267; 44.9%), followed by surgical masks  
229 (77/267; 28.8%) or a combination of the two, respectively (39/267; 14.6%), and  
230 powered air-purifying respirators (PAPR) (21/267; 7.9%). Variations existed within  
231 the 6 regions (Table 3). In Africa and Western Pacific regions, N95/FFP2 respirators  
232 and surgical masks (36/85; 42.3% and 6/14; 42.8%, respectively) were mainly  
233 recommended. In Europe, the Americas and Eastern Mediterranean, N95/FFP2  
234 respirators were recommended according to more than half of respondents (55.8%,  
235 52% and 70%, respectively). The use of PAPR was recommended in Africa (8/85;  
236 9.4%) and Europe (12/68; 17.6%)  $P = .15$ .

237

#### 238 *Gown*

239 Most respondents reported the use of long-sleeve water-repellent or resistant gowns  
240 (170/242; 70%). By contrast, Southeast Asia reported a variety of recommended  
241 gowns to be used, i.e. long-sleeve water-resistant (38.3%), short-sleeved plastic gown  
242 and a combination of both long-sleeve water-resistant and short-sleeved plastic gown  
243 (26.6%) concurrently (Table 3).

244

#### 245 *Head protection*

246 More than half of respondents (56.3%) reported the use of a cap that covers the head  
247 only, while 43.6% used a cap that covers both head and neck (Table 3). There was a  
248 significant regional variation in their recommendations for the use of head protection  
249 ( $P < .01$ ) (Table 3).

250

### 251 *Eye protection*

252 Overall, guidelines recommended the use of eye protection (72.2%; 95% CI, 68-77)  
253 (Table 2). More than half (56%) of respondents reported the use of a disposable face  
254 shield while 28.2% recommended the use of goggles in the guidelines with significant  
255 regional differences ( $P < .01$ ) (Table 3).

256

### 257 *Gloves*

258 The highest recommendation was reported for single-use disposable gloves (79.5%).  
259 By contrast, double gloving was recommended by 17.5%: Africa, 30.1%; Europe,  
260 20.5%; and Western Pacific, 15.3% ( $P < .01$ ) (Table 3).

261

### 262 *Shoe cover*

263 More than half of respondents (58.9%) reported that guidelines recommended the use  
264 of some type of shoe covers. Of note, this was higher in Southeast Asia (70.3%) than  
265 in other regions ( $P < .01$ ) (Table 3).

266

### 267 **Training**

268 Training sessions for HCWs concerning the appropriate and safe use of PPE were  
269 reported to happen by most respondents (235; 86.2%; 95% CI, 82.6-90.7) (Table 2,  
270 Fig. 1) with higher frequencies reported in HICs (74/79; 93.6%; 95% CI, 88.3-99) and

271 UMICs (83/88; 99%; 95% CI, 89.4-99.1) than in LICs (30/48; 62.5%; 95% CI, 62.5-  
272 76.2) ( $P < .01$ ) (figure 2).

273

274

### 275 **COVID-19 and PPE supplies**

276 When asked about the availability of PPE supplies, 163 of 339 (48%; 95% CI, 42.7-  
277 53.4) respondents reported a shortage of supplies (64.2% [36/56; 95% CI, 51.7-76.8]  
278 in LICs compared with 27.4% [31/113; 95% CI, 19.2-35.6] in HICs). Shortages were  
279 reported commonly in Southeast Asia (51/72; 70%; 95% CI, 60.3-81.3) and Africa  
280 (65/113; 57.5%; 95% CI, 48.4-66.6). Shortage of facemasks was reported across all  
281 regions (Africa, 25.6%; the Americas, 21.2%; Eastern Mediterranean, 6.6%; Europe,  
282 20.6% and Southeast Asia, 37.5%), except the Western Pacific (0%). Additional PPE  
283 supplies have been ordered across all regions (Africa, 19.4%; the Americas, 30.3%;  
284 Eastern Mediterranean, 40%; Europe, 33.7%; Southeast Asia 73.6%; and the Western  
285 Pacific 64.2%). However, increasing the PPE stockpile as part of the COVID-19  
286 preparedness plan was only reported in 12% of institutions (41/339), with more in  
287 HICs (19%; 22/113) than LICs (7%; 4/56). Distribution of PPE supplies was  
288 organized by the government (i.e. ministry of health) in 24.1% of institutions  
289 (82/339), while only 19.4% (66/339) of facilities could order as much as necessary.  
290 Of note, 44.2% (150/339) were not aware of the distribution procedure of PPE  
291 supplies at their institution.

292

### 293 **Environmental Decontamination**

294 Most respondents (199/270; 73.7%; 95% CI, 68.4-78.9) included hypochlorite  
295 disinfectant for environmental decontamination. Approximately one-third (100/270;

296 37.4%; 95% CI, 31.2-42.8) used automated room disinfection system technology at  
297 their institutions, such as hydrogen peroxide vapor and ultraviolet light (Table 2).  
298 Among these, 12.5% (6/48; 95% CI, 3.1-21.8) were in LICs compared with 35.9%  
299 (28/78; 95% CI, 25.2-46.5) in HICs (figure 1).

300

### 301 **Community Preparedness**

302 Less than one-third (69/253; 27.2%; 95% CI, 21.7-32.7) believed that community  
303 preparedness was adequate, with the lowest frequencies reported in Southeast Asia  
304 (9/63; 14.2%) and Africa (18/87; 20.6%) ( $P = .003$ ), and a higher preparedness in  
305 HIC (36/71; 50.7%) than in LICs (10/45; 22.2%) ( $P < .01$ ). More than half (144/270;  
306 53.3; 95% CI, 47.3-59.2) of respondents reported that PPE use for COVID-19 was  
307 recommended in the community, mainly in Southeast Asia 77.2% (figure 2).

308

### 309 **Overuse/misuse of supplies**

310 More than half (149/253; 58.8%; 95% CI, 52.3-64.9) of respondents agreed that there  
311 was an overuse/misuse of PPE, with a significant variation according to region ( $P <$   
312  $.05$ ) and income level ( $P < .001$ ). Among these, 74.3% (188/253; 95% CI, 68.9-79.6)  
313 believed that the use and heightened focus on wearing facemasks creates a misplaced  
314 feeling of safety, possibly reducing attention on other IPC measures, such as hand  
315 hygiene. Fifty percent of respondents (95% CI 43.6-55.9) agreed that there was a  
316 possible overuse/misuse of disinfectants in the community (figure 2).

317

### 318 **Media exposure**

319 The belief that opinions expressed by the media influenced the choices made for  
320 national/local guidelines or the preparedness plans for COVID-19 was confirmed by

321 41.5% (105/252; 95% CI, 35.4-47.5) of respondents. More than half (161/253; 63.6%;  
322 95% CI, 57.7-69.5) also believed that national/local guidelines were based  
323 predominantly on maximum security, rather than on evidence-based  
324 recommendations. HICs were more likely than LICs to report sufficient preparedness  
325 (51/71; 71.8%; 95% CI, 61.3-82.2 vs 14/45; 31%; 95% CI, 17.5-44.6;  $P < .01$ ) (Fig.  
326 2).

## 327 **Discussion**

328 The COVID-19 pandemic has raised international concern prompting IPC  
329 professionals to better control transmission and mitigate potential consequences. Our  
330 exploratory survey was initiated less than 4 weeks after WHO's Public Health  
331 Emergency of International Concern declaration on 30 January 2020 to provide  
332 insight into the state of COVID-19 IPC preparedness worldwide. The vast majority of  
333 respondents believed that preparedness guidelines were based on safety-maximized  
334 procedures rather than on evidence-based recommendations; thus, uncertainties  
335 regarding the transmission modes of COVID-19 continue to generate  
336 controversy.[1][15]

337

338 Our results show a wide variation of PPE recommendations, with predominantly the  
339 use of N95/FFP2 respirators only or of surgical masks only or in combination with  
340 respirators in specific situations. At the height of the outbreak, uncertainties about  
341 transmission led many institutions to impose airborne precautions while considerable  
342 variation was observed amongst international guidelines. The main transmission  
343 modes of COVID-19 virus occur via respiratory droplets and contact [2,11,16] and  
344 contact and droplet precautions were effective to control the MERS-CoV outbreak in  
345 a haemodialysis unit in Saudi Arabia[10] and SARS in Hong Kong.[17][18] Aerosol-

346 generating procedures have been associated with the incidence of transmission of  
347 coronaviruses.[19] Mainly guidelines do not recommend the use of shoe covers and  
348 the transmission risk from contaminated footwear is likely low.[20] However, PPE  
349 guidelines for HCWs in China recommend the use of shoe covers.[21] More  
350 uniformity is needed at the international level on PPE recommended for care of  
351 suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients, based on available evidence and the  
352 most effective IPC strategies.

353

354 At the time of the survey, most respondents were engaged in providing training to  
355 HCWs on the appropriate and safe use of PPE, although lower frequency of training  
356 were reported in LMICs. Recent healthcare-associated infections and deaths among  
357 HCWs in China[12] and Italy[13] have emphasized the importance of training in  
358 appropriate PPE use, particularly in performing a fit test of a particulate respirator,  
359 safe PPE doffing and appropriate hand hygiene and use of gloves.[22] SARS infection  
360 transmission among HCWs was associated with an inadequate compliance with PPE,  
361 lack of understanding of IPC procedures and less than 2 h of infection control  
362 training.[8] Although the importance of fit testing has been highlighted, national  
363 standards vary widely and few documents explain the procedure in detail.[23] In some  
364 countries, fit testing is required annually or before use, while in others it is not a  
365 requirement, or fully absent, even though it has been shown that the efficacy of  
366 respirator use improves after fit testing is performed [24].

367

368 Hands-on training sessions on the use and compliance with PPE precautions and hand  
369 hygiene compliance monitoring have been recommended as key measures.[22] HCWs  
370 not trained in safe PPE doffing run the risk of accidental self-contamination, as

371 reported during the Ebola outbreak.[9] Innovative approaches to training are  
372 important to mitigate the risk of viral self-contamination, suggesting that a rigorous  
373 process must be designed, combined with standardized training.[25,26] The PPE  
374 doffing process is critical to keep HCWs safe and further research on the science of  
375 human factors and HCW behavior with respiratory protection safety is needed.  
376  
377 Shortage of PPE has become a global concern; 48% of respondents reported a  
378 shortage of PPE across all regions, notably facemasks, with higher frequencies in  
379 LMICs. Importantly, this shortage jeopardizes outbreak response strategies by  
380 impeding appropriate and safe action to combat COVID-19 spread. An increasing  
381 need for PPE supplies worldwide remains unmet and places HCWs and patient safety  
382 under threat. Protection of HCWs should be prioritized and healthcare facilities must  
383 have the necessary equipment. Political leaders and health authorities need to urgently  
384 seek solutions and develop contingency plans to reserve and allocate resources where  
385 these are needed the most. Increasing the PPE stockpile as part of the COVID-19  
386 preparedness plan was only reported in 12% of facilities. While HICs have  
387 established IPC programmes and yet are faced with deficient supplies, LICs may not  
388 have the resources necessary to fight the current pandemic. WHO is undertaking  
389 major efforts to coordinate the Emergency Global Supply Chain System facilitating  
390 the purchase and shipment of PPE and medical supplies across the globe; as of 7  
391 April, millions of pieces of PPE were shipped to 133 countries.[27]  
392 Local production of alcohol-based hand rub using the WHO-recommended  
393 formulation[28] has been reported in many countries in an attempt to replace the  
394 current shortage. Some facilities are also considering reprocessing and reuse of



395 single-use PPE.[29] WHO has provided guidance of rational use of PPE including  
396 considerations pertaining to reprocessing and reuse in case of severe shortage.[30]

397

398 The survival of coronaviruses on environmental surfaces and the impact of  
399 environmental contamination on healthcare-associated outbreaks as a mechanism of  
400 transmission argue for enhanced environmental hygiene.[20,31,32] A chlorine-based  
401 surface disinfectant was used by most participating facilities, but there appears to be  
402 an infrequent use of automated room disinfection system technology. Automated  
403 disinfection system technology may be more accurate as it diminishes reliance on the  
404 operator.[33] Decontamination of high-touch surfaces as a potential source of  
405 transmission needs to be considered.

#### 406 **Limitations**

407 In the context of global health with increased attention to the COVID-19 epidemic  
408 evolving and a situation that is rapidly changing, our specific intent was to provide a  
409 snapshot of the state of affairs of IPC implemented measures less than four weeks  
410 after WHO's declaration of a public health emergency of international concern and  
411 while it had been declared a global pandemic. Since then, IPC preparedness measures  
412 in healthcare facilities across countries have intensified and therefore it will be  
413 interesting to assess with a follow-up survey.

414 Our study has limitations. First, this is a voluntary survey consisting of self-selected  
415 participants whose perceptions and opinions might not be entirely representative for  
416 healthcare facilities of a country and there was no validation method of the  
417 participants' data entry. Second, most responses were from tertiary-care healthcare  
418 facilities, which might suggest an overrepresentation of these settings. However,  
419 tertiary-care hospitals have a central role in preparedness activities for emerging

420 infectious diseases and our results provide important information on their state of  
421 preparedness. Third, some of the questions in our survey remained unanswered ('I  
422 don't know') by a proportion of participants as depicted in Table 2 and 3, likely due to  
423 some topics not having relevance to the local context of study participants. Fourth,  
424 due to time and resource constraints the survey was made available only in English  
425 and Chinese. Finally, the questions of the survey were not formally validated, since  
426 the survey items were based mainly on the WHO COVID-19 global research roadmap  
427 priorities that had been identified. Regardless of these limitations, the study provides  
428 some important insight on necessary IPC measures that need to be considered to  
429 scale-up preparedness to combat COVID-19.

## 430 **Conclusion**

431 Our findings, including identified concerns, may help to provide direction to improve  
432 preparedness in countries and prioritization of critical actions. The COVID-19 global  
433 pandemic has shown the importance of building more resilient healthcare systems  
434 with effective IPC as key to avoid or mitigate outbreaks impact. Results revealed lack  
435 of guidelines and, when available, large variations exist in recommendations. Health  
436 organizations should jointly evaluate the available evidence and develop a uniform  
437 policy on the appropriate PPE to be used. Strengthening of coordinated international  
438 efforts is urgent to address the challenges related to the major PPE shortage in  
439 healthcare facilities, particularly the lack of resources in low-income settings, and to  
440 improve reliable communication through the media.

441

## 442 **Acknowledgments**

443 We are greatly indebted to all colleagues and members of the International Society of  
444 Antimicrobial Chemotherapy on Infection Prevention and Control (ISAC-IPC)  
445 Working Group and Infection Control Africa Network (ICAN) who participated in  
446 this survey and for contributions to the questionnaire.

447

#### 448 **Contributors**

449 ET, JH, BA and AV were involved in study design and implementation. ET and JH  
450 contributed equally to the work. ET, JH, BG, KM, VCCC, SCW, AW, FO, AV  
451 undertook data collection. ET and JH did data analysis and made the figures and  
452 tables. ET, JH, BA, BG, AW, VCCC, SCW, KM, FO and AV were involved in data  
453 interpretation and study coordination and contributed to writing and reviewing the  
454 manuscript. All authors approved the final version for publication.

455 **Funding** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the  
456 public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

457 **Competing interests** None declared.

#### 458 **Disclaimer**

459 The opinions expressed in this Article are those of the authors and do not reflect the  
460 official position of WHO. WHO takes no responsibility for the information provided  
461 or the views expressed in this article.

462 **Ethical approval** This study was exempted by the Radboud University Medical  
463 Center (The Netherlands) as it did not fall within the remit of the Medical Research  
464 Involving Human Subjects Act (NL2020-6262).

465

## 466 **References**

- 467 [1] Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A novel coronavirus  
468 from patients with pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:727–33.  
469 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017>.
- 470 [2] Chan JFW, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KKW, Chu H, Yang J, et al. A familial  
471 cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating  
472 person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *Lancet*  
473 2020;395:514–23. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30154-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30154-9).
- 474 [3] World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Situation  
475 report 90. Geneva, Switzerland: 2020.
- 476 [4] World Health Organization. Statement on the second meeting of the  
477 International Health Regulations (2005) Emergency Committee regarding the  
478 outbreak of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). Geneva: n.d.
- 479 [5] WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19  
480 - 11 March 2020 n.d. [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)  
481 [general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)  
482 [2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020) (accessed April 16, 2020).
- 483 [6] GLOPID-R and World Health Organization. COVID 19 Public Health  
484 Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) Global research and innovation  
485 forum: towards a research roadmap. Geneva, 11-12 February: n.d.
- 486 [7] Storr J, Twyman A, Zingg W, Damani N, Kilpatrick C, Reilly J, et al. Core  
487 components for effective infection prevention and control programmes: New  
488 WHO evidence-based recommendations. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*  
489 2017;6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-016-0149-9>.
- 490 [8] Lau JTF, Fung KS, Wong TW, Kim JH, Wong E, Chung S, et al. SARS  
491 Transmission among Hospital Workers in Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis*  
492 2004;10:280–6. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1002.030534>.
- 493 [9] World Health Organization. Ebola Response Roadmap Situation Report 1  
494 Summary. n.d.
- 495 [10] Assiri A, McGeer A, Perl TM, Price CS, Al Rabeeah AA, Cummings DAT, et  
496 al. Hospital outbreak of middle east respiratory syndrome coronavirus. *N Engl*  
497 *J Med* 2013;369:407–16. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1306742>.
- 498 [11] Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical Characteristics of

- 499 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia  
500 in Wuhan, China. *Jama* 2020:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.1585>.
- 501 [12] Wang J, Zhou M, Liu F. Reasons for healthcare workers becoming infected  
502 with novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *J Hosp Infect*  
503 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.03.002>.
- 504 [13] Istituto Superiore di Sanità [Higher Institute of Health]. Sorveglianza integrata  
505 COVID-19 in Italia. n.d.
- 506 [14] World Bank list of economies. Washington, DC TWB. World Bank list of  
507 economies. 2019.
- 508 [15] Han Q, Lin Q, Ni Z, You L. Uncertainties about the transmission routes of  
509 2019 novel coronavirus. *Influenza Other Respi Viruses* 2020:irv.12735.  
510 <https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12735>.
- 511 [16] Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of  
512 patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*  
513 2020;395:497–506. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30183-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5).
- 514 [17] Seto W, Tsang D, Yung R, Ching T, Ng T, Ho M, et al. Effectiveness of  
515 precautions against droplets and contact in prevention of nosocomial  
516 transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). *Lancet*  
517 2003;361:1519–20. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(03\)13168-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(03)13168-6).
- 518 [18] Jefferson T, Del Mar CB, Dooley L, Ferroni E, Al-Ansary LA, Bawazeer GA,  
519 et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory  
520 viruses. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011.  
521 <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006207.pub4>.
- 522 [19] Tran K, Cimon K, Severn M, Pessoa-Silva CL, Conly J. Aerosol generating  
523 procedures and risk of transmission of acute respiratory infections to healthcare  
524 workers: A systematic review. *PLoS One* 2012;7.  
525 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0035797>.
- 526 [20] Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, et al. Air, Surface  
527 Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe  
528 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From a  
529 Symptomatic Patient. *Jama* 2020:3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3227>.
- 530 [21] National Health Commission of the People’s Republic of China. Technical  
531 guidelines for the prevention and control of new coronavirus infections in  
532 medical institutions (first edition). n.d.

- 533 [22] Cheng VCC, Wong S-C, Chen JHK, Yip CCY, Chuang VWM, Tsang OTY, et  
534 al. Escalating infection control response to the rapidly evolving epidemiology  
535 of the Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) due to SARS-CoV-2 in Hong  
536 Kong. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2020;2019:1–24.  
537 <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2020.58>.
- 538 [23] World Health Organization. How to perform a particulate respirator seal check  
539 n.d. <https://www.who.int/csr/resources/publications/respiratorsealcheck/en/>  
540 (accessed April 8, 2020).
- 541 [24] Chughtai AA, Seale H, Macintyre CR. Availability, consistency and evidence-  
542 base of policies and guidelines on the use of mask and respirator to protect  
543 hospital health care workers: A global analysis. *BMC Res Notes* 2013;6:1.  
544 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0500-6-216>.
- 545 [25] Casanova L, Alfano-Sobsey E, Rutala WA, Weber DJ, Sobsey M. Virus  
546 transfer from personal protective equipment to healthcare employees' skin and  
547 clothing. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2008;14:1291–3.  
548 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1408.080085>.
- 549 [26] Mumma JM, Durso FT, Casanova LM, Erukunuakpor K, Kraft CS, Ray SM, et  
550 al. Common Behaviors and Faults When Doffing Personal Protective  
551 Equipment for Patients with Serious Communicable Diseases. *Clin Infect Dis*  
552 2019;69:S214–20. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciz614>.
- 553 [27] World Health Organization. Strategic preparedness and response plan. Geneva,  
554 Switzerland: 2020.
- 555 [28] World Health Organization. Guide to local production: WHO-recommended  
556 handrub formulations. n.d.
- 557 [29] Cheng VCC, Wong SC, Kwan GSW, Hui WT YK. Disinfection of N95  
558 respirators by ionized hydrogen peroxide in pandemic coronavirus disease  
559 2019 (COVID-19) due to SARS-CoV-2. *J Hosp Infect* 2020.  
560 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.04.003>.
- 561 [30] World Health Organization. Rational use of personal protective equipment for  
562 coronavirus disease (COVID-19). Interim guidance. 27 February 2020. vol.  
563 2019. Geneva, Switzerland: 2020.
- 564 [31] Santarpia JL, Rivera DN, Herrera V, Morwitzer MJ, Creager H, Santarpia GW,  
565 et al. Transmission Potential of SARS-CoV-2 in Viral Shedding Observed at  
566 the University of Nebraska Medical Center. *MedRxiv*

- 567           2020:2020.03.23.20039446. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.20039446>.
- 568   [32]   Chia PY, Coleman KK, Tan YK, Ong SWX, Gum M, Lau SK, et al. Detection  
569           of Air and Surface Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
570           Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Hospital Rooms of Infected Patients.  
571           MedRxiv 2020:2020.03.29.20046557.  
572           <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.29.20046557>.
- 573   [33]   Otter JA, Yezli S, Perl TM, Barbut F, French GL. The role of “no-touch”  
574           automated room disinfection systems in infection prevention and control. *J*  
575           *Hosp Infect* 2013;83:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2012.10.002>.
- 576
- 577

578 **Figure legends**

579

580

581

582

583 **Figure 1:** Presence of COVID-19 Guidelines and the Most Critical Infection

584 Prevention and Control Measures Recommended as Identified Among Survey

585 Respondents, Stratified by Country Income Level.

586 HIC, high-income country; UMIC, upper-middle income country; LMIC, lower-

587 middle income country; LIC, low-income country; PPE, personal protective

588 equipment.

589

590 **Figure 2:** Perceived Opinion of the Level of Preparedness of Institutions for COVID-

591 19 Among Survey Respondents, Stratified by Country Income Level.

592 HIC, high-income country; UMIC, upper-middle income country; LMIC, lower-

593 middle income country; LIC, low-income country; PPE, personal protective

594 equipment; IPC, infection prevention and control.

595

596



597 **Supplementary File**  
 598 **1. STROBE checklist.**  
 599 **2. Survey Instrument.**  
 600

**Table 1 Characteristics of Survey Respondents**

Characteristic	No. of Respondents (%)						
<b>Geographical region</b>							
Africa	113 (33·33)						
Europe	92 (27·14)						
Southeast Asia	72 (21·24)						
Americas	33 (9·73)						
Eastern Mediterranean	15 (4·42)						
Western Pacific	14 (4·13)						
<b>Income level</b>							
High income	113 (33·33)						
Upper middle income	99 (29·20)						
Lower middle income	71 (20·94)						
Low income	56 (16·52)						
<b>Profession</b>							
Physician	154 (45·43)						
Nurse	95 (28·02)						
Infection control practitioner	28 (8·26)						
Microbiologist	26 (7·67)						
Pharmacist	14 (4·13)						
Other	11 (3·24)						
Public health specialists	11 (3·24)						
<b>Healthcare Facility</b>							
Primary-level health care facility	73 (21·53)						
Secondary-level health care facility	63 (18·58)						
Tertiary-level health care facility	156 (46·02)						
Other (please specify)	47 (13·86)						
<b>Hospital size</b>							
	min	first quartile	mean	median	third quartile	max	
< 200	0	18	284·21	50	150	2500	
200 - 800	21	200	483·51	300	462·5	3005	
300 - 1500	0	460	865·31	800	1000	4400	
Other	0	0	288·91	0	89	3000	

601  
 602  
 603  
 604  
 605  
 606  
 607

608  
609  
610  
611  
612

**Table 2. Geographical comparison of healthcare facilities and IPC preparedness for patients with COVID-19, results from survey of representatives from 339 healthcare facilities in 63 countries worldwide, February-March**

	No (%) of Respondents	Comparison between regions						P-value
		Africa	Americas	East Mediterranean	Europe	South-East Asia	Western Pacific	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
<b>COVID-19 Guidelines</b>								
National guidelines	226 (66.67)	53 (46.9)	22 (66.67)	13 (86.67)	65 (70.65)	60 (83.33)	13 (92.86)	<0.001
Local guidelines	182 (53.69)	40 (35.4)	21 (63.64)	8 (53.33)	42 (45.65)	62 (86.11)	9 (64.29)	<0.001
Guidelines recommend use of PPE								
Guidelines address PPE	214 (63.13)	60 (53.1)	20 (60.61)	9 (60)	51 (55.43)	63 (87.5)	11 (78.57)	<0.001
Facemask	272 (80.24)	87 (76.99)	25 (75.76)	11 (73.33)	70 (76.09)	65 (90.28)	14 (100)	0.06
Gown	251 (74.04)	81 (71.68)	22 (66.67)	9 (60)	65 (70.65)	60 (83.33)	14 (100)	0.04
Cap	182 (64.31)	66 (68.75)	8 (29.63)	5 (50)	42 (60)	57 (86.36)	4 (28.57)	<0.001
Eye protection	245 (72.27)	75 (66.37)	22 (66.67)	10 (66.67)	65 (70.65)	60 (83.33)	13 (92.86)	0.07
Gloves	266 (97.08)	90 (96.77)	26 (96.3)	10 (100)	65 (95.59)	62 (98.41)	13 (100)	0.004
Preparedness effort								
Hand hygiene	259 (96.28)	86 (93.48)	24 (92.31)	10 (100)	63 (98.44)	65 (98.48)	11 (100)	0.34
Training HCWs	235 (86.72)	67 (72.83)	24 (85.71)	10 (100)	59 (92.19)	64 (96.97)	11 (100)	<0.001
PPE in community	144 (53.33)	51 (55.43)	8 (29.63)	1 (10)	27 (42.19)	51 (77.27)	6 (54.55)	<0.001
PPE in outpatient setting	243 (91.35)	80 (86.96)	21 (84)	10 (100)	56 (90.32)	65 (98.48)	11 (100)	0.07
Environmental decontamination								
Use of Hypochlorite	199 (73.7)	74 (80.43)	13 (48.15)	5 (50)	40 (62.5)	61 (92.42)	6 (54.55)	<0.001
Automated disinfection system	100 (37.04)	12 (13.04)	6 (22.22)	4 (40)	25 (39.06)	52 (78.79)	1 (9.09)	<0.001

2020 613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631

632  
633

**Table 3 Protective Equipment (PPE) included in national or local COVID-19 guidelines**

	No. (%) of Respondents	Comparison between regions						P-value
		Africa	Americas	East Mediterranean	Europe	South-East Asia	Western Pacific	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
<b>Face mask</b>	N = 267							
FFP1	6 (2.25)	2 (2.35)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (4.41)	1 (1.54)	0 (0)	0.16
N95/FFP2	120 (44.94)	36 (42.35)	13 (52)	7 (70)	38 (55.88)	20 (30.77)	6 (42.86)	< 0.001
Respirators	21 (7.87)	8 (9.41)	1 (4)	0 (0)	12 (17.65)	0 (0)	0 (0)	< 0.001
Surgical mask & N95/FFP2	39 (14.61)	1 (1.18)	1 (4)	0 (0)	2 (2.94)	33 (50.77)	2 (14.29)	< 0.001
Surgical mask	77 (28.84)	36 (42.35)	10 (40)	3 (30)	11 (16.18)	11 (16.92)	6 (42.86)	< 0.001
Other	4 (1.5)	2 (2.35)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2.94)	0 (0)	0 (0)	< 0.001
<b>Gown type:</b>	N = 242							
Short-sleeved plastic	27 (11.16)	4 (5.41)	2 (9.09)	0 (0)	1 (1.59)	20 (33.33)	0 (0)	< 0.001
Long sleeve water repellent	170 (70.25)	52 (70.27)	20 (90.91)	8 (88.89)	55 (87.3)	23 (38.33)	12 (85.71)	< 0.001
Coverall	29 (11.98)	18 (24.32)	0 (0)	1 (11.11)	7 (11.11)	1 (1.67)	2 (14.29)	< 0.001
Long-sleeved-water resistant & Short-sleeved plastic	16 (6.61)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16 (26.67)	0 (0)	< 0.001
<b>Cap type:</b>	N = 181							
Cap covering head and neck	79 (43.65)	44 (67.69)	4 (50)	2 (40)	19 (45.24)	6 (10.53)	4 (100)	< 0.001
Cap covering the head only	102 (56.35)	21 (32.31)	4 (50)	3 (60)	23 (54.76)	51 (89.47)	0 (0)	< 0.001
<b>Eye protection:</b>	N = 241							
"Ski"-goggles	68 (28.22)	17 (23.29)	5 (22.73)	1 (10)	15 (23.44)	29 (48.33)	1 (8.33)	< 0.001
Face shield	135 (56.02)	47 (64.38)	8 (36.36)	8 (80)	37 (57.81)	28 (46.67)	7 (58.33)	< 0.001
Other	38 (15.77)	9 (12.33)	9 (40.91)	1 (10)	12 (18.75)	3 (5)	4 (33.33)	< 0.001
<b>Gloves:</b>	N = 274							
No gloves	8 (2.92)	3 (3.23)	1 (3.7)	0 (0)	3 (4.41)	1 (1.59)	0 (0)	0.22
Double gloving	48 (17.52)	28 (30.11)	1 (3.7)	1 (10)	14 (20.59)	2 (3.17)	2 (15.38)	< 0.001
Single pair disposable	218 (79.56)	62 (66.67)	25 (92.59)	9 (90)	51 (75)	60 (95.24)	11 (84.62)	< 0.001
<b>Shoe cover:</b>	N = 275							
Shoe and lower leg cover	50 (18.18)	30 (32.26)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (16.18)	5 (7.81)	4 (30.77)	< 0.001
Shoe cover	99 (36)	30 (32.26)	6 (22.22)	2 (20)	16 (23.53)	45 (70.31)	0 (0)	< 0.001
No shoe cover	126 (45.82)	33 (35.49)	21 (77.77)	8 (80)	41 (60.29)	14 (21.87)	9 (69.23)	< 0.001

PPE: Personal protective equipment; PAPR: powered air-purifying respirators.

634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646

647  
648  
649



