

1 **Personal protective equipment for reducing the risk of COVID-19 infection among healthcare workers**
2 **involved in emergency trauma surgery during the pandemic: an umbrella review.**

3 **Dylan P Griswold^{1,2} Andres Gempeler³ Angelos Koliass^{1,2} Peter J. Hutchinson^{1,2} Andres Rubiano⁴**

4 ¹ NIHR Global Health Research Group on Neurotrauma, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

5 ² Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Addenbrooke's Hospital & University of
6 Cambridge, Cambridge, UK ³ Clinical Research Center, Fundación Valle del Lili, Cali, Colombia ⁴ Neuroscience
7 Institute, INUB-MEDITECH Research Group, El Bosque University, Bogotá, Colombia.

8
9 **Conflict of interest:** All authors have completed the [ICMJE uniform disclosure form](#) and declare: no support from any
10 organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in
11 the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have
12 influenced the submitted work. The lead author* affirms that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and
13 transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and
14 that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

15
16 **Acknowledgements:** None to report

17
18 **Disclosure of funding**

19 This work is supported by the NIHR Global Health Research Group on Neurotrauma, which was commissioned by the
20 National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) using United Kingdom aid from the United Kingdom Government
21 (project 16/137/105) Dr Hutchinson is the Chief Investigator of the RESCUEicp and RESCUE- ASDH randomised trials.
22 Mr Griswold was supported by the Gates Cambridge Trust. Prof Hutchinson was supported by a Research
23 Professorship from the NIHR, the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre, a European Union Seventh
24 Framework Programme grant (CENTER-TBI; grant no. 602,150), and the Royal College of Surgeons of England. Dr
25 Koliass was supported by a Clinical Lectureship from the School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cambridge, and the
26 Royal College of Surgeons of England.

27
28 **Keywords:** umbrella review; broad evidence synthesis; COVID-19; global health; trauma surgery; evidence-based
29 practice; PPE; N95 masks.

30
31
32
33 **Correspondence:**

34 Andres Rubiano
35 Neuroscience Institute, INUB-MEDITECH Research Group
36 El Bosque University
37 Bogotá, Colombia
38 rubianoam@gmail.com

39 ABSTRACT

40 **Objective:** The objective of this review was to summarise the effects of different personal protective equipment
41 (PPE) for reducing the risk of COVID-19 infection in health personnel caring for patients undergoing trauma surgery.
42 The purpose of the review was to inform recommendations for rational use of PPE for emergency surgery staff,
43 particularly in low resources environments where PPE shortages and high costs are expected to hamper the safety
44 of healthcare workers (HCWs) and affect the care of trauma patients.

45 **Introduction:** Many healthcare facilities in low-and middle-income countries are inadequately resourced. COVID-19
46 has the potential to decimate these already strained surgical healthcare services unless health systems take
47 stringent measures to protect healthcare workers from viral exposure.

48 **Inclusion criteria:** This review included systematic reviews, experimental and observational studies evaluating the
49 effect of different PPE on the risk of COVID-19 infection in HCWs involved in emergency trauma surgery. Indirect
50 evidence from other healthcare settings was considered, as well as evidence from other viral outbreaks summarised
51 and discussed for the COVID-19 pandemic.

52 **Methods:** We conducted searches in the L·OVE (Living Overview of Evidence) platform for COVID-19, a system that
53 performs automated regular searches in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
54 (CENTRAL), and over thirty other sources. The risk of bias assessment of the included studies was planned with the
55 AMSTAR II tool for systematic reviews, the RoBII tool for randomised controlled trials, and the ROBINS-I tool for non-
56 randomised studies. Data were extracted using a standardised data extraction tool and summarised narratively. The
57 Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach for grading the
58 certainty of the evidence was followed.

59 **Results:** We identified 17 systematic reviews that fulfilled our selection criteria and were included for synthesis. We
60 did not identify randomised controlled trials during COVID-19 or studies additional to those included in the reviews
61 that discussed other similar viral respiratory illnesses.

62 **Conclusions:**

63 The use of PPE drastically reduces the risk of COVID-19 compared with no mask use in HCWs in the hospital setting.
64 N95 and N95 equivalent respirators provided more protection and were found to halve the risk of COVID-19
65 contagion in HCWs from moderate and high-risk environments. Eye protection also offers additional security and is
66 associated with reduced incidence of contagion. These effects apply to emergency trauma care. Decontamination
67 and reuse appear as feasible, cost-effective measures that would likely help overcome PPE shortages and enhance
68 the allocation of limited resources.

69 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

70 There is high certainty that the use of N95 respirators and surgical masks are associated with a reduced risk of
71 coronaviruses respiratory illness when compared with no mask use. In moderate to high-risk environments,
72 especially in aerosol-generating procedures, N95 respirators are associated with a more significant reduction in risk
73 of COVID-19 infection compared with surgical masks. Eye protection also reduces the risk of contagion.
74 Decontamination of masks and respirators with ultraviolet germicidal irradiation, vaporous hydrogen peroxide, or
75 dry heat is effective and does not affect PPE performance or fit.

76 *(Figure 1: GRADE summary of findings)*

77 INTRODUCTION

78 Many healthcare facilities in low-and middle-income countries are inadequately resourced. COVID-19 has the
79 potential to decimate these already strained surgical healthcare services unless health systems take stringent
80 measures to protect healthcare workers (HCWs) from viral exposure. A recent study showed that 15.6% of
81 confirmed COVID-19 patients are symptomatic and that nearly half of patients with no symptoms at detection time
82 will develop symptoms later.¹ Furthermore, the preoperative evaluation of emergency trauma patients is limited.
83 These factors impede and confound diagnostic triage. Improper infection prevention may create a ‘super-spreader’
84 event in a high-volume healthcare facility or reduce available personnel. Consequently, the infection control
85 strategy of trauma surgery staff is a top priority.

86 To take care of patients, providers must first take care of themselves. Personal protective equipment (PPE) is
87 paramount to protect health care workers from contracting the virus and becoming disease carriers. Basic
88 recommended PPE for trauma surgery staff of high-income country facilities include: 1) a surgical mask or better for
89 all personnel interacting with patients and in the OR (including cleaning staff); 2) N95 or better mask for all staff in
90 close contact with the patients (<6 feet away); 3) PAPR for aerosolising and high-risk procedures (ear, nose, throat,
91 thoracic, and transsphenoidal neurosurgery operations); 4) universal testing of patients pre-operatively to enable
92 appropriate PPE use, and 5) changing scrubs after every procedure.² These recommendations are suitable for high-
93 resource settings but are less feasible in low-resource settings. A rapid-turnaround survey of 40 healthcare
94 organisations across 15 LMICs revealed that 70% lack PPE and COVID-19 testing kits, and only 65% of the
95 respondents showed confidence in hospital staff’s knowledge about precautions to be taken to prevent COVID-19
96 infection among hospital personnel.³

97 Some resource-adjusted recommendations include the use of cloth masks and bandanas. While innovative, their
98 moisture retention, reusability, and filtration are considered very inferior to N95, and other masks.⁴ What is most
99 needed is evidence guided recommendations for PPE use and COVID-19 screening in LMICs surgical systems
100 where resources are either limited or unavailable. HCWs have been instructed to consider refraining from caring for
101 patients in the absence of adequate PPE availability.

102 A preliminary search of PROSPERO, MEDLINE, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, and the *JBI*
103 *Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports* was conducted, and no current or underway systematic
104 reviews on the topic were identified.

105 The primary objective of the review was to summarise the effects of different personal protective equipment in
106 reducing the risk of COVID-19 infection of health personnel caring for patients undergoing trauma surgery. The
107 purpose of the review was to inform recommendations for the rational use of PPE in emergency surgery staff,
108 particularly in low resources environments where PPE shortages and high costs are expected to hamper the safety of

109 HCWs and affect the care of trauma patients. A preliminary search of PROSPERO, MEDLINE, the Cochrane
110 Database of Systematic Reviews, and the JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports was
111 conducted, and no current or underway systematic reviews on the topic were identified.

112 REVIEW QUESTIONS

113 We set to synthesise the available evidence on the effects of various personal protective equipment (PPE) in
114 reducing the risk of COVID-19 infection of health personnel caring for patients undergoing trauma surgery. We were
115 also interested in data on the costs associated with the use of PPE since it is a vital aspect to consider when
116 generating recommendations for low-resources environments.

117 INCLUSION CRITERIA

118 119 **Participants**

120 We considered studies that included HCWs in emergency trauma surgery settings during the COVID-19 pandemic.
121 Given the likelihood that reports on this specific population were scarce or even non-existent, we also included
122 studies of HCWs in any procedural and in-hospital setting, such as the operating room, the emergency room, and
123 critical care units. Furthermore, indirect evidence from other viral respiratory diseases (especially SARS and MERS)
124 was considered if summarised and discussed regarding the COVID-19 pandemic.

125 **Intervention(s)**

126 Different types of PPE used while caring for patients in hospital settings (preferably in emergency surgery).

127 **Comparator(s)**

128 Comparators of interest were no PPE use and different types of PPE.

129 **Outcomes**

130 The primary outcome of interest was the risk of contagion to health personnel involved in the care of the described
131 population during the COVID-19 pandemic, expressed as incidence, or with association measures such as risk ratios
132 or odds ratio when compared to different PPEs or no-PPE. We were also interested in summarising evidence of
133 costs associated with PPE use during the pandemic.

134 **Types of studies**

135 This review considered systematic reviews of experimental and observational studies, and experimental or
136 observational studies if not included in systematic reviews that fulfilled population and intervention criteria. We also

137 included reports of costs associated with the use of PPE and reports on implementation strategies that could inform
138 recommendations for low resource settings. Only studies published in English or Spanish were included. We
139 included preprint studies identified in our search, but no ongoing studies were considered.

140 METHODS

141
142 We conducted a broad evidence synthesis (umbrella review) to summarise the effects of PPE on the risk of COVID-
143 19 infection in healthcare workers (HCW) caring for patients in need of emergency surgery due to trauma. A
144 protocol of this review following the PRISMA statement was registered in the International Prospective Registry of
145 Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO; CRD42020198267). This review was conducted following the JBI methodology for
146 systematic reviews of aetiology and risk.⁵

147 Search strategy

148 We conducted searches in the L·OVE (Living OVERview of Evidence) platform for COVID-19. The platform was
149 consulted on Jul 27 2020, using the entries: 1) Prevention or treatment - Procedures – Protective measures - PPE +
150 Population Filter: COVID19; 2) Prevention or treatment - Procedures – Protective measures -PE + Population filter:
151 Health workers.

152 Information sources

153 The databases to be searched include the L·OVE (Living OVERview of Evidence) platform for COVID-19, a system that
154 performs automated regular searches in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
155 (CENTRAL), and over thirty other sources. When compared to manual searches, this platform consistently identifies
156 all the available studies associated with the terms of interest. It allows for a fast (automated) search that is easy to
157 update - a crucial element given the urgent need to answer the research question rapidly and thoroughly.

158 Study selection

159 Following the search, all identified citations were collated and uploaded into EndNoteX9 (Clarivate Analytics, PA,
160 USA). The citations were then imported into JBI SUMARI for the review process. Two independent reviewers
161 examined titles and abstracts for eligibility. Full-text review verified fulfilment of selection criteria. All decisions
162 taken during screening were documented and are outlined in this report with a list of excluded studies. Any
163 disagreements that arose between the reviewers were solved by consensus. The results of the search are presented
164 in a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram (Figure 2).⁶

165 **Assessment of methodological quality**

166 Eligible studies were critically appraised by a reviewer and verified by a second reviewer using the AMSTAR tool. The
167 risk of bias was assessed for only the primary outcome: infection of healthcare workers by COVID-19 or similar. The
168 results of the critical appraisal are reported narratively and are considered for discussion of results.
169 All included studies, regardless of their risk of bias, underwent data extraction and synthesis.

170 **Data extraction**

171 Data were extracted from the included studies by a reviewer and verified by a second reviewer using a data
172 extraction tool from JBI SUMARI.⁵

173 The data extracted include specific details about the populations, study methods, interventions, and outcomes of
174 significance to the review question and specific objectives. Disagreements were solved by consensus.

175 **Data synthesis**

176 Studies were summarized narratively considering their scope, number of included studies, and risk of bias. Effect
177 sizes from systematic reviews and individual studies not included in them are expressed as odds ratios (for
178 dichotomous data) with their 95% confidence intervals.

179 **Assessing certainty in the findings**

180 The Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach for grading the
181 certainty of the evidence was followed. Grading the certainty of the evidence was not undertaken if adaptation from
182 the identified reviews using the GRADE approach was considered complete and adequate.^{7,8} The certainty of the
183 evidence was considered for interpretation and discussion of findings.

184 **RESULTS**

185 186 **Study inclusion**

187 The study selection process is illustrated in Figure 1.⁶ The described search identified a total of 258 records. After
188 title and abstract screening, 78 studies were considered for full-text review, of which 59 were excluded. Reasons for
189 exclusion were: wrong study design (n=29),⁹⁻³⁷ wrong intervention (n=23),³⁸⁻⁵⁹ wrong outcomes (n=1),⁶⁰ wrong
190 language (n=5),⁶¹⁻⁶⁵ wrong patient population (n=2).^{66,67} This left 19 studies for appraisal, extraction, and
191 synthesis.^{4,68-83}

192 Appendix I shows a list of the 59 excluded studies, with reasons for their exclusion. In general, studies were excluded
 193 because they had a wrong study design (mostly narrative reviews, guideline recommendations, and case reports),
 194 wrong setting (non-hospital settings, community setting), and not reporting data related to COVID-19 contagion in
 195 healthcare workers.

196

197 **Methodological quality**

198 Tables 1-3 show the results of the critical appraisal of the methodological quality. Overall, the quality of the 19
 199 included studies was assessed as moderate to high by JBI appraisal standards, and no disagreements occurred
 200 between the reviewers. Of the 17 included systematic reviews, nine fulfilled all 11 indicators of the critical appraisal
 201 tool,^{69,70,72,75–77,79,81,82} one fulfilled ten indicators,⁶⁸ choosing not to perform risk of bias assessment given the
 202 rapid publication of the review; four fulfilled nine indicators,^{4,80,83,84} failing to report a risk of bias assessment and
 203 choosing not to combine studies for meta-analysis owing to study limitations and heterogeneity in study designs,
 204 comparisons, and analyses. Two fulfilled six indicators,^{71,78} having no method of study appraisal, no method of
 205 minimising errors in data extraction, failing to report a risk of bias assessment, and choosing not to combine studies
 206 for meta-analysis owing to study limitations and heterogeneity in study designs, comparisons, and analyses; and one
 207 fulfilled four indicators,⁷³ for not reporting the indicators aforementioned in the previous studies in addition to a
 208 lack of future directives and recommendations for policy and clinical practice. All systematic reviews clearly stated
 209 the review question, applied appropriate inclusion criteria and search strategy.

210 **Critical Appraisal Results**

211 *Table 1: Case Series*

| Citation | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q10 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Wilson JM, Schwartz AM, Farley KX, Devito DP, Fletcher ND. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| % | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

212 *Table 2: Qualitative Research*

| Citation | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q10 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Houghton C, Meskell P, Delaney H, Smalle M, Glenton C, Booth A, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| % | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

213
214

Table 3: Systematic Reviews

| Citation | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q10 | Q11 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Abdelrahman T, Ansell J, Brown C, Egan R, Evans T, Ryan Harper E, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | U | Y | Y | N | Y | Y |
| Ana L, Andrew JS, Rhonda S. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Bartoszko JJ, Farooqi MAM, Alhazzani W, Loeb M. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Carl-Etienne J, Toma P, Matt B, Genevieve G, Louise P. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | N | N/A | N/A | Y | Y |
| Chou R, Dana T, Jungbauer R, Weeks C, McDonagh MS. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N/A | N/A | Y | Y |
| Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Elaine T, Yvonne C, Christopher B, Simon S, Michael S, Xin-Hui C, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N/A | N/A | Y | Y |
| Fouladi Dehaghi B, Ghodrati Torbati A, Teimori G, Ghavamabadi LI, Jamshidnezhad A. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N | N/A |
| Iannone P, Castellini G, Coclite D, Napoletano A, Fauci AJ, Iacrossi L, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Katie O, Gertsman S, Sampson M, Webster R, Tsampalieros A, Ng R, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Liang M, Gao L, Cheng C, Zhou Q, Uy JP, Heiner K, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N/A | N | N/A | N/A | Y | Y |
| Offeddu V, Yung CF, Low MSF, Tam CC. 2017. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Prashanth R, Jonathan Thomas S, Ruben D, Christopher A, Shehan H. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N/A | N/A | Y | Y |
| Tom J, Mark J, Lubna AAA, Ghada B, Elaine B, Justin C, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Verbeek JH, Rajamaki B, Ijaz S, Sauni R, Toomey E, Blackwood B, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Zorko DJ, Gertsman S, O’Hearn K, Timmerman N, Ambu-Ali N, Dinh T, et al. 2020. | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N/A | N/A | Y | Y |
| % | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 82.35 | 76.47 | 82.35 | 58.82 | 52.94 | 94.11 | 94.11 |

215
216

Characteristics of included studies

217
218
219

The 17 included studies were systematic reviews,^{4,68–73,75,76,79–84}. Appendix II provides details of the characteristics of the included studies. All but one study was published in 2020.⁷⁹ Data extracted from reviews included thousands of participants from 35 different countries.

220
221
222

Ten of 17 systematic reviews evaluated the risk of contagion for respiratory viral infections,^{4,35,69–72,77,82} which six included outcome data for COVID-19 infection.^{4,69,72,75,77,78,82}

223 Four systematic reviews,^{70,75,79,81} evaluate other respiratory pathogens such as seasonal influenza, SARS, H1N1,
224 and MERS.

225 **Review findings**

226 We did not identify comparative studies of PPE effect on the risk of COVID-19 contagion in the emergency surgery
227 setting. We did identify observational studies of COVID-19 in HCW, as well as experimental and observational
228 studies that also addressed this question in HCWs regarding other coronavirus epidemics (SARS and MERS
229 epidemics) considered generalisable to the COVID-19 pandemic. Some studies also assessed and summarised
230 evidence from other viral respiratory illnesses, such as H1N1 or influenza, and reported results consistent with those
231 of the coronaviruses outbreaks.

232 A high-quality systematic review that evaluated the effect of physical distancing face masks and eye protection on
233 preventing COVID-19 contagion included 172 studies, considering evidence from COVID-19, MERS, and SARS.⁷² The
234 authors identified 30 comparative studies that focused on the effect of different masks and respirators on virus
235 transmission in healthcare workers or patients and 13 studies that addressed the same effect for eye protection.
236 They report that the use of a surgical mask compared with no face mask was associated with a considerable
237 reduction in risk of contagion (OR= 0.33, 95% CI= 0.17–0.61). An even larger effect was seen when comparing N95
238 and N95 equivalent respirators to no mask (OR= 0.04, 95% CI= 0.004–0.30). Such estimates are based on studies,
239 including a total of 12,817 participants. Adjusted and unadjusted studies were considered, and both estimates were
240 consistent with the mentioned effect on contagion risk reduction when considering N95 or surgical/medical masks
241 vs. no mask (adjusted OR= 0.15 (0.07 to 0.34); unadjusted RR 0.34 (95% CI 0.26 to 0.45). Evidence for the precisely
242 estimated reduction was rated as low by the authors, given some inconsistency and risk of bias. Nevertheless, the
243 beneficial effect of mask protection was large, and they considered it of high certainty.⁷² They report that N95 had a
244 stronger protective association compared with surgical masks or 12–16-layer cotton masks, and both N95 and
245 surgical masks also had a stronger association with protection versus single-layer masks.

246 Regarding the use of eye protection, pooled analysis of 13 unadjusted and two adjusted studies suggested a
247 reduced risk of contagion with eye protection compared with no eye protection (unadjusted: RR= 0.34, 95% CI 0.22
248 to 0.52; adjusted OR= 0.22, 95% CI 0.12 to 0.39). This review was considered pivotal due to the high number of
249 included studies, the recent date of publication, and the adequacy of methods and reporting. Challenges reported in
250 the studies included frequent discomfort, high resource use, less clear communication, and perceived reduced
251 empathy of care providers by their patients.⁷²

252 A rapid systematic review that also addressed the effect of masks to prevent COVID-19 infection considered
253 evidence from the current pandemic in addition to the SARS and MERS epidemics.⁴ The review reports a reduction

254 of risk of transmission associated with the use of masks in general. It suggests a more significant reduction
255 associated with N95 respirators compared to surgical masks in the hospital setting (an effect seen for COVID-19
256 independently, as well as with the other coronaviruses outbreaks).

257 Other reviews considered evidence from viral respiratory illnesses, including influenza or H1N1, and report a
258 beneficial effect of PPE (medical masks or N95 respirators) on contagion risk reduction.^{70,75,77–79,81} One of these
259 reviews reports that the use of masks by HCWs and non-HCWs can reduce the risk of respiratory virus infection by
260 80% compared to no-mask (OR = 0.20, 95% CI = 0.11–0.37).⁷⁷ Furthermore, respirators were found to be more
261 protective than surgical masks; and surgical masks more protective than cloth masks.⁷⁸ There appears to be no
262 difference between respirators and medical masks when used in non-aerosol generating procedures low-risk
263 environments)^{70,81} Conversely, no significant evidence was found that supported an equivalence claim of medical
264 masks with respirators in their level of protection against COVID-19 or other similar viruses.⁸⁰ In moderate and
265 high-risk hospital settings, N95 are associated with more significant reductions in risk of contagion.^{4,78}

266 A systematic review based on experimental designs only found that N95 respirators halve the risk of any respiratory
267 illness compared to surgical masks; the certainty of the evidence was low due to baseline differences, indirectness
268 of evidence for COVID-19, and low event rates that account for imprecision.⁷⁵ The reduction in contagion risk
269 calculated from 2 RCTs was estimated to be: RR 0.43, 95% CI 0.29, 0.64; I² = 0%, from pooled analysis; with an
270 absolute effect of preventing 73 (95% CI= 91 - 46) more infections per 1000 HCWs wearing N95 respirators
271 compared with surgical masks.⁷⁵

272 Among the included studies, one reported on the use of Powered Air Purifier Respirators (PAPR).⁶⁹ Based on
273 observational studies, the authors report they did not find a difference in risk of contagion in HCWs when
274 comparing PAPR devices with other, more compliant protective elements (N95, FFP2). They found that PAPR users
275 reported higher heat tolerance but limited mobility and reduced audibility.

276 Regarding decontamination, we included a systematic review that assessed the effectiveness of ultra-violet
277 germicidal irradiation (UVGI) for the decontamination of PPE and its impact on PPE performance.⁷⁶ Their findings
278 support that the use of a cumulative UV-C dose of at least 40,000 J/m² results in adequate decontamination without
279 affecting performance or fit afterwards. Another review on the subject reported that mask (N95) performance was
280 best conserved using dry heat decontamination, and that vaporous hydrogen peroxide, as well as UVGI, are effective
281 decontaminants. However, its effect on surgical masks is unknown.⁸³ The authors also state that bleach is not safe
282 for decontamination since it alters mask performance and might be associated with health risk for users.

283 A systematic review that searched for barriers and facilitators of HCWs adherence to PPE protocols included 20
284 studies of moderate to high-quality overall (10 from Asia, four from Africa, four from Central and North America,
285 and two from Australia).⁷⁴ They report that HCWs were unsure to follow recommendations when they are long and
286 ambiguous or do not reflect national or international guidelines. Some were overwhelmed because of constantly
287 changing guidelines and by the increased workload and fatigue associated with PPE use due to preparation and
288 cleaning. A serious concern was the lack of PPE or the low quality of the available items, pointing at a need to adjust
289 supplies during the pandemic. HCWs reported that it was challenging to use masks and other equipment when it
290 made patients feel isolated, frightened, or stigmatised. Of course, discomfort associated with wearing PPE was also
291 reported.

292 Discussion

293 Our review aimed at summarising the available evidence of the effect of different PPE on the risk of COVID-19
294 infection among HCWs caring for patients requiring urgent trauma assessment and surgical care. We did not find
295 experimental studies that assessed PPE on emergency trauma surgery settings during the pandemic. Limited
296 observational evidence from COVID-19, indirect evidence from other healthcare settings, and other viral outbreaks
297 were all considered to answer our research question given that the population (HCW) and intervention (PPE) of
298 interest were the same and thus considered applicable to the emergency surgery setting.

299 The available evidence was consistent to show that the use of N95 respirators and surgical masks is associated with
300 a reduced risk of coronaviruses respiratory illness compared with no mask use, with high certainty on this beneficial
301 effect.^{4,72} In moderate to high-risk environments, especially in aerosol-generating procedures, evidence suggests
302 that N95 respirators are associated with a more significant reduction in risk of COVID-19 infection compared with
303 surgical masks; an effect seen in observational COVID-19 studies and experimental viral respiratory illness studies.
304 Low-quality evidence estimates from these studies suggest a relative reduction of 50% in the risk of contagion
305 associated with N95 respirators compared to surgical masks. Eye protection also significantly reduces the risk of
306 contagion compared to no-eye protection. Furthermore, the decontamination of masks and respirators with
307 ultraviolet germicidal irradiation, vaporous hydrogen peroxide, or dry heat is effective and does not affect PPE
308 performance or fit. This evidence should inform decontamination and reuse protocols to avoid shortages and
309 enhance resource allocation and use.

310 The costs associated with additional protective measures during the COVID-19 pandemic could be significant and
311 affect healthcare institutions in low and middle-income countries. The cost-effectiveness of interventions must also
312 be taken into consideration to generate recommendations during the current pandemic. The possibility to
313 decontaminate and reuse different types of masks can be determinant in shortages and will probably reduce costs
314 without affecting HCW's safety. A cost analysis study compared the use of disposable FFP3 standard masks vs. SR

315 100 reusable respirators.⁸⁵ Disposable masks are indicated to be replaced after each surgical case, and each one
316 costs roughly \$4.27 (USD). The cost per unit for a reusable respirator, supplied with an appropriate filter, is
317 approximately \$44(USD), and replacement filters cost \$0.37. The authors of this economic evaluation highlighted
318 that reusable PPE could be associated with considerable cost savings and estimated that the cost of acquiring a
319 respirator is recovered after it is used for the care of 10 patients.⁸⁵

320 In a survey of 5,442 neurosurgical staff members in Hubei province, among 120 participants that were
321 infected, 78.3% reported wearing surgical masks, and 20.8% failed to use any protection when exposed to the
322 source of infection. A total of 1,287 operated under level 2 protection, and only one was infected,²⁹ further
323 illustrating the pertinence of wearing adequate PPE when caring for surgical trauma patients.

324 Expert recommendations developed from a study of emergency tracheal intubation in 202 patients with COVID-19
325 in Wuhan, China, notes that while PAPRs were the PPE of choice when face shields or full hoods without PAPR were
326 substituted, there were no instances of infection of operators.¹⁰ As the risk of virus exposure due to self-
327 contamination is high during the removal of PPE, educational training for proper donning and doffing of PPE as well
328 as monitoring for compliance is essential. The minimum recommended PPE is eye protection, a fit-tested respirator
329 (N95 or FFP3), a fluid-resistant gown, and gloves. The French guidelines recommend FFP2-type protective filtering
330 masks when performing any aerosol-generating procedures.¹² Guidelines for chest compressions recommend 'level
331 three' PPE, which includes an FFP, disposable fluid-resistant gown, disposable apron, and gloves, fluid-resistant
332 surgical mask, and eye or full-face protection.¹⁷ Recommendations for otolaryngologists include fluid-resistant
333 FFP3/N95 mask, disposable and fluid resistant gloves, and gown, glasses, or a full face shield.¹⁴

334 Recommendations for safe orthopaedic surgery practices state that surgery should only be performed on COVID-19
335 positive patients when the risks of surgery are outweighed by the benefits, such as in emergencies or when a
336 surgical delay could cause increased morbidity and mortality.¹¹ The recommended PPE are N95 respirators or PAPR
337 with the use of face shields, isolation gowns, boot covers, and gloves.

338 Intubation of trauma patients is a high-risk-of-contagion procedure during the COVID-19 pandemic. A survey in 503
339 hospitals from 17 countries included 1,718 HCWs performing 5,148 tracheal intubations and measured a 10.7%
340 incidence of COVID-19 infection after tracheal intubation.³² Most participants reported wearing gloves, gown, eye
341 protection, and FFP2/FFP3/N95/N100 respirators. Simulation studies have assessed the effect of additional
342 protective and preventive measures, such as transparent plastic boxes or PAPR, on the vision, comfort, and success
343 of tracheal intubations.^{35,36}

344 A survey of HCWs realities and perceptions during the pandemic in Latin America included 936 participants and
345 reported low access to disposable gowns (67.3%), N95 respirators (56.1%), and facial protective shields (32.6%).
346 Even access to disposable surgical masks was reported by only 83.9% of participants.³³ This emphasises the need for
347 rational use of limited PPE during the pandemic in LMICs to ensure HCW safety without withholding urgent trauma
348 care.

349 Our findings regarding decontamination should be considered as a feasible solution for the limited access to N95
350 equivalent respirators during shortages and in limited resources environments. Also, to avoid such shortages, it
351 appears that N95 respirator equivalents use should be limited to moderate to high-risk environments; when caring
352 for patients with confirmed COVID-19, or for suspicious or unknown status patients that need emergency surgery
353 due to trauma.

354 **Strengths and Limitations**

355 Our review employed an automated search platform where evidence on COVID-19 is available. This strategy
356 streamlined the rapid nature of the review while ensuring that all relevant studies were identified. Using an
357 automated system has the additional long-term advantage of facilitating review updates by quickly identifying new
358 studies that satisfy selection criteria. Our review also has the strength of having critically assessed all included
359 studies. We report on the estimates and evidence grading of the identified high-quality systematic reviews. A
360 meta-analysis of systematic reviews results was not planned in our review protocol and was not considered adequate,
361 given the overlap of included studies among reviews and the variation in selection criteria. Despite the differences
362 between reviews, the consistency of findings among the reviews provides high certainty of the beneficial effects of
363 PPE in the hospital setting. The main limitation of our review is that evidence from our specific setting of interest -
364 emergency trauma surgery - was not identified. Nevertheless, extrapolation from other clinical settings such as the
365 emergency room, COVID-19 wards and critical care during the pandemic was considered adequate given the
366 characteristics of the intervention and the similarities to the setting of interest.

367 **Conclusions**

368 The use of PPE drastically reduces the risk of COVID-19 compared with no mask use in HCWs in the hospital
369 setting. Respirators like N95 or equivalent provided more protection and were found to halve the risk of COVID-19
370 contagion in HCWs from moderate and high-risk settings. Eye protection also provides additional protection and is
371 associated with reduced incidence of contagion. These effects apply to emergency trauma care. Decontamination
372 and reuse appear as feasible, cost-effective measures than could help overcome PPE shortages and enhance the
373 allocation of limited resources.

374 **Recommendations for practice**

375 When caring for a trauma patient with suspected or unknown COVID-19 status, HCWs should use at least N95
376 respirators or equivalents to reduce the risk of COVID-19 infection adequately. Decontamination with ultraviolet
377 light, hydrogen peroxide, and dry heat should be made available.

378 **Recommendations for research**

379 Robust RCTs comparing the efficacy of surgical masks vs N95 respirators in HCWs caring for trauma patients are
380 potentially unethical, as existing data show a significant protective effect, thus requiring emergency trauma surgery
381 staff to wear N95 respirators when available. As of October 2020, there is a lack of consensus among international
382 experts surrounding the topic of aerosol transmission, meaning that viral micro-droplets are capable of floating in
383 the air without being pulled down by gravity. This means that if someone coughs, sings, or even breathes, the micro-
384 droplets can stay in stagnant air for up to 16 hours, and with normal ventilation between 20 minutes to four
385 hours. While multiple studies have discussed how SARS-CoV-2 can be found in aerosols, including one from May
386 and another from April,^{86,87} a group of epidemiologists in late July characterised research on aerosol transmission
387 as unconvincing and cited extensive published evidence from across the globe showing the overwhelming majority
388 of viral spread is via large respiratory droplets.⁸⁸ The CDC did not acknowledge aerosol transmission as an important
389 route for viral transmission until September 2020, placing aerosol ahead of droplet transmission as the predominant
390 mechanism of viral spread. However, just a few days later the statement was recalled, with updated guidelines
391 saying HCWs need an N95 respirator for aerosol-generating procedures, only.⁸⁹ The hospital administrators and
392 epidemiologists who argue that the virus is mainly droplet-spread claim N95 respirators and strict patient isolation
393 practices are not necessary for routine care of COVID-19 patients. It is essential to develop a complete
394 understanding of the transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 as it drives two different sets of protective practices, touching
395 on everything from airflow within hospital wards to patient isolation to choices of PPE. Enhanced protections would
396 be expensive and disruptive and would have strong implications on cost-effectiveness data, especially for low-
397 income environments. Amid the uncertainty, adopting the highest possible forms of protection seems the best
398 course of action.

399 (Figure 3: GRADE conclusions)

400 APPENDICES

401

402 Appendix I: Studies excluded on full text

403

404 **Parreira PCL et al. Personal protective masks for COVID-19 prevention: quick systematic review.**

405 Reason for exclusion: Portuguese language

406

407 **Schnitzbauer AA et al. SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19: systematic review of requirements for personal protective equipment in primary patient contact and organisation of the operating area.**

408 Reason for exclusion: German language

409

410 **Comité Provincial de Biotecnología. Use of face masks in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic in the Neuquén Health System.**

411 Reason for exclusion: Spanish language

412

413 **ANVISA. Guidelines for health services: prevention and control measures that should be adopted when assisting suspected or confirmed cases of infection with the new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2).**

414 Reason for exclusion: Portuguese language

415

416 **Instituto de Evaluación de Tecnologías en Salud e Investigación. Comparison of surgical (medical) masks with respirators to prevent SARS-COV-2 infection in health personnel to COVID-19.**

417 Reason for exclusion: Spanish language

418

419 **Gralton et al. Protecting healthcare workers from pandemic influenza: N95 or surgical masks?**

420 Reason for exclusion: Wrong patient population: healthcare workers at high risk for occupationally acquired influenza.

421

422 **Brainard J et al. Facemasks and similar barriers to prevent respiratory illness such as COVID-19: A rapid systematic review.**

423 Reason for exclusion: Wrong patient population: influenza-like illness in community settings

424

425 **Canova V et al. Transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2 to healthcare workers - observational results of a primary care hospital contact tracing.**

426 Reason for exclusion: wrong outcome: no comparable outcome data for risk of contagion

427

428 **Dedeilia et al. Medical and Surgical Education Challenges and Innovations in the COVID-19 Era: A Systematic Review.**

429 Reason for exclusion: wrong intervention: the review aimed to identify the challenges imposed on medical and surgical education by the COVID-19 pandemic and the proposed innovations enabling the continuation of medical student and resident training.

430

431 **Jones P et al. What proportion of healthcare worker masks carry virus? A systematic review.**

432 Reason for exclusion: wrong intervention: this review aimed to determine the carriage of respiratory viruses on facemasks used by HCW

433

434 **Begg S et al. Can we use these masks? Rapid Assessment of the Inhalation Resistance Performance of Uncertified Medical Face Masks in the Context of Restricted Resources Imposed during a Public Health Emergency.**

435 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: assessment of filtration performance of surgical masks

436

437 **Malysz M et al. Resuscitation of the patient with suspected/confirmed COVID-19 when wearing personal protective equipment: A randomised multicenter crossover simulation trial.**

438 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: median chest compression depth and rate

439

- 451 **Islam MS et al. Examining the current intelligence on COVID-19 and infection prevention and control strategies in**
452 **health settings: A global analysis.**
453 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: transmission dynamics and pathogenic and clinical features of COVID-19
454
- 455 **Cadnum JL et al. Effectiveness of Ultraviolet-C Light and a High-Level Disinfection Cabinet for Decontamination of**
456 **N95 Respirators.**
457 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods for N95 respirators
458
- 459 **Zulauf KE et al. Microwave-Generated Steam Decontamination of N95 Respirators Utilising Universally Accessible**
460 **Materials.**
461 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods for N95 respirators
462
- 463 **Zhong H et al. Reusable and Recyclable Graphene Masks with Outstanding Superhydrophobic and Photothermal**
464 **Performances.**
465 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods for N95 respirators
466
- 467 **Jones P et al. What proportion of healthcare worker masks carry virus? A systematic review.**
468 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: This review aimed to determine the carriage of respiratory viruses on
469 facemasks used by HCW.
470
- 471 **Derr TH et al. Aerosolized Hydrogen Peroxide Decontamination of N95 Respirators, with Fit-Testing and Virologic**
472 **Confirmation of Suitability for Re-Use During the COVID-19 Pandemic.**
473 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods for N95 respirators
474
- 475 **Christensen L et al. A randomised trial of instructor-led training versus video lesson in training health care providers**
476 **in proper donning and doffing of personal protective equipment.**
477 Reason for exclusion: wrong intervention: evaluated method of education for donning and doffing
- 478 **Leormandi R et al. Effect of ethanol cleaning on the permeability of FFP2 mask.**
479 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods for N95 respirators
480
- 481 **Avilash C et al. Analysis of SteraMist ionised hydrogen peroxide technology as a method for sterilising N95**
482 **respirators and other personal protective equipment.**
483 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods for N95 respirators
484
- 485 **Massey T et al. Quantitative form and fit of N95 filtering facepiece respirators are retained after dry and humid heat**
486 **treatments for coronavirus deactivation.**
487 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating form and fit after decontamination methods for N95
488 respirators
489
- 490 **Cramer A et al. Disposable N95 Masks Pass Qualitative Fit-Test But Have Decreased Filtration Efficiency after Cobalt-**
491 **60 Gamma Irradiation.**
492 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating form and fit after decontamination methods for N95
493 respirators
494
- 495 **Simmons S et al. Disinfection effect of pulsed xenon ultraviolet irradiation on SARS-CoV-2 and implications for**
496 **environmental risk of COVID-19 transmission.**
497 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods to prevent COVID-19 transmission
498
- 499 **Simeon C et al. Thermal Disinfection Inactivates SARS-CoV-2 in N95 Respirators while Maintaining Their Protective**
500 **Function.**
501 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods for N95 respirators
502

- 503 **Ebru O et al. Vapor H2O2 sterilisation as a decontamination method for the reuse of N95 respirators in the COVID-**
504 **19 emergency.**
505 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: evaluating decontamination methods for N95 respirators
506
- 507 **Derince T. Effect of Using Barrier Devices for Intubation in COVID-19 Patients.**
508 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: testing barrier devices for intubation
509
- 510 **Mhango M et al. COVID-19 Risk Factors Among Health Workers: A Rapid Review.**
511 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: This study evaluated evidence on Covid-19 risk factors among HCWs
512
- 513 **Rubin GD et al. The Role of Chest Imaging in Patient Management during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Multinational**
514 **Consensus Statement from the Fleischner Society.**
515 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: CT imaging
516
- 517 **Wahidi MM et al. The Use of Bronchoscopy during the COVID-19 Pandemic: CHEST/AABIP Guideline and Expert**
518 **Panel Report.**
519 Reason for exclusion: Wrong study design: guidelines on the use of bronchoscopy during the COVID-19 pandemic
520
- 521 **Powell-Jackson T et al. Infection prevention and control compliance in Tanzanian outpatient facilities: a cross-**
522 **sectional study with implications for the control of COVID-19.**
523 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: Infection prevention and control compliance
524
- 525 **Liao L et al. Can N95 Respirators Be Reused after Disinfection? How Many Times?**
526 Reason for exclusion: Wrong intervention: investigated multiple commonly used disinfection schemes on media
527 with a particle filtration efficiency of 95%.
528
- 529 **Konda A et al. Aerosol Filtration Efficiency of Common Fabrics Used in Respiratory Cloth Masks.**
530 Reason for exclusion: wrong intervention: filtration efficiency of common fabrics
531
- 532 **Qiangping et al. Epidemiological characteristics of COVID-19 in medical staff members of neurosurgery departments**
533 **in Hubei province: A multicentre descriptive study.**
534 Reason for exclusion: Wrong study design: survey
535
- 536 **Ippolito M et al. Medical masks and Respirators for the Protection of Healthcare Workers from SARS-CoV-2 and**
537 **other viruses.**
538 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: narrative summary of surgical mask and respirator characteristics
539
- 540 **Yao W et al. Emergency tracheal intubation in 202 patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: lessons learnt and**
541 **international expert recommendations.**
542 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: guideline recommendations for emergency tracheal intubation
543
- 544 **Service BC et al. Medically Necessary Orthopaedic Surgery During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Safe Surgical Practices**
545 **and a Classification to Guide Treatment.**
546 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: guideline recommendations for safe orthopaedic surgical practices during
547 COVID-19 pandemic
548
- 549 **Lepelletier D et al. What face mask for what use in the context of COVID-19 pandemic? The French guidelines.**
550 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: guideline recommendations for the use of face masks during COVID-19
551
- 552 **Leboulanger N et al. COVID-19 and ENT Pediatric otolaryngology during the COVID-19 pandemic. Guidelines of the**
553 **French Association of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology (AFOP) and French Society of Otorhinolaryngology (SFORL).**
554 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: guideline recommendations for ENT pediatric otolaryngology during the
555 COVID-19 pandemic

- 556
557 **Krajewska J et al. COVID-19 in otolaryngologist practice: a review of current knowledge.**
558 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: Narrative review of the current knowledge on COVID-19-related
559 information useful in otolaryngologist practice.
560
561 **Hirschmann MT et al. COVID-19 coronavirus: recommended personal protective equipment for the orthopaedic and**
562 **trauma surgeon.**
563 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: guideline recommendations for safe orthopaedic surgical practices during
564 COVID-19 pandemic
565
566 **Godoy et al. Facial protection for healthcare workers during pandemics: a scoping review.**
567 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: scoping review
568
569 **Brown E et al. Should chest compressions be considered an aerosol-generating procedure? A literature review in**
570 **response to recent guidelines on personal protective equipment for patients with suspected COVID-19.**
571 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: guideline recommendations on the role of chest compressions for
572 patients with suspected COVID-19
573
574 **Malik T. COVID-19 and the Efficacy of Different Types of Respiratory Protective Equipment Used by Health Care**
575 **Providers in a Health Care Setting.**
576 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: case report
577
578 **Chersich MF et al. COVID-19 in Africa: care and protection for frontline healthcare workers.**
579 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: recommendations
580
581 **Hiramatsu M et al. Anesthetic and surgical management of tracheostomy in a patient with COVID-19.**
582 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: recommendations
583
584 **Lee S et al. Asymptomatic carriage and transmission of SARS-CoV-2: What do we know?**
585 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: narrative recommendations
586
587 **Mueller AV et al. Assessment of Fabric Masks as Alternatives to Standard Surgical Masks in Terms of Particle**
588 **Filtration Efficiency.**
589 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: narrative review and recommendations regarding fabric masks in place of
590 surgical masks
591
592 **Winck JC et al. COVID-19 pandemic and non invasive respiratory management: Every Goliath needs a David. An**
593 **evidence based evaluation of problems.**
594 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: narrative review describes some problems with the management of
595 Covid-19 induced acute respiratory failure (ARF) by pulmonologists.
596
597 **Boskoski I et al. COVID-19 pandemic and personal protective equipment shortage: protective efficacy comparing**
598 **masks and scientific methods for respirator reuse.**
599 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: guideline recommendations on rational use and successful reuse of
600 respirators
601
602 **Convissar D et al. Personal Protective Equipment N95 Facemask Shortage Quick Fix: The Modified Airway From**
603 **VENTilatoR Circuit (MAVerIC).**
604 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: technical report proposes a makeshift filter mask
605
606 **Sugrue M et al. A cloth mask for under-resourced healthcare settings in the COVID19 pandemic.**
607 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: narrative recommendations
608

- 609 **Jessop ZM et al. Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) for Surgeons during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review**
610 **of Availability, Usage, and Rationing.**
611 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: guideline recommendations on the rational use of PPE for surgeons
612 during COVID-19 pandemic
613
- 614 **Heinzerling A et al. Transmission of COVID-19 to Health Care Personnel During Exposures to a Hospitalised Patient -**
615 **Solano County, California, February 2020.**
616 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: anecdotal and descriptive
617
- 618 **Delgado D et al. Personal Safety during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Realities and Perspectives of Healthcare Workers in**
619 **Latin America.**
620 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: questionnaire
621
- 622 **El-Boghdady K et al. Risks to healthcare workers following tracheal intubation of patients with COVID-19: a**
623 **prospective international multicentre cohort study.**
624 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: descriptive study
625
- 626 **Xinghuan W et al. Association between 2019-nCoV transmission and N95 respirator use.**
627 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: quasi-experimental study
628
- 629 **Clariot S et al. Minimising COVID-19 exposure during tracheal intubation by using a transparent plastic box: a**
630 **randomised prospective simulation study.**
631 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: a simulation study
632
- 633 **Schumacher J et al. The impact of respiratory protective equipment on difficult airway management: a randomised,**
634 **crossover, simulation study.**
635 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: a simulation study
636
- 637 **Gong Y et al. Anesthesia Considerations and Infection Precautions for Trauma and Acute Care Cases During the**
638 **COVID-19 Pandemic: Recommendations From a Task Force of the Chinese Society of Anesthesiology.**
639 Reason for exclusion: wrong study design: clinical recommendation
640

Appendix Table I: Systematic Reviews

| Study | Review objectives | Descriptions of interventions/phenomena of interest | Descriptions of outcomes included in the review | Descriptions of contexts included in the review | Search details | Number of studies and participants included | Appraisal instruments used |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Abdelrahman T, et al. 2020. | To identify and collate global experience, practice and recommendations relating to OR practice in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic | Specific practices, or providing recommendations or guidance relating to OR practice, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic | Five domains for data capture were identified a priori: 1) the physical OR factors, 2) personnel factors, 3) patient factors, 4) procedure factors, 5) other considerations. | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Articles reporting specific practices, experience, recommendations, or guidance in relation to emergency OR practice, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, were included. Articles were excluded if they did not meet the inclusion criteria, if the full-text article was unavailable, or if no English version was extractable. | 11 studies. two of which had cohorts of four and 17 | Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine (OCEBM) |
| Ana L, Andrew JS, Rhonda S. 2020. | To evaluate the effect of powered air-purifying respirators (PAPRs) as part of respiratory protection versus another device (N95/FFP2) on HCW infection rates and contamination | Powered Air-Purifying Respirator (PAPR) studied separately or within Personal Protective equipment vs. Any other respiratory protective equipment, FFP3/FFP2/N95 or surgical masks | 1) healthcare worker infection rates utilising PAPR technology within a PPE program as infection with SARS-Cov-2, SARS-Cov-1, EBOLA or MERS; 2) contamination of skin or clothing measured with any type of test material to visualise contamination; 3) compliance with guidance on use of PAPR measured with e.g. observation checklist; 4) level of wearer comfort whilst using the PAPR; - objective and/or subjective measures of work of breathing during the use of PAPR; 5) costs of resource use of PAPR equipment; 6) impact of structured training programs on PAPR use | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | P: Healthcare workers Volunteers I: Powered Air-Purifying Respirator (PAPR) studied separately or within Personal Protective equipment C: Any other respiratory protective equipment, FFP3/FFP2/N95 or surgical masks O: - healthcare worker infection rates utilising PAPR technology within a PPE program as infection with SARS-Cov-2, SARS-Cov-1, EBOLA or MERS; - contamination of skin or clothing measured with any type of test material to visualise contamination; - compliance with guidance on use of PAPR measured with e.g. observation checklist; - level of wearer comfort whilst using the PAPR; - objective and/or subjective measures of work of breathing during the use of PAPR; - costs of resource use of PAPR equipment; - impact of structured training programs on PAPR use S: Randomised controlled trials, Non-randomised studies, Observational studies (cohort studies, case-control studies, cross-sectional studies, case series) S: Inpatient care/Critical Care/Intensive Care, Perioperative process-preadmission, preoperative, intraoperative and postoperative setting Timing: Perioperative process-preadmission, preoperative, intraoperative and postoperative setting | Ten eligible studies. Five of these studies were simulation studies. Two of the studies were randomised controlled trials. A single study was a randomised controlled trial in a simulation setting. A single study was a randomised controlled trial in a simulation setting. A single study was an observational case series of healthcare workers (airway proceduralist only) managing patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in China at the start of 2020. Two were observational studies with control cohorts. One observational simulation study was a case series without a control group. | Cochrane RoB and ROBINS-I |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Bartoszko JJ, Farooqi MAM, Alhazzani W, Loeb M. 2020. | To compare medical masks to N95 respirators in preventing laboratory-confirmed viral infection and respiratory illness including coronavirus specifically in healthcare workers. | N95 vs medical masks | Viral respiratory infection laboratory confirmed by PCR, serology, or viral culture (our primary outcome), laboratory-confirmed coronavirus infection, laboratory-confirmed influenza, infection, influenza-like illness, clinical respiratory illness, or workplace absenteeism. | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | P: healthcare workers (defined as workers in a healthcare setting that could be exposed to a patient with acute respiratory illness) I: medical masks (defined surgical, procedural, isolation, laser, fluid resistant or face masks certified for use as a medical device) C: N95 respirators (defined as respirators were N95 filtering face piece respirators certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and European standard filtering face-piece (FFP2) respirators) O: viral respiratory infection laboratory confirmed by PCR, serology, or viral culture (our primary outcome), laboratory-confirmed coronavirus infection, laboratory-confirmed influenza infection, influenza-like illness, clinical respiratory illness, or workplace absenteeism | Four RCTs | Modified Cochrane RoB |
| Carl-Etienne J, Toma P, Matt B, Genevieve G, Louise P. 2020. | To provide a comprehensive summary of the evidence on pandemic control, with a focus on cost-effectiveness. | Effectiveness of hand washing and face masks. | cost-effectiveness | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Articles reporting on the effectiveness or cost-effectiveness of at least one intervention were included and grouped into higher-quality evidence (randomised trials) and lower-quality evidence (other study designs). | 62 studies | Did not examine risk of bias. |
| Chou R, Dana T, Jungbauer R, Weeks C, McDonagh MS. 2020. | To evaluate the effectiveness of respirators (e.g., N95) versus facemasks (surgical) versus cloth masks for prevention of COVID-19 in addition to standard precautions (gowns + gloves + handwashing) in community settings, high-risk healthcare settings (e.g., intensive care unit, emergency department), and in healthcare settings with close contact but unknown risk (e.g., primary care, other settings) To also evaluate the evidence for extended use or reuse of N95 respirators for prevention of COVID-19. | N95 respirators or equivalent, surgical/medical masks, and cloth masks. | 1) Infection with SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1, or MERS-CoV 2) Influenza-like illness, lab-confirmed viral infection, lab-confirmed influenza, and clinical respiratory illness 3) Harms of mask usage | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Healthcare workers or community members at risk of contracting COVID-19 or other viral respiratory illnesses due to workplace or community-based exposure. Randomised controlled trials of one mask type versus another for prevention of COVID-19 (the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 infection), SARS-1 (the disease caused by SARS-CoV-1 infection), and MERS (the disease caused by MERS-CoV infection). influenza-like illness, and laboratory-confirmed viral respiratory illness. Randomised controlled trials of masks versus no masks (to inform indirect comparisons) for prevention of COVID-19, SARS-1, MERS, influenza-like illness, and laboratory-confirmed viral respiratory illness. Cohort and case-control studies on effects of mask use and risk for prevention of COVID-19 (the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 infection), SARS-1 (the disease caused by SARS-CoV-1 infection), and MERS (the disease caused by MERS-CoV infection). Randomised controlled trials, cohort studies, and case-control studies on reuse or extended use of masks versus standard use for prevention of COVID-19, SARS-1, or MERS. | 39 studies (18 randomised controlled trials and 21 observational studies; 33 867 participants) | Criteria adapted from the US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF). |
| Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. 2020. | To provide a quantitative assessment on the physical distance associated with reduced risk of acquiring infection when caring for an individual infected with SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, or MERS-CoV. | optimum distance for avoiding person-to-person virus transmission and to assess the use of face masks and eye protection to prevent transmission of viruses. | 1) risk of transmission to people in healthcare or non-healthcare settings by those infected; 2) contextual factors such as acceptability, feasibility, effect on equity, and resource considerations related to the interventions of interest. | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Studies of any design and in any setting that included patients with WHO-defined confirmed or probable COVID-19, SARS, or MERS, and people in close contact with them, comparing distances between people and COVID-19 infected patients of 1 m or larger with smaller distances, with or without a face mask on the patient, or with or without a face mask, eye protection, or both on the exposed individual. | 172 observational studies and 44 relevant comparative studies (n=25,697 patients) | Standardised prepiloted forms (covidence); cross-checked screening results using artificial intelligence (Evidence Prime) |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Elaine T, Yvonne C, Christopher B, Simon S, Michael S, Xin-Hui C, et al. 2020. | To summarise recommendations regarding the extended use or reuse of N95 respirators, and to provide an overview of published information by regulatory authorities, surveillance organisations, and ministries of health of several countries. | N95 Respirators | N/A | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Two researchers independently scrutinised the websites of the regulatory authorities of countries or regions and of ministries of health that are members or associates of the International Coalition of Medicines Regulatory Authorities (ICMRA). | N/A | N/A |
| Fouladi Dehaghi B, Ghodrati Torbati A, Teimori G, Ghavamabad i LI, Jamshidnezhad A. 2020. | To investigate the effectiveness of face masks against respiratory infections, including coronavirus. | Respirator and non-respirator masks | settings, mask type, findings | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | A survey of articles published up to Apr 30 2020 about the effectiveness of face masks against coronavirus infections was performed using four electronic databases: PubMed, Scopus, Science Citation Index (Web of Science), and Google scholar. The following terms were used in the search strategy: ['Facemask' OR 'Facemasks' OR 'Mask' OR 'Masks' OR 'Respirator' OR 'Respirators'] AND ['COVID-19' OR 'Coronavirus' OR 'Novel Coronavirus'] AND ['Medical staff' OR 'Healthcare staff' OR 'health care providers' OR 'Healthcare providers' OR 'Healthcare workers' OR 'Health workers' OR 'Healthcare Professionals']. | 5 studies | N/A |
| Katie O, Gertsman S, Sampson M, Webster R, Tsampalieros A, Ng R, et al. 2020. | To synthesise existing data on the effectiveness of ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) for N95 FFR decontamination. | decontamination procedures for N95 (including SN95) filtering facemask respirators or their components | 1) effectiveness of the UVGI method at removing viral or bacterial load; 2) impact of the UVGI method on filtering face mask performance, with a specific focus on aerosol penetration and airflow resistance (pressure drop); or 3) measures or observations related to change in mask fit or physical degradation of the mask following UVGI exposure. | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Original research reporting on function, decontamination, or mask fit following UVGI were included. | Thirteen studies were identified, comprising 54 UVGI intervention arms and 58 N95 models. | Independent instrument evaluating population, design, methodology, outcome |
| Liang M, Gao L, Cheng C, Zhou Q, Uy JP, Heiner K, et al. 2020. | To evaluate the effectiveness of the use of masks to prevent laboratory-confirmed respiratory virus transmission. | Protective effect of masks against spread of respiratory infections | protective effect of mask vs respiratory viral infections | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | The studies meeting the following criteria were included: (1) concerning the relationship between the face mask and preventing RVIs; (2) diagnosis of respiratory virus must have laboratory evidence, or the local clinical diagnostic criteria are applied during an acute large-scale infectious disease when laboratory evidence might be not available; (3) complete data available of both cases and controls to calculate an odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI); (4) appropriate study design; (5) no language restrictions applied. The exclusive criteria were as follows: (1) conferences/meetings abstracts, case reports, editorials, and review articles; (2) duplicate publication or overlapping studies; (3) studies with unavailable full texts. | 21 studies which included 13 case-control studies, 6 cluster randomised trials, and 2 cohort studies. 12 studies investigated HCWs. 7 studies investigated Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV), 12 studies investigated influenza virus including 5 investigating the H1N1 virus, and 1 study investigated SARS-CoV-2. | The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) and the Jadad scale. |
| MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. 2020. | To review the evidence around the efficacy of masks and respirators for healthcare workers, sick patients and the general public. | Use of respiratory protection by healthcare workers, sick patients and community members | respiratory viral infection | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Randomised controlled trials on masks and respirators. Studies that were not randomised controlled trials, were about anesthesia, or not about prevention of infection were excluded. Animal studies, experimental and observational epidemiologic studies were also excluded. Studies published in English language were included | 19 studies | N/A |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Offeddu V, Yung CF, Low MSF, Tam CC. 2017. | To develop evidence-based recommendations to reduce the occupational risk of respiratory infection among medical personnel. | Protective effect of facemasks and respirators against respiratory infections among healthcare workers | Effectiveness of PPE in reducing the risk of clinical or laboratory-confirmed respiratory outcomes; | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | P: HCWs; I: Any type of PPE; C: no PPE O: Effectiveness of PPE in reducing the risk of clinical or laboratory-confirmed respiratory outcomes; S Healthcare settings worldwide. Study design: Published, peer-reviewed randomised control trials (RCTs) and observational studies; | 6 RCTs and 23 observational studies | Cochrane RoB and RevMan for RCTs. Adapted Newcastle-Ottawa scales for case-control, cohort, and cross-sectional studies. |
| Prashanth R, Jonathan Thomas S, Ruben D, Christopher A, Shehan H. 2020. | To evaluate the evidence behind UK Government PPE Guidance on surgical masks versus respirators for SARS-CoV-2 protection in patient-facing healthcare workers delivering secondary care. | UK guidelines comparing surgical facemasks and respirators specific to SARS-CoV-2 | For laboratory studies, these data included study design, research question, masks/respirators tests, testing particle/pathogen, findings, and appraisal comments. For clinical studies, these data included setting, participants, interventions, outcomes, and limitations raised in appraisal. | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Any comparison between FRSM and respirator. Any study design containing primary data | 9 studies | CASP Checklists |
| Tom J, Mark J, Lubna AAA, Ghada B, Elaine B, Justin C, et al. 2020. | To examine the effectiveness of eye protection, face masks, or person distancing on interrupting or reducing the spread of respiratory viruses. | Social distancing, mask and hand hygiene either as stand-alone interventions or combined | any acute respiratory illness and its related consequences | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | People of any age using face masks (i.e. surgical or medical masks and N95 respirators), eye protection, or person distancing against standard practice, or a similar physical barrier, or compared any of these interventions. Studies that reported a measure of acute respiratory illness – such as influenza-like illness, influenza, or respiratory infections – and/or its consequences (e.g. days off work, complications, hospitalisation and death, if clearly reported as consequences of the respiratory illness). | 15 randomised trials investigating the effect of masks (14 trials) in healthcare workers and the general population and of quarantine (1 trial). | Cochrane RoB |
| Verbeek JH, Rajamaki B, Ijaz S, Sauni R, Toomey E, Blackwood B, et al. 2020. | To evaluate which type of full-body PPE and which method of donning or doffing PPE have the least risk of contamination or infection for HCW, and which training methods increase compliance with PPE protocols. | PPE with PAPR, more protective attire, not permeable not breathable (A), gowns versus aprons, one type of full-body PPE, sealed gown-glove interface, gown: easy to doff, gown with gown-glove improvement, gloves with tab, mask tabs, CDC method of doffing, single-step doffing, doffing with double gloves, donning and doffing with instructions, doffing with extra sanitation of gloves, doffing with hypochlorite, video-based learning | 1) contamination of skin or clothing, measured with any type of test material to visualise contamination (e.g. stains made visible with UV light) or harmless viruses or bacteria; 2) infection with EVD, another viral haemorrhagic fever, or comparable highly infectious disease with serious consequences such as SARS, or COVID-19; 3) compliance with guidance on selection of type and use of PPE measured, for example, with an observation checklist 4) User-reported assessment of comfort and convenience 5) Costs or resource use 6) Time to don and doff the PPE. | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Controlled studies that evaluated the effect of full-body PPE used by HCW exposed to highly infectious diseases, on the risk of infection, contamination, or non-compliance with protocols. Studies that compared the effect of various ways of donning or doffing PPE, and the effects of training on the same outcomes. | 24 studies with 2278 participants, of which 14 were randomised controlled trials (RCT), one was a quasi-RCT and nine had a non-randomised design. Eight studies compared types of PPE. Six studies evaluated adapted PPE. Eight studies compared donning and doffing processes and three studies evaluated types of training. Eighteen studies used simulated exposure with fluorescent markers or harmless microbes. | Cochrane RoB and ROBINS-I |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Zorko DJ, Gertsman S, O'Hearn K, Timmerman N, Ambu-Ali N, Dinh T, et al. 2020. | To identify and synthesise data from original research evaluating interventions to decontaminate surgical masks for the purpose of reuse | dry heat, autoclave, ethanol, isopropanol, bleach | mask performance (filtration efficiency [FE] and airflow resistance); reduction in pathogen load; in vivo infection rates following use of treated masks; mask appearance or physical degradation; or adverse effects experienced by the wearer. | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | P: HCWs donning surgical facemask PPE or their components I: intervention(s) to decontaminate, sterilise or treat surgical masks (applied either before or after their use) for the purposes of reuse as PPE C: no decontamination O: a) mask performance (i.e. filtration efficiency and airflow resistance); b) reduction in pathogen load; c) in vivo infection rates following use of decontaminated masks; d) changes in physical appearance (i.e. mask appearance or physical degradation); e) adverse effects experienced by the wearer (e.g. skin irritation); or f) feasibility of the intervention (e.g. time, cost, resource utilisation). Prospective original research on decontamination interventions for surgical masks. Original research, including systematic reviews | 7 studies. Decontamination (n=1) Pre-contamination (n=6) | Independent instrument evaluating RoB in study design, methodological consistency, population heterogeneity, sampling bias, outcome evaluation, and selective reporting |
| Iannone P, Castellini G, Coclite D, Napolitano A, Fauci AJ, Iacorossi L, et al. 2020. | To assess the the role of N95 respirators in protecting HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic | N95 respirators versus surgical masks. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary outcomes: 1) SARS-CoV-2 infection; 2) Clinical respiratory illness (CRI). Secondary outcomes: (3) Influenza like illness (ILI); (4) Laboratory-confirmed respiratory viral infection; (5) Laboratory-confirmed bacterial colonisation; (6) Laboratory-confirmed respiratory infection; (7) Laboratory-confirmed influenza; (8) Discomfort of wearing respiratory protections. | Healthcare settings amidst COVID-19 pandemic | Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) run in healthcare settings. Randomisation was allowed both at individual and cluster level. | Four RCTs involving 8736 HCWs. No trial specifically on prevention of COVID-19 | Cochrane RoB |

Appendix Table II: Case Series

| Study | Country | Setting/context | Participant characteristics | Groups | Outcomes measured |
|--|---------|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Wilson JM, Schwartz AM, Farley KX, Devito DP, Fletcher ND. 2020. | USA | infectious complications, perioperative bodily fluid occupational exposure | 1,270 patients who underwent CRPP of a supracondylar humeral fracture and met inclusion criteria were identified. Patients had a mean age of 6 years, and sex approached an even divide between male patients and female patients. Over 90% of patients stayed in the hospital <24 hours. The proportion of fracture occurrence and treatment for the entire cohort was greatest in April to June (30.2%), followed by July to September (27.0%), October to December (25.3%), and January to March (17.5%). | Sterile (n=874)Semi-Sterile (n=396) | 1 of 2 large, metropolitan, pediatric hospitals within the same hospital system. |

Appendix Table III: Qualitative Research

| Study | Methods for data collection and analysis | Country | Phenomena of interest | Setting/context/culture | Participant characteristics and sample size |
|---|---|----------------|---|---|--|
| <p>Houghton C, Meskell P, Delaney H, Smalle M, Glenton C, Booth A, et al. 2020.</p> | <p>An information specialist (MS) designed and conducted all searches, which were informed by a topic expert and independently peer reviewed by an Information Specialist and Assistant Managing Editor at Cochrane. In order to ensure a range of respiratory infectious disease types were captured, all nine studies that looked at coronaviruses were included (MERS = 2 and SARS = 7), as, similarly to COVID-19, they have a mixture of contact, droplet, and airborne transmission. GRADE-CERQual (Confidence in the Evidence from Reviews of Qualitative research) approach to assess our confidence in each finding. Second, the data richness of the 27 remaining studies focusing on TB, H1N1 and general respiratory virus outbreaks was assessed. From these 27 studies, the studies that scored a 3 or higher for data richness were sampled.</p> | <p>Ireland</p> | <p>When new respiratory infectious diseases become widespread, such as during the COVID-19 pandemic, healthcare workers' adherence to infection prevention and control (IPC) guidelines becomes even more important. Strategies in these guidelines include the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) such as masks, face shields, gloves and gowns; the separation of patients with respiratory infections from others; and stricter cleaning routines. These strategies can be difficult and time-consuming to adhere to in practice. Authorities and healthcare facilities therefore need to consider how best to support healthcare workers to implement them. Objectives: To identify barriers and facilitators to healthcare workers' adherence to IPC guidelines for respiratory infectious diseases.</p> | <p>Views and experiences of nurses, doctors and other healthcare workers when dealing with severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), H1N1, MERS (Middle East respiratory syndrome), tuberculosis (TB), or seasonal influenza. Most of these healthcare workers worked in hospitals; others worked in primary and community care settings.</p> | <p>36 relevant studies and sampled 20 of these studies for analysis. Ten of these studies were from Asia, four from Africa, four from Central and North America and two from Australia. Studies that focused on the experiences and perceptions of healthcare workers with regards to IPC guidelines for respiratory infectious diseases were included. By definition healthcare workers meant any healthcare worker, including clinicians (e.g. doctors, nurses, midwives, clinical managers, allied health professionals, pharmacists) or other staff members (e.g. porters, healthcare assistants), with responsibility for patient care in any hospital, long-term care, primary care or community setting (adapted from</p> |

REFERENCES

1. Zhu J, Ji P, Pang J, Zhong Z, Li H, He C, et al. Clinical characteristics of 3062 COVID-19 patients: A meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2020;92(10):1902–14.
2. Stewart CL, Thornblade LW, Diamond DJ, Fong Y, Melstrom LG. Personal Protective Equipment and COVID-19: A Review for Surgeons. *Ann Surg*. 2020;272(2):e132–8.
3. Gonzalez N, Hatchcock A, Jansen N, Weine S. A Rapid Turnaround Survey of COVID-19 in LMICs: The Readiness, Responses, and Challenges of Healthcare Organizations. 2020.
4. R C, T D, R J, C W, MS M. Masks for Prevention of Respiratory Virus Infections, Including SARS-CoV-2, in Health Care and Community Settings: A Living Rapid Review. *Ann Intern Med* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/bcb6c8deb5ec04e9a0edfaa513c37ed68e9f9eb5>
5. Aromataris E, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Campbell J, Hopp L. *JBIR Reviewer’s Manual*. 2019;
6. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Int J Surg Lond Engl*. 2010;8(5):336–41.
7. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *Bmj*. 2004;328(7454):1490.
8. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction—GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(4):383–94.
9. Ippolito M, Vitale F, Accurso G, Iozzo P, Gregoretti C, Giarratano A, et al. Medical masks and Respirators for the Protection of Healthcare Workers from SARS-CoV-2 and other viruses. *Pulmonol* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/a60f66b5fe29434559fb6ee0e7bb2d827b288e25>
10. Yao W, Wang T, Jiang B, Gao F, Wang L, Zheng H, et al. Emergency tracheal intubation in 202 patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: lessons learnt and international expert recommendations. *Brit J Anaesth*. 2020;125(1):e28–37.
11. Service BC, Collins AP, Crespo A, Couto P, Gupta S, Avilucea F, et al. Medically Necessary Orthopaedic Surgery During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Safe Surgical Practices and a Classification to Guide Treatment. *J Bone Jt Surg Am Volume*. 2020;102(14):e76-1–8.

12. Lepelletier D, Grandbastien B, Romano-Bertrand S, Aho S, Chidiac C, Géhanno J-F, et al. What face mask for what use in the context of COVID-19 pandemic? The French guidelines. *J Hosp Infect.* 2020;105(3):414–8.
13. Leboulanger N, Sagardoy T, Akkari M, Ayari-Khalfallah S, Celerier C, Fayoux P, et al. COVID-19 and ENT Pediatric otolaryngology during the COVID-19 pandemic. Guidelines of the French Association of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology (AFOP) and French Society of Otorhinolaryngology (SFORL). *European Ann Otorhinolaryngology Head Neck Dis.* 2020;137(3):177–81.
14. Krajewska J, Krajewski W, Zub K, Zatoński T. COVID-19 in otolaryngologist practice: a review of current knowledge. *Eur Arch Oto-rhino-l.* 2020;277(7):1885–97.
15. Hirschmann MT, Hart A, Henckel J, Sadoghi P, Seil R, Mouton C. COVID-19 coronavirus: recommended personal protective equipment for the orthopaedic and trauma surgeon. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatology Arthrosc Official J Esska.* 2020;28(6):1690–8.
16. Godoy LRG, Jones AE, Anderson TN, Fisher CL, Seeley KML, Beeson EA, et al. Facial protection for healthcare workers during pandemics: a scoping review. *Bmj Global Heal.* 2020;5(5):e002553.
17. Brown E, Chan LM. Should chest compressions be considered an aerosol-generating procedure? A literature review in response to recent guidelines on personal protective equipment for patients with suspected COVID-19. *Clin Medicine Lond Engl.* 2020;clinmed.2020-0258.
18. Malik T, T M. COVID-19 and the Efficacy of Different Types of Respiratory Protective Equipment Used by Health Care Providers in a Health Care Setting. *Cureus J Medical Sci.* 2020;12(4):e7621.
19. Chersich MF, Gray G, Fairlie L, Eichbaum Q, Mayhew S, Allwood B, et al. COVID-19 in Africa: care and protection for frontline healthcare workers. *Globalization Health.* 2020;16(1):46.
20. Hiramatsu M, Nishio N, Ozaki M, Shindo Y, Suzuki K, Yamamoto T, et al. Anesthetic and surgical management of tracheostomy in a patient with COVID-19. *Auris Nasus Larynx.* 2020;47(3):472–6.
21. Lee S, Meyler P, Mozel M, Tauh T, Merchant R. Asymptomatic carriage and transmission of SARS-CoV-2: What do we know? *Can J Anesthesia J Can D’anesthésie.* 2020;67(10):1424–30.
22. Mueller AV, Eden MJ, Oakes JM, Bellini C, Fernandez LA. Quantitative Method for Comparative Assessment of Particle Removal Efficiency of Fabric Masks as Alternatives to Standard Surgical Masks for PPE. *Matter.* 2020;3(3):950–62.

23. Winck JC, Ambrosino N. COVID-19 pandemic and non invasive respiratory management: every Goliath needs a David. An evidence based evaluation of problems. *Pulmonol*. 2020;26(4):213–20.
24. Boškoski I, Gallo C, Wallace MB, Costamagna G. COVID-19 pandemic and personal protective equipment shortage: protective efficacy comparing masks and scientific methods for respirator reuse. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2020;92(3):519–23.
25. Convissar D, Berra L, Chang MG, Bittner EA, D C, L B, et al. Personal Protective Equipment N95 Facemask Shortage Quick Fix: The Modified Airway From VEntilatoR Circuit (MAVerIC). *Cureus J Medical Sci*. 2020;12(5):e7914.
26. Sugrue M, O’Keeffe D, Sugrue R, MacLean L, Varzgalis M. A cloth mask for under-resourced healthcare settings in the COVID19 pandemic. *Ir J Medical Sci* 1971 -. 2020;1–3.
27. Heinzerling A, Stuckey MJ, Scheuer T, Xu K, Perkins KM, Resseger H, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 to Health Care Personnel During Exposures to a Hospitalised Patient - Solano County, California, February 2020. *Mmwr Morbidity Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(15):472–6.
28. Jessop ZM, Dobbs TD, Ali SR, Combellack E, Clancy R, Ibrahim N, et al. Personal protective equipment for surgeons during COVID-19 pandemic: systematic review of availability, usage and rationing. *Brit J Surg*. 2020;107(10):1262–80.
29. Wang Q, Huang X, Bai Y, Wang X, Wang H, Hu X, et al. Epidemiological characteristics of COVID-19 in medical staff members of neurosurgery departments in Hubei province: A multicentre descriptive study. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/652a02f570d0ad3eaa7f07efe6af650a9954fa0d>
30. Wahidi MM, Shojaee S, Lamb CR, Ost D, Maldonado F, Eapen G, et al. The Use of Bronchoscopy during the COVID-19 Pandemic: CHEST/AABIP Guideline and Expert Panel Report. *Chest*. 2020;
31. Hospital DT and R. Effect of Using Barrier Devices for Intubation in COVID-19 Patients. *ClinicalTrials.gov* [Internet]. 2020; Available from: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04412226>
32. K E-B, DJN W, R O, MD N, S P, JB C, et al. Risks to healthcare workers following tracheal intubation of patients with COVID-19: a prospective international multicentre cohort study. *Anaesthesia* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/3c092e4e1b3035f4f73d5faf13a7f0baceaaaa7c>
33. Delgado D, Quintana FW, Perez G, Liprandi AS, Ponte-Negretti C, Mendoza I, et al. Personal Safety during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Realities and Perspectives of Healthcare Workers in Latin America. *Int J Environ Res Pu* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;17(8). Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/db105362dcc1a3721051a960935a1ffbaca655e4>

34. Wang X, Pan Z, Cheng Z. Association between 2019-nCoV transmission and N95 respirator use. Medrxiv [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/3c83cd8b9b57ddbe93ab39cf87dd0647094b1fff>
35. S C, G D, E G, O L, É L. Minimising COVID-19 exposure during tracheal intubation by using a transparent plastic box: a randomised prospective simulation study. Anaesth Crit Care Pa [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/8a0cac23862e1e14a8cff339b0a3df48f8081504>
36. Schumacher J, Arlidge J, Dudley D, Sicinski M, Ahmad I. The impact of respiratory protective equipment on difficult airway management: a randomised, crossover, simulation study. Anaesthesia [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/c9b8d7c95c248975d4e760d3631a1e942c127ec2>
37. Gong Y, Cao X, Mei W, Wang J, Shen L, Wang S, et al. Anesthesia Considerations and Infection Precautions for Trauma and Acute Care Cases During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Recommendations From a Task Force of the Chinese Society of Anesthesiology. Anesthesia Analgesia [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;131(2):326–34. Available from: <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/wk/ane/2020/00000131/00000002/art00069;jsessionid=4cu4t60orhkiu.x-ic-live-01>
38. DEDEILIA A, SOTIROPOULOS MG, HANRAHAN JG, JANGA D, DEDEILIAS P, SIDERIS M. Medical and Surgical Education Challenges and Innovations in the COVID-19 Era: A Systematic Review. *In Vivo*. 2020;34(3 suppl):1603–11.
39. Jones P, Roberts S, Hotu C, Kamona S. What proportion of healthcare worker masks carry virus? A systematic review. *Emerg Med Australas*. 2020;
40. Mhango M, Dzobo M, Chitungo I, Dzinamarira T. COVID-19 risk factors among health workers: A rapid review. *Saf Heal Work*. 2020;
41. Rubin GD, Ryerson CJ, Haramati LB, Sverzellati N, Kanne JP, Raouf S, et al. The Role of Chest Imaging in Patient Management During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Chest*. 2020;158(1):106–16.
42. Begg S, Emekwuru NG, Miche N, Whitney B, Ejohwomu O. Can we use these masks? Rapid Assessment of the Inhalation Resistance Performance of Uncertified Medical Face Masks in the Context of Restricted Resources Imposed during a Public Health Emergency. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/8682b912c8a0186a389d477cd83d4be9f35955c7>
43. Malysz M, Dabrowski M, Böttiger BW, Smereka J, Kulak K, Szarpak A, et al. Resuscitation of the patient with suspected/confirmed COVID-19 when wearing personal protective equipment: A randomised multicenter crossover simulation trial. *Cardiol J* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/5a7957daae0aa7285e6852a87d7512dbd9cc5722>

44. Islam MS, Rahman KM, Sun Y, Qureshi MO, Abdi I, Chughtai AA, et al. Examining the current intelligence on COVID-19 and infection prevention and control strategies in health settings: A global analysis. *Infect Cont Hosp Ep* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;1–29. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/921632ef59904515642c40647a100e43e454a35c>
45. Powell-Jackson T, King JJC, Makungu C, Spieker N, Woodd S, Risha P, et al. Infection prevention and control compliance in Tanzanian outpatient facilities: a cross-sectional study with implications for the control of COVID-19. *Lancet Global Heal* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;8(6):e780–9. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/9cf7b30d317f344ffff377fa28d1880af7d65ee8>
46. Liao L, Xiao W, Zhao M, Yu X, Wang H, Wang Q, et al. Can N95 Respirators Be Reused after Disinfection? How Many Times? *Acs Nano*. 2020;14(5):6348–56.
47. Derr TH, James MA, Kuny CV, Kandel PP, Beckman MD, Hockett KL, et al. Aerosolized Hydrogen Peroxide Decontamination of N95 Respirators, with Fit-Testing and Virologic Confirmation of Suitability for Re-Use During the COVID-19 Pandemic. n.d.;
48. Cadnum JL, Li D, Redmond SN, John AR, Pearlmutter B, Donskey C. Effectiveness of Ultraviolet-C Light and a High-Level Disinfection Cabinet for Decontamination of N95 Respirators. *Pathogens Immun*. 2020;5(1):52–67.
49. Zulauf KE, Green AB, Ba ANN, Jagdish T, Reif D, Seeley R, et al. Microwave-Generated Steam Decontamination of N95 Respirators Utilising Universally Accessible Materials. *Mbio*. 2020;11(3):e00997-20.
50. Zhong H, Zhu Z, Lin J, Cheung CF, Lu VL, Yan F, et al. Reusable and Recyclable Graphene Masks with Outstanding Superhydrophobic and Photothermal Performances. *Acs Nano*. 2020;14(5):6213–21.
51. Konda A, Prakash A, Moss GA, Schmoltdt M, Grant GD, Guha S. Aerosol Filtration Efficiency of Common Fabrics Used in Respiratory Cloth Masks. *Acs Nano*. 2020;14(5):6339–47.
52. Lenormand R, Lenormand G. Effect of ethanol cleaning on the permeability of FFP2 mask. n.d.;
53. Christensen L, Rasmussen CS, Benfield T, Franc JM. A RANDOMISED TRIAL OF INSTRUCTOR-LED TRAINING VERSUS VIDEO LESSON IN TRAINING HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS IN PROPER DORNING AND DOFFING OF PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT. *Disaster Med Public*. 2020;1–15.
54. Cramer A, Plana D, Yang HL, Carmack M, Tian E, Sinha MS, et al. Analysis of SteraMist ionised hydrogen peroxide technology in the sterilisation of N95 respirators and other PPE: a quality improvement study. *Medrxiv Prepr Serv Heal Sci*. 2020;

55. Simmons S, Carrion R, Alfson K, Staples H, Jinadatha C, Jarvis W, et al. Disinfection effect of pulsed xenon ultraviolet irradiation on SARS-CoV-2 and implications for environmental risk of COVID-19 transmission. n.d.;
56. Daeschler SC, Manson N, Joachim K, Chin AWH, Chan K, Chen PZ, et al. Reprocessing N95 Respirators During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Moist Heat Inactivates SARS-CoV-2 and Maintains N95 Filtration. n.d.;
57. Oral E, Wannomae KK, Connolly RL, Gardecki JA, Leung HM, Muratoglu OK, et al. Vapor H₂O₂ sterilisation as a decontamination method for the reuse of N95 respirators in the COVID-19 emergency. n.d.;
58. Massey T, Borucki M, Paik S, Fuhrer K, Bora M, Kane S, et al. Quantitative form and fit of N95 filtering facepiece respirators are retained and coronavirus surrogate is inactivated after heat treatments. n.d.;
59. Cramer A, Tian E, Yu SH, Galanek M, Lamere E, Li J, et al. Disposable N95 Masks Pass Qualitative Fit-Test But Have Decreased Filtration Efficiency after Cobalt-60 Gamma Irradiation. n.d.;
60. Canova V, Schlpfer HL, Piso RJ, Droll A, Fenner L, Hoffmann T, et al. Transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2 to healthcare workers –observational results of a primary care hospital contact tracing. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2020;150(1718):w20257.
61. PCL P, FC M, GV B, JY M, LP M, AM B, et al. Personal protective masks for COVID-19 prevention: quick systematic review [Internet]. 2020 Jan. (Unidade de Avaliação de Tecnologias em Saúde do Hospital Alemão Oswaldo Cruz (UATSHAOC), o Núcleo de Avaliação de Tecnologias em Saúde do Hospital Sírio-Libanês (NATS-HSL) e o Núcleo de Avaliação de Tecnologias em Saúde do Hospital Moinhos de Vento (NATS-)). Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/a394d40845ad60398cbdc51b003b094dc1bd13f1>
62. Schnitzbauer AA, Kempf VAJ, Hack D, Ciesek S, Meier S, Vehreschild MJGT, et al. [SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19: systematic review of requirements for personal protective equipment in primary patient contact and organization of the operating area]. *Der Chir Zeitschrift Fur Alle Gebiete Der Operativen Medizin*. 2020;
63. ANVISA. Guidelines for health services: prevention and control measures that should be adopted when assisting suspected or confirmed cases of infection with the new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). 2020;
64. e IPerúEsSaludI de E de T en S. Comparison of surgical (medical) masks with respirators to prevent SARS-COV-2 infection in health personnel to COVID-19 [Internet]. 2020 Jan. (Perú. EsSalud. Instituto de Evaluación de Tecnologías en Salud e Investigación.). Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/df7b81459bc0035aecf443de8516d2068c8ac59a>

65. Neuquén CP de B de la P de. Use of face masks in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic in the Neuquén Health System. 2020;
66. Gralton J, McLaws M-L. Protecting healthcare workers from pandemic influenza: N95 or surgical masks? *Crit Care Med*. 2010;38(2):657–67.
67. Brainard JS, Jones N, Lake I, Hooper L, Hunter P. Facemasks and similar barriers to prevent respiratory illness such as COVID-19: A rapid systematic review. *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/58b724cf394b38ef128755a7763937e9873616e6>
68. T A, J A, C B, R E, T E, E RH, et al. Systematic review of recommended operating room practice during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Bjs Open* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/f970ff7db2d56f70088e05b7e44e618390ea6a07>
69. Licina A, Silvers AJ, Stuart R. Use of Powered Air-Purifying Respirator(PAPR) by healthcare workers for preventing highly infectious viral diseases -a systematic review of evidence. *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/bb416519cb8b79de2d1353c5395fd5a312839b72>
70. JJ B, MAM F, W A, M L. Medical Masks vs N95 Respirators for Preventing COVID-19 in Health Care Workers A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomised Trials. *Influenza Other Resp* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;14(4):365–73. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/6f9003f5fe3ad066c139d7849695339bfa885fdd>
71. Carl-Etienne J, Toma P, Matt B, Genevieve G, Louise P. Evidence-based, cost-effective interventions to suppress the COVID-19 pandemic: a rapid systematic review. *Medrxiv* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/ab5f455bf3272c04b03d2f24a1f12465e56df044>
72. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;395(10242):1973–87. Available from: <https://pdf.sciencedirectassets.com/271074/1-s2.0-S0140673620X00262/1-s2.0-S0140673620311429/main.pdf?X-Amz-Security-Token=IQoJb3JpZ2luX2VjEBoaCXVzLWVhc3QtMSJIMEYCIQCoD3KkwwRjRlem5CjHpoQAZTpMKYH%2Fdee6PjuhONL%2BKAIhAKV55lLhNcmSFcdRwscLEGxSUDkDDjt%2By47vLl>
73. Dehaghi BF, Torbati AG, Teimori G, Ghavamabadi LI, Jamshidnezhad A. Face masks vs. COVID-19: a systematic review. *Investigación y educación en enfermería* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;38(2):[e13]-[e13]. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/46e994134165a34bd4d3f50614918c0f162e1093>
74. Houghton C, Meskell P, Delaney H, Smalle M, Glenton C, Booth A, et al. Barriers and facilitators to healthcare workers' adherence with infection prevention and control (IPC)

guidelines for respiratory infectious diseases: a rapid qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane Db Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;4:CD013582. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/5b2a4d21734e2eee405f04f28305477de64f5195>

75. Iannone P, Castellini G, Coclite D, Napoletano A, Fauci AJ, Iacorossi L, et al. The need of health policy perspective to protect Healthcare Workers during COVID-19 pandemic. A GRADE rapid review on the N95 respirators effectiveness. *Plos One* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;15(6):e0234025. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/5e623012300f6d2c2782770b1e5f1e54c9ca2264>

76. O K, S G, M S, R W, A T, R N, et al. Decontaminating N95 and SN95 masks with Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation (UVGI) does not impair mask efficacy and safety: A Systematic Review. *J Hosp Infect* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/0e3802fadd54949aaed427085071620afa7ed2a2>

77. Liang M, Gao L, Cheng C, Zhou Q, Uy JP, Heiner K, et al. Efficacy of face mask in preventing respiratory virus transmission: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Med Infect Di* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;101751. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/9db538bbd5858673f3c865b79a627580e13de25a>

78. MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. A rapid systematic review of the efficacy of face masks and respirators against coronaviruses and other respiratory transmissible viruses for the community, healthcare workers and sick patients. *Int J Nurs Stud* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;108:103629. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/f9f7fb9826c47e3f2ce9713d2096681732327585>

79. Offeddu V, Yung CF, Low MSF, Tam CC. Effectiveness of Masks and Respirators Against Respiratory Infections in Healthcare Workers: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Clin Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1;65(11):1934–42. Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/cc7fb1cf5687d99c6dd6a8050cac79782c2a7ff6>

80. Prashanth R, Thomas SJ, Ruben D, Christopher A, Shehan H. Triaging of Respiratory Protective Equipment on the assumed risk of SARS-CoV-2 aerosol exposure in patient-facing healthcare workers delivering secondary care: a rapid review. *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/c9abf390a52e030ddcf1f5ac167a5a835fefac15>

81. Tom J, Mark J, Lubna AAA, Ghada B, Elaine B, Justin C, et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Part 1 - Face masks, eye protection and person distancing: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medrxiv* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from: <http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/348eb29aefab04a7820d4def631e6ff5d35f4d25>

82. Verbeek JH, Rajamaki B, Ijaz S, Sauni R, Toomey E, Blackwood B, et al. Personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases due to exposure to contaminated body fluids in healthcare staff. *Cochrane Db Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1;5(5):CD011621.

Available from:

<http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/6dc02454ae9c2eb0a46ad45aee9ba40b9ed6ad6b>

83. DJ Z, S G, K O, N T, N A-A, T D, et al. DECONTAMINATION INTERVENTIONS FOR THE REUSE OF SURGICAL MASK PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW. *J Hosp Infect* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 1; Available from:

<http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/33a8996521f94e1e9eb3471d4dc2f78014656aa2>

84. Toomey E, Conway Y, Burton C, Smith S, Smalle M, Chan X-H, et al. Extended use or reuse of single-use surgical masks and filtering facepiece respirators: A rapid evidence review. *Medrxiv* [Internet]. 2020 JJan 1 Available from:

<http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/4d63bfdb90db91ebe6238b1edcc63830fe8bb73f>

85. Patel B, Hardman JC, Yang W, Robson A, Putnam G, George A, et al. Reusable respirators as personal protective equipment during ENT surgery. *J Laryngology Otology*. 2020;1–3.

86. Somsen GA, Rijn C van, Kooij S, Bem RA, Bonn D. Small droplet aerosols in poorly ventilated spaces and SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Lancet Respir Medicine*. 2020;8(7):658–9.

87. Doremalen N van, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *New Engl J Med*. 2020;382(16):1564–7.

88. Medicine P. Penn Medicine Statement on The Question of Droplet or Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [Internet]. Medicine P, editor. Penn Medicine; 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 24].

Available from:

[http://image.www2.pennmedicine.org/lib/fe2d117170640478711179/m/1/d6cef08a-993b-4f2f-](http://image.www2.pennmedicine.org/lib/fe2d117170640478711179/m/1/d6cef08a-993b-4f2f-b2c9-)

[8a89b8bcf373.pdf?utm_medium=Email&utm_source=SFMC&_ga=2.188560171.2014488761.1600379380-1856937710.1598565557](http://image.www2.pennmedicine.org/lib/fe2d117170640478711179/m/1/d6cef08a-993b-4f2f-b2c9-8a89b8bcf373.pdf?utm_medium=Email&utm_source=SFMC&_ga=2.188560171.2014488761.1600379380-1856937710.1598565557)

89. Prevention C for DC and. How COVID-19 Spreads [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 24].

Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html>

FIGURES

SUMMARY OF JUDGEMENTS

| PROBLEM | JUDGEMENT | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------|--------|---------------------|
| | No | Probably no | Probably yes | Yes | | Varies | Don't know |
| DESIRABLE EFFECTS | Trivial | Small | Moderate | Large | | Varies | Don't know |
| UNDESIRABLE EFFECTS | Large | Moderate | Small | Trivial | | Varies | Don't know |
| CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE | Very low | Low | Moderate | High | | | No included studies |
| VALUES | Important uncertainty or variability | Possibly important uncertainty or variability | Probably no important uncertainty or variability | No important uncertainty or variability | | | |
| BALANCE OF EFFECTS | Favors the comparison | Probably favors the comparison | Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison | Probably favors the intervention | Favors the intervention | Varies | Don't know |
| RESOURCES REQUIRED | Large costs | Moderate costs | Negligible costs and savings | Moderate savings | Large savings | Varies | Don't know |
| CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE OF REQUIRED RESOURCES | Very low | Low | Moderate | High | | | No included studies |
| COST EFFECTIVENESS | Favors the comparison | Probably favors the comparison | Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison | Probably favors the intervention | Favors the intervention | Varies | No included studies |
| EQUITY | Reduced | Probably reduced | Probably no impact | Probably increased | Increased | Varies | Don't know |
| ACCEPTABILITY | No | Probably no | Probably yes | Yes | | Varies | Don't know |
| FEASIBILITY | No | Probably no | Probably yes | Yes | | Varies | Don't know |

TYPE OF RECOMMENDATION

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Strong recommendation against the option <input type="radio"/> | Conditional recommendation against the option <input type="radio"/> | Conditional recommendation for either the option or the comparison <input type="radio"/> | Conditional recommendation for the option <input type="radio"/> | Strong recommendation for the option <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
|---|--|---|--|--|

Figure 1. GRADE summary of judgements

Description of studies

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Figure 2. PRISMA search results, study selection and inclusion process

CONCLUSIONS

Recommendation

1. It is critical to ensure that at least the minimum requirements for the perioperative use of PPE are implemented as soon as possible for trauma cases requiring emergency surgery. Immediate implementation of wearing N95 respirators is likely to avoid no more than 51 infections per 1000 HCWs, in the worst-case scenario, making unethical the deferral of implementation until more studies are available.

- NIOSH-certified N95 respirator
- Eye protection (goggles or face shield)
- Cap and Gown
- Gloves (ideally double)
- Powered air-purifying respirator in aerosol-generating procedures, such as during induction of anesthesia and intubation, when available.

2. Proper technique while donning and doffing PPE is essential in avoiding unnecessary exposure to the virus. The best-designed and engineered items of PPE will fail healthcare workers and their patients if the PPE is donned or doffed incorrectly and contamination is spread.

3. Immersive simulation can be used to address the human, system, and technical elements of PPE. Simulation training ensures familiarity prior to patient care, providing a safe environment for the 'deliberate practice' of procedural skills, communication and teamwork, and management of medical emergencies.

4. It is suggested that a step-wise, standardized system of training be established to ease decision fatigue in already overworked HCWs. Building graphic illustrations and animated videos to aid in this educational process are essential.

- Inpatients who go to emergency surgery and who have clinical criteria for COVID-19 according to the guidelines of the Colombian Ministry of Health.
- Patients who require emergency surgery and who are symptomatic with known high-risk comorbidities for complications and COVID-19 mortality during hospitalization.
- Patients who are hospitalized or arrive directly to urgent procedures and have a confirmed history of being direct contacts of patients confirmed with COVID-19 or who have been in high-risk environments of contagion (hospitalization in ICU or emergency services) in the last 14 days.

Figure 3. GRADE recommendations and conclusions

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .