

1 **International observational survey of the effectiveness of personal protective equipment**
2 **during endoscopic procedures performed in patients with COVID-19**

3 Ryota Niikura^a, Mitsuhiro Fujishiro^b, Yousuke Nakai^{a, c}, Koji Matsuda^d, Takuya Kawahara^e,
4 Atsuo Yamada^a, Yosuke Tsuji^a, Yoku Hayakawa^a, Kazuhiko Koike^a

5 a Department of Gastroenterology, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo,
6 Tokyo, Japan

7 b Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Nagoya University Graduate School of
8 Medicine, Nagoya, Japan

9 c Department of Endoscopy and Endoscopic Surgery, Graduate School of Medicine, The
10 University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

11 d St. Marianna University School of Medicine, Head of endoscopy center, Shizuoka Medical
12 Center, Shizuoka, Japan

13 e Clinical Research Promotion Center, The University of Tokyo Hospital, Tokyo, Japan

14 **Short title:** PPE for COVID-19

15 **Corresponding author:** Yousuke Nakai

16 Department of Gastroenterology, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1

17 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8655, Japan

18 Tel.: +81-3-3815-5411 Fax: +81-3-3815-5411

19 Email: ynakai-tky@umin.ac.jp.

20 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Endoscopy, Gastrointestinal bleeding, and personal protective

21 equipment

22 **Abstract**

23 **Introduction and aims:** This international survey was performed to evaluate the cumulative
24 incidence of nosocomial novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) among healthcare
25 professionals during endoscopic procedures.

26 **Methods:** We performed an international web-based self-reported questionnaire survey.
27 Participants completed the questionnaires every week for 12 weeks. The questionnaire elicited
28 responses regarding the development of COVID-19 and details of the PPE used.

29 **Results:** All 483 participants were included in the analysis. Participants had a mean age of 42.3
30 years and comprised 68.3% males. The geographic distribution of the study population was Asia
31 (89.2%), Europe (2.9%), North and South America (4.8%), Oceania (0.6%), and Africa (1.5%).
32 The most common endoscopy-related role of the participants was endoscopist (78.7%), and
33 74.5% had > 10 years of experience. Fourteen participants had performed 83 endoscopic
34 procedures in patients positive for COVID-19. During the mean follow-up period of 4.95 weeks,
35 there were no cases of COVID-19 when treating COVID-19 positive patients. The most common
36 PPE used by participants treating patients with COVID-19 was a surgical mask plus N95 mask
37 plus face shield, goggles, cap, long-sleeved isolation gown, and single pair of gloves. The most
38 common PPE used by participants treating patients without COVID-19 was a surgical mask, no
39 face shield but goggles, cap, long-sleeved isolation gown, and single pair of gloves during all
40 endoscopic procedures.

41 **Conclusions:** The risk of COVID-19 transmission during any endoscopic procedure was low in
42 clinical practice.

43

44

45 **Introduction**

46 The morbidity and mortality of novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) are increasing
47 worldwide. The virus responsible for this disease, severe acute respiratory syndrome
48 coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), is highly infectious and causes nosocomial infection in healthcare
49 professionals [1]. Especially, endoscopic procedures have a potentially high risk for healthcare
50 professionals due to transmission via aerosol from COVID-19 patients [2-7]. In addition, SARS-
51 CoV-2 has also been detected in stool specimens, suggesting a possible risk of fecal–oral
52 transmission [8], similar to SARS [9,10]. However, although endoscopic procedures pose a risk
53 of COVID-19 transmission, they are often necessary for diagnosis and treatment of
54 gastrointestinal (GI) bleeding, malignancies, obstructive jaundice, and cholangitis.
55 Recently, a research group in Italy [11] and the World Endoscopy Organization [12] performed a
56 hospital-based email questionnaire survey among endoscopy units and clarified the current status
57 of personal protective equipment (PPE) use when performing endoscopic procedures in patients
58 with a positive diagnosis or suspected COVID-19. Although these data represent very important
59 initial reports, we considered the further necessity of data regarding the type of PPE used during
60 endoscopic procedures in patients with different risks of COVID-19 transmission. The
61 incidences of SARS-CoV-2 genomic mutations and clinical COVID-19 reportedly vary among
62 geographic regions [13]. Therefore, we designed an international web-based questionnaire
63 survey for endoscopy-related healthcare professionals (UMIN000040162) consisting of 16
64 questions regarding the use of PPE, such as surgical masks, face shields, goggles, gowns, and
65 gloves. The aims of this survey were to evaluate cumulative short-term incidence rates of
66 COVID-19 and to share information among healthcare providers regarding the appropriate PPE
67 use to prevent COVID-19 transmission.

68

69 **Methods**

70 *Design and participants*

71 We performed an international web-based questionnaire survey among endoscopy-related
72 healthcare professionals, including endoscopists, nurses, laboratory technicians, and endoscopy
73 reprocessing technicians working in the endoscopy suite. Participants were invited to join the
74 survey by the principal investigators related to personal communication and World Endoscopy
75 Organization volunteer members and were enrolled by snow-ball sampling methods. The survey
76 began on April 15, 2020 and ended on August 8, 2020. Participants completed web-based
77 questionnaires every week for 12 weeks, prompted by automated reminder emails using Google
78 Forms®. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Tokyo Hospital
79 (No. 2020046NI).

80 *Web-based questionnaire*

81 The web-based questionnaire included items regarding COVID-19 development, age, sex, role
82 (endoscopist, nurse, laboratory technician, endoscopy reprocessing technician), geographical
83 area (North America, South America, Africa, Asia, Europe, Oceania), number of years of
84 experience, PPE (mask and face shield, goggles and face shield, cap, gown, gloves), endoscopic
85 procedures (esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD), colonoscopy, endoscopic retrograde
86 cholangiopancreatography (ERCP), endoscopic ultrasound (EUS), endoscopic hemostasis,
87 endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD)) performed in patients with and without confirmed
88 COVID-19, and PPE replacement frequency (After each procedure, every day, 1-7day, every
89 week). N95 masks were defined as N95 (United States NIOSH-42CFR84), FFP2 (Europe EN
90 149-2001), KN95 (China GB2626-2006), P2 (Australia/New Zealand AS/NZA 1716:2012),

91 Korea 1st class (Korea KMOEL - 2017-64), and DS (Japan JMHLW-Notification 214, 2018)
92 masks. The details of the questionnaire are shown in Supplementary Table 1.

93 *PPE evaluation*

94 We evaluated each PPE for protection of the mouth, eyes, body, and hands and defined each as
95 mask and face shield, goggles and face shield, cap and gown, and gloves. We also defined the
96 minimum and maximum use of each PPE category as follows. For the mask and face shield
97 category, the minimum PPE use consisted of a surgical mask, followed by N95 mask, and the
98 maximum was N95 mask plus face shield. Regarding goggles and face shields, the minimum was
99 no goggles or face shield, followed by face shield but no goggles, and goggles but no face shield;
100 the maximum PPE was use of both goggles and face shield. For caps, the minimum and
101 maximum were no use and use of a cap, respectively. Regarding gowns, the minimum was short-
102 sleeved vinyl-type gown, followed by short-sleeved vinyl-type gown plus arm covers, and long-
103 sleeved vinyl-type gown; the maximum was long-sleeved isolation-type gown. For gloves, the
104 minimum and maximum uses were a single pair and double pair of gloves, respectively.

105 *Statistics*

106 The full analysis set included participants who had not been diagnosed with COVID-19 at
107 baseline to exclude potential cases of community-acquired or nosocomial infection not related to
108 endoscopic procedures. The primary outcome was the incidence of COVID-19 when treating
109 COVID-19 positive patients, defined as a self-reported positive PCR test in the absence of close
110 contact with an infected subject other than patients among participants who performed
111 endoscopic procedures for COVID-19-positive patients; this was censored at the date of
112 completion of the final questionnaire. The secondary outcome was the incidence of COVID-19
113 when treating patients without confirmed COVID-19.

114 The Kaplan–Meier method was used to estimate the cumulative incidence of COVID-19 over a
115 12-week period from the start to questionnaire response was calculated. Number of COVID-19
116 new cases were evaluated using public site data ([https://github.com/owid/covid-19-](https://github.com/owid/covid-19-data/tree/master/public/data)
117 [data/tree/master/public/data](https://github.com/owid/covid-19-data/tree/master/public/data)). The statistical analyses were performed using SAS software
118 (version 9.4; SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

119

120 **Results**

121 From April 15 to August 8, 2020, a total of 488 participants were invited to join the survey. After
122 excluding 5 because of a diagnosis of COVID-19 at baseline, 483 participants were included in
123 the analysis. Of 483 participants, 103 participants (21.3%) completed the questionnaire during
124 the 12 weeks of the study. Number of COVID-19 new cases during study period is shown in

125 **Figure 1.**

126 *Participant characteristics and endoscopic procedures*

127 The participants had a mean age of 42.3 years and comprised 68.3% (330/483) males. The
128 distribution according to geographic area was as follows: Asia (89.2%), Europe (2.9%), North
129 and South America (4.8%), Oceania (0.6%), and Africa (1.5%). The most common endoscopy-
130 related role of the participants was endoscopist (78.7%), and 74.5% had more than 10 years of
131 experience. The participants had performed EGD (401), colonoscopy (342), ERCP and EUS
132 (211), upper GI hemostasis (79), lower GI hemostasis (45), upper GI ESD (104), and lower GI
133 ESD (49; multiple responses included).

134 Change of each endoscopic procedure volume during study period are shown in **Figure 2**. EGD
135 volume was increased (A), and other procedure volumes were same level at beginning and end of
136 the study (B-E).

137 *COVID-19 incidence and the minimum and most common PPE used when treating COVID-19-*
138 *positive patients*

139 Fourteen participants performed 83 endoscopic procedures in patients with a positive diagnosis
140 of COVID-19. None of these participants developed COVID-19 over the mean follow-up period
141 of 4.95 weeks (**Figure 3A**). The distribution according to geographic area was as follows: Asia,
142 43%; Europe, 22%; North and South America, 21%; Oceania, 7%; and Africa, 7%. The
143 procedures performed were EGD by 11 participants, colonoscopy by 7, ERCP and EUS by 10,
144 hemostasis during EGD by 6, hemostasis during colonoscopy by 3, and upper GI ESD by 2. The
145 details are shown in **Table 2**.

146 The minimum PPE used was a surgical mask (21%), face shield but no goggles (14%), no cap
147 (43%), short-sleeved vinyl-type gown (7%), and single pair of gloves (64%). The most common
148 PPE used was a surgical mask plus N95 mask (36%) or N95 mask (36%), face shield but no
149 goggles (50%), cap (57%), long-sleeved isolation-type gown (71%), and single pair of gloves
150 (64%) (**Table 2**).

151 *COVID-19 incidence and the minimum and most common PPE used when treating patients*
152 *without confirmed COVID-19*

153 One participant who treated patients without confirmed COVID-19 developed COVID-19 over
154 the mean follow-up period of 4.45 weeks (**Figure 3B**).

155 The minimum and most common PPE use with regard to masks was use of a surgical mask
156 during all endoscopic procedures. The minimum PPE regarding face shields and goggles was no
157 use of a face shield or goggles during all endoscopic procedures. The most common PPE use
158 regarding face shields and goggles was no use of face shield but use of goggles. The minimum
159 and most common PPE use regarding caps was use of a cap except for ESD. The minimum and

160 most common PPE regarding gowns was no use of a gown and use of a long-sleeved isolation-
161 type gown, respectively, during all endoscopic procedures. The minimum and most common
162 PPE use regarding gloves was a single pair of gloves (**Table 3**).

163 *Change of PPE replacement frequency*

164 Change of mask, cap, and gown replacement frequencies were same level at beginning and end
165 of the study (**Figure 4**). Most common replacement frequency was every day in mask and cap,
166 and each procedure in gown, respectively.

167

168 **Discussion**

169 In this international questionnaire survey, we found that the transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2
170 during endoscopic procedures was not high in appropriate PPE settings. In addition, our data
171 suggest that the minimum PPE to prevent the development of COVID-19 was less than expected.
172 In contrast to previous concerns, none of participant developed COVID-19 when treating
173 COVID-19 positive patients and one participant developed COVID-19 when treating patients
174 without confirmed COVID-19. There are two possible explanations for this discrepancy. First,
175 most cases of nosocomial COVID-19 may occur when PPE is absent or insufficient in situations
176 where healthcare professionals are unaware of the infection status of the patient. A recent
177 European study also reported a low risk of COVID-19 transmission in endoscopy settings [14],
178 which supported our findings. Another reason for the low incidence rate of COVID-19 in our
179 study may be related to the procedure time and distance between the patient and healthcare
180 professionals compared with other medical practices in the infectious ward. Most EGDs and
181 colonoscopies take minutes to tens of minutes; upper and lower GI hemostasis and ERCP are
182 completed within 1 hour, and even the longest ESD procedures are completed within a few

183 hours. In addition, a certain distance is maintained between the patient and endoscopist, and no
184 close contact with the patient is necessary.

185 The results of our survey identified the minimum PPE used during endoscopic procedures in
186 patients diagnosed with COVID-19. With regard to masks, a surgical mask may have the
187 potential to reduce COVID-19 transmission, it was consistent with previous observations [15].
188 The use of a face shield or goggles may help prevent transmission risk via the eyes. Therefore,
189 we suggested the use of a surgical mask, or a face shield or goggles, any type of long-sleeved
190 gown, and a single pair of gloves as the minimum PPE when performing EGD, colonoscopy,
191 ERCP and EUS, upper and lower GI hemostasis, and upper GI ESD procedures in COVID-19-
192 positive patients. However, further studies to collect data from more endoscopic procedures
193 conducted in patients with a COVID-19 over longer-term observation periods are needed to
194 elucidate the appropriate PPE to prevent the development of COVID-19 related to endoscopic
195 procedures.

196 In contrast to many health care providers concerns, replacement frequencies of mask, cap, and
197 gown were maintained at the similar levels throughout the study period (Figure 4). The most
198 common timing to replacement was "every day" in mask and cap, and "after each procedure" in
199 gown, respectively.

200 This was the first longitudinal international survey to evaluate the incidence of nosocomial
201 COVID-19 among healthcare professionals involved in endoscopic procedures. Our survey
202 included participant from all continents except Antarctica and included both areas with high and
203 low rates of SARS-CoV-2 infection. In addition, we used a solid questionnaire survey system to
204 collect high-quality questionnaire data. Repeat questionnaire surveys will enable us to perform
205 survival analyses of patients with COVID-19. However, our study had some limitations. First,

206 the primary outcome data were collected using self-reported questionnaires only, and we did not
207 perform additional surveys, such as collection of PCR or computed tomography data, to confirm
208 the events to protect the privacy of the participants. In addition, we may have missed some
209 COVID-19 events because some participants developed severe pneumonia and did not respond
210 to the survey during the follow-up period. However, we invited participants using a personal
211 private network among academic experts, and we are continuously collecting data. Therefore, we
212 believe the data to be both reliable and of high quality. Second, differential diagnosis of
213 community-acquired and endoscopy-related SARS-CoV-2 infections may be difficult. Third, our
214 primary outcome definition was COVID-19 development, not COVID-19 pneumonia, or other
215 symptoms development.

216 In conclusion, the risk of COVID-19 transmission during endoscopic procedures, including
217 EGD, colonoscopy, ERCP and EUS, upper and lower GI hemostasis, and upper GI ESD, was
218 low in PPE settings.

219

220 **Acknowledgments:** We thank all the participants and their families.

221 **Statement of Ethics:** The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of
222 Tokyo Hospital (No. 2020046NI) and conducted ethically in accordance with the World Medical
223 Association Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consents were obtained by web survey.

224 **Conflict of Interest Statement:** The authors declare no competing interests.

225 **Funding Sources:** None.

226 **Author Contributions:** All authors contributed to the design of the study. T. Kawahara
227 performed the data management and statistical analysis. R. Niikura drafted the manuscript. All
228 authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

229 **Word count: 2014 words**

230

231 **References**

232 1 Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health
233 concern. *Lancet*. 2020; **395**: 470-3.

234 2 Soetikno R, Teoh AYB, Kaltenbach T, Lau JYW, Asokkumar R, Cabral-Prodigalidad P, et al.
235 Considerations in performing endoscopy during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Gastrointest.Endosc.*
236 2020; **92**:176-83.

237 3 Chiu PWY, Ng SC, Inoue H, Reddy DN, Ling Hu E, Cho JY, et al. Practice of endoscopy
238 during COVID-19 pandemic: position statements of the Asian Pacific Society for Digestive
239 Endoscopy (APSDE-COVID statements). *Gut*. 2020; **69**: 991-6.

240 4 Tang JW, Li Y, Eames I, Chan PKS, Ridgway GL. Factors involved in the aerosol
241 transmission of infection and control of ventilation in healthcare premises. *J Hosp Infect*. 2006;
242 **64**: 100-14.

243 5 Johnston ER, Habib-Bein N, Dueker JM, Quiroz B, Corsaro E, Ambrogio M, et al. Risk of
244 bacterial exposure to the endoscopist's face during endoscopy. *Gastrointest.Endosc.* 2019; **89**:
245 818-24.

246 6 Furuta T, Irisawa A, Matsumoto T, Kawai T, Inaba T, Kanno A, et al. Clinical Questions and
247 Answers on Gastrointestinal Endoscopy during the Novel COVID-19 Pandemic. *Dig Endosc.*
248 Published online: 29 May 2020; DOI: 10.1111/den.13757.

249 7 Irisawa A, Furuta T, Matsumoto T, Kawai T, Inaba T, Kanno A, et al. Gastrointestinal
250 endoscopy in the era of the acute pandemic of coronavirus disease 2019: Recommendations by

- 251 Japan Gastroenterological Endoscopy Society. *Dig Endosc*. Published online: 26 April 2020;
252 DOI: 10.1111/den.13703.
- 253 8 Lamers MM, Beumer J, van der Vaart J, Knoop K, Puschhof J, Breugem TI, et al. SARS-
254 CoV-2 productively infects human gut enterocytes. *Science*. Published online: 1 May 2020; DOI:
255 10.1126/science.abc1669.
- 256 9 Leung WK, To KF, Chan PK, Chan HL, Wu AK, Lee N, et al. Enteric involvement of severe
257 acute respiratory syndrome-associated coronavirus infection. *Gastroenterology*. 2003; **125**:
258 1011-7.
- 259 10 Chan KH, Poon LL, Cheng VC, Guan Y, Hung IF, Kong J, et al. Detection of SARS
260 coronavirus in patients with suspected SARS. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004; **10**: 294-9.
- 261 11 Repici A, Pace F, Gabbiadini R, Colombo M, Hassan C, Dinelli M, et al. Endoscopy Units
262 and the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Outbreak: A Multicenter Experience From Italy.
263 *Gastroenterology*. Published online: 10 April 2020; DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.04.003.
- 264 12 Parasa S, Reddy N, Faigel DO, Repici A, Emura F, Sharma P. Global Impact of the COVID-
265 19 Pandemic on Endoscopy: An International Survey of 252 Centers from 55 Countries.
266 *Gastroenterology*. Published online: 11 June 2020; DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.06.009.
- 267 13 Forster P, Forster L, Renfrew C, Forster M. Phylogenetic network analysis of SARS-CoV-2
268 genomes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020; **117**: 9241-3.
- 269 14 Repici A, Aragona G, Cengia G, Cantu P, Spadaccini M, Maselli R, et al. Low risk of covid-
270 19 transmission in GI endoscopy. *Gut*. Published online: 22 April 2020; DOI: 10.1136/gutjnl-
271 2020-321341.
- 272 15 Boskoski I, Gallo C, Wallace MB, Costamagna G. COVID-19 pandemic and personal
273 protective equipment shortage: protective efficacy comparing masks and scientific methods for

274 respirator reuse. *Gastrointest.Endosc.* Published online: 27 April 2020;

275 DOI:10.1016/j.gie.2020.04.048.

276

277 **Table 1. Participant characteristics (*n* = 483)**

Variable	Number (%)
Age, mean \pm standard deviation, years	42.3 \pm 9.0
Sex, female/male/no response	151 (31.3)/330 (68.3)/2 (0.4)
Geographic area	
Asia	431 (89.2)
Europe	14 (2.9)
North/South America	23 (4.8)
Oceania	3 (0.6)
Africa	7 (1.5)
No response	5 (1.0)
Role in endoscopic procedures	
Endoscopist	380 (78.7)
Nurse	75 (15.5)
Laboratory technician	24 (5.0)
Cleaner	2 (0.4)
No response	2 (0.4)
Number of years of experience	
< 5 years	44 (9.1)
5 to < 10 years	77 (16.0)
\geq 10 years	360 (74.5)
No response	2 (0.4)

Endoscopic procedures performed in COVID-19 patients 14 (2.9)

Endoscopic procedure performed in non-COVID-19

patients*

EGD	401
Colonoscopy	342
ERCP and EUS	211
Upper GI Hemostasis	79
Lower GI Hemostasis	45
Upper GI ESD	104
Lower GI ESD	49

278 * Multiple responses allowed

279 Abbreviations: EGD, esophagogastroduodenoscopy; ERCP, endoscopic retrograde

280 cholangiopancreatography; EUS, endoscopic ultrasound; GI, gastrointestinal.

281

282 **Table 2. Endoscopic procedures and personal protective equipment used during**
283 **procedures performed in patients with confirmed COVID-19 (*n* = 14)**

Variable	Number (%)
Endoscopic procedure	
EGD	11 (79)
Colonoscopy	7 (50)
ERCP and EUS	10 (71)
Upper GI hemostasis	6 (43)
Lower GI hemostasis	3 (21)
Upper GI ESD	2 (14)
Mask	
No use	1 (7)
Surgical mask	3 (21)
N95	5 (36)
Surgical mask + N95 mask	5 (36)
Face shield and goggles	
No use of face shield or goggles	0
Use of face shield but no goggles	2 (14)
No use of face shield but use of goggles	7 (50)
Use of face shield and goggles	5 (36)
Cap	
No use	6 (43)

Use	8 (57)
-----	--------

Gown

Short-sleeved vinyl-type	1 (7)
--------------------------	-------

Short-sleeved vinyl-type + arm cover	0
--------------------------------------	---

Long-sleeved vinyl-type	3 (21)
-------------------------	--------

Long-sleeved isolation-type	10 (71)
-----------------------------	---------

Gloves

Single pair	9 (64)
-------------	--------

Double pair	5 (36)
-------------	--------

284 Abbreviations: EGD, esophagogastroduodenoscopy; ERCP, endoscopic retrograde

285 cholangiopancreatography; EUS, endoscopic ultrasound.

286

Table 3. Endoscopic procedures and personal protective equipment used during procedures performed in patients without confirmed COVID-19

Variable	EGD <i>n</i> = 401 (%)	Colonoscopy <i>n</i> = 342 (%)	ERCP and EUS <i>n</i> = 211 (%)	Hemostasis <i>n</i> = 101 (%)	ESD <i>n</i> = 117 (%)
Mask					
No use	28 (7.0)	24 (7.0)	13 (6.2)	5 (5.0)	8 (6.8)
Surgical mask	274 (68.3)	231 (67.5)	127 (60.2)	62 (61.4)	95 (81.2)
N95 mask	49 (12.2)	42 (12.3)	35 (16.6)	14 (13.8)	6 (5.1)
Surgical mask + N95 mask	50 (12.5)	45 (13.2)	36 (17.0)	20 (19.8)	8 (6.9)
Face shield and goggles					
No use of face shield or goggles	49 (12.2)	40 (11.7)	34 (16.1)	11 (10.9)	12 (10.3)
Use of face shield but no goggles	47 (11.7)	36 (10.5)	25 (11.9)	13 (12.9)	8 (6.8)
No use of face shield but use of goggles	216 (53.9)	187 (54.7)	102 (48.3)	49 (48.5)	71 (60.7)
Use of face shield and goggles	89 (22.2)	79 (23.1)	50 (23.7)	28 (27.7)	26 (22.2)
Cap					
No use	199 (49.6)	170 (49.7)	103 (48.8)	46 (45.5)	62 (53.0)
Use	202 (50.4)	172 (50.3)	108 (51.2)	55 (54.5)	55 (47.0)

Gown

No use	10 (2.5)	9 (2.6)	4 (1.9)	2 (2.0)	3 (2.6)
Short-sleeved vinyl-type	45 (11.2)	43 (12.6)	28 (13.3)	9 (8.9)	10 (8.6)
Short-sleeved vinyl-type + arm cover	12 (3.0)	12 (3.5)	5 (2.4)	4 (3.9)	4 (3.4)
Long-sleeved vinyl-type	95 (23.7)	78 (22.8)	58 (27.4)	19 (18.8)	17 (14.5)
Long-sleeved isolation-type	239 (59.6)	200 (58.5)	116 (55.0)	67 (66.4)	83 (70.9)

Gloves

Single pair	346 (86.3)	296 (86.5)	179 (84.8)	82 (81.2)	106 (90.6)
Double pair	55 (13.7)	46 (13.5)	32 (15.2)	19 (18.8)	11 (9.4)

Abbreviations: EGD, esophagogastroduodenoscopy; ERCP, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; EUS, endoscopic ultrasound.

Figure legend

Figure 1. COVID-19 pandemic during study period

Figure 2. Change of endoscopic procedure volume during study period

(A) 10 or more upper endoscopy (B) 10 or more colonoscopy (C) One or more ERCP and

EUS (D) One or more ESD (E) One or more upper and lower GI hemostasis


Bar shows 95% confidence interval.



Figure 3. (A) COVID-19 incidence when treating COVID-19-positive patients (B) COVID-

19 incidence when treating patients without confirmed COVID-19


Figure 4. Change of personal protective equipment replacement frequency

(A) Mask (B) Cap (C) Gown




A**B**

(A) Mask



(B) Cap



(C) Gown

