

1

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

3 **Preparedness: A Multinational Survey**

4 Ermira Tartari^{1,2,3¶}; Joost Hopman^{4¶}; Benedetta Allegranzi^{2,5}; Bin Gao^{6,7}; Andreas

5 Widmer⁸; Vincent Chi-Chung Cheng^{9,10}; Shuk Ching Wong¹⁰; Kalisvar

6 Marimuthu^{11,12,13}; Folasade Ogunisola^{14,15}; Andreas Voss^{4,16,17*}; on behalf of the

7 International Society of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy Infection and Prevention

8 Control (ISAC-IPC) Working Group^

9

10 ¹ 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 ² Institute of Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva,

14 Switzerland

15 ³ Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Malta, Msida, Malta

16 ⁴ Radboudumc Center for Infectious Diseases, Department of Medical Microbiology,

17 Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

18 ⁵ Infection Prevention and Control Technical and Clinical Hub, Department of

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

20 ⁶ Infectious Disease Unit, Tianjin 4th Centre Hospital, Tianjin, China

21 ⁷ Graduate School, Tianjin Medical University, Tianjin, China

22 ⁸ Division of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital

23 Basel, Switzerland

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

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

28 ¹¹ Department of Infectious Diseases, Tan Tock Seng Hospital, Singapore, Singapore

29 ¹² National Centre for Infectious Diseases, Singapore, Singapore

30 ¹³ Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore,
31 Singapore

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

34 ¹⁵ Infection Control Africa Network

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

37 ¹⁷ 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 (%)						
Geographical region							
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)						
Income level							
High income	113 (33·33)						
Upper middle income	99 (29·20)						
Lower middle income	71 (20·94)						
Low income	56 (16·52)						
Profession							
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)						
Healthcare Facility							
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)						
Hospital size							
	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 (%)	
COVID-19 Guidelines								
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 (%)	
Face mask	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
Gown type:	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
Cap type:	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
Eye protection:	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
Gloves:	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
Shoe cover:	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



