Hands are frequently contaminated with fecal bacteria and enteric pathogens globally: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Molly E. Cantrell[1], Émile Sylvestre[2], Hannah Wharton[8], Rahel Scheidegger[3], Lou Curchod[3], David M. Gute[1], Jeffrey Griffiths[1,4,5], Timothy R Julian[2,6,7#]*, Amy J. Pickering[1,8,9#]*

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tufts University, Medford, MA, 02155, US

[2] Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, 8600, Dubendorf, Switzerland

[3] ETH Zurich, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, 8092, Zurich, Switzerland

[4] Department of Public Health and Family Medicine, Tufts Medical School, Tufts University, Boston, MA, 02111, US

[5] Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts University, Boston, MA, 02111, US

[6] Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, 4051, Basel, Switzerland

[7] University of Basel, 4001, Basel, Switzerland

[8] Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, CA, 94720, US

[9] Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, CA

*Correspondence to: Tim.Julian@eawag.ch; pickering@berkeley.edu

#Authors contributed equally

Abstract

Enteric pathogen infections are a leading cause of morbidity and mortality globally, with the highest disease burden in low-income countries. Hands act as intermediaries in enteric pathogen transmission, transferring enteric pathogens between people and the environment through contact with fomites, food, water, and soil. In this study, we conducted a systematic review of prevalence and concentrations of fecal indicator microorganisms (i.e., *E. coli*, fecal coliform) and enteric pathogens on hands. We identified eighty-four studies, reporting 35,440 observations of

hand contamination of people in community or household settings. The studies investigated 44 unique microorganisms, of which the most commonly reported indicators were *E. coli* and fecal coliforms. Hand contamination with 12 unique enteric pathogens was reported, with adenovirus and norovirus as the most frequent. Mean *E. coli* prevalence on hands was 62% [95% CI 40%-82%] and mean fecal coliform prevalence was 66% [95% CI 22%-100%]. Hands were more likely to be contaminated with *E. coli* in low/lower-middle-income countries (prevalence: 69% [95% CI 48% - 88%]) than in upper-middle/high-income countries (6% [95% CI 2% - 12%]). The review also highlighted the importance of standardizing hand sampling methods, as hand rinsing was associated with greater fecal contamination compared to other sampling methods.

Key Words: hand contamination, fecal indicator bacteria, fecal indicator microorganisms, enteric pathogens, global

Introduction

Hands are an important route of enteric pathogen transmission. The routes enteric pathogens can take from contaminated feces to a susceptible host are complex and include fomites, food, drinking water, and soil (see the fecal-diagram, Figure S1). Hands can facilitate direct exposure to pathogens (hand-to-mouth contacts), as well as indirect exposure through contact with drinking water, food, and fomites (1).

Several studies have implicated contaminated hands in child diarrheal disease risk (2,3). A study of handwashing interventions at day care centers in the United States showed significant reductions in child diarrheal disease (4). Similarly, in rural Bangladesh, a study of households measured fecal contamination in hands, soil, water, flies, and food, and found that hands were the most strongly associated with increased subsequent risk of diarrheal illness among children under five years old (3). In an exposure study in India, infants mouthing their own hands posed the second highest daily risk of enteric infection after soil ingestion (5). A fecal exposure assessment model showed that children in Tanzania ingest a significantly greater amount of feces each day from hand-to-mouth contacts (0.93 mg) than from drinking water (0.098 mg) (2) . Another Tanzanian study found that viral pathogens were more frequently found on hands than in drinking water (6). Further evidence on the role of contaminated hands in diarrheal disease risks includes evidence of the efficacy of hand hygiene interventions on reducing diarrheal disease risks in communities globally (4,7–9). The goal of this study is to determine the extent to which hands are contaminated with enteric pathogens and other fecal indicators. We further aimed to identify factors that influence the prevalence and concentrations of fecal and enteric pathogen contamination on hands, including age, gender, country income, urbanicity, climate, and hand sampling method.

Materials and Methods

We conducted a systematic review of fecal indicator microorganisms and enteric pathogen detection on hands following the PRISMA-P guidelines (see Supplemental Information for PRISMA-P Checklist and search terms). Studies were identified in an electronic search of PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science databases, first in March 2018, updated in June 2020, and updated again in September 2022. The following search terms were used: (((fecal OR pathogenic OR enteric) AND bacteria) OR e. coli OR enterococci OR helminth OR protozoa OR virus OR

phage) AND hand AND contamination. Two independent reviewers completed initial title and abstract screening and a third reviewer resolved discrepancies. Data extraction from each study was completed by one reviewer and checked by a second; data extraction included type of organism, prevalence (defined as percentage of hand samples positive for the organism), the concentration of the organism measured on hands, methods used, and detection limit. Given wide variation in the units used to report hand contamination, mean concentration values were synthesized and reported using units of $\log_{10}$CFU/hand (see Supplemental Information).

We included peer-reviewed published studies of all designs that measured fecal indicators or enteric pathogens on human hands for people in non-occupational settings, such as in households and communities. Studies were excluded for the following reasons: microorganisms measured were not enteric pathogens or fecal indicators; hands were artificially contaminated with bacteria; studies did not present primary data; studies were conducted in occupational settings such as food handling, farm, clinical, or laboratory settings; and/or dealt with food and animal contamination.

We conducted a meta-analysis to analyze the subset of studies with estimates of the prevalence rates (defined as the proportion of hands with detectable contamination) for *E. coli* and fecal coliforms. *E. coli* and fecal coliforms were chosen as the fecal indicators to use for a meta-analysis because they were reported by the largest number of studies. Within the meta-analysis, we combined the prevalence rates of hand contamination using the inverse variance method to obtain a weighted average across individual studies. We modelled the mean proportion $\hat{p}$ (the number of positive samples n_S divided by the total number of samples n), as a Bernoulli trial process. For the ith study, the variance of the estimator of $\hat{p}$ can be approximated with a normal distribution as follows:

$$Var(\hat{p}_i) = \frac{\hat{p}_i(1-\hat{p}_i)}{n_i} \qquad (1)$$

Using the inverse variance method, the weight for the ith study is then $w_i = 1/Var(\hat{p}_i)$. We used a double arcsine function to transform the prevalence $\hat{p}$ to a value that is not constrained to the 0-1 range and back-transformed to $\hat{p}$ after pooling (10). To calculate pooled sample prevalences, we chose an inverse variance heterogeneity (IVhet) model rather than the more conventional random-effects model. The advantage of the IVhet model is that it can maintain the individual study weights despite substantial between-study heterogeneity (11). We evaluated

publication bias with Luis Furuya-Kanamori (LFK) index and Doi plots (12). We performed analyses with the MetaXL add-in version 5.3 in Microsoft Excel and the *metafor* package in R (13).

We compared *E. coli* and fecal coliform prevalence between i) children and adults, ii) country income groups (low and lower-middle vs. upper-middle, and high-income), iii) urban and rural areas, iv) climate classifications (Köppen-Geiger), and v) types of hand sampling methods. We tested for differences between the mean pooled prevalence of two groups using a two-sample z-test allowing unequal variance. Country income levels were based on World Bank country income classifications (available via the *World Bank Data Help Desk*, https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/) for the year the study was conducted; if that information was not reported, then the year the study was published was used (see Supplemental Information for how fiscal year 2023 classifications are defined). The climate classifications were based on Köppen-Geiger Climate Classifications where zone A is tropical or equatorial, zone B is arid or dry, zone C is warm/mild temperate, zone D is continental, and zone E is polar (14).

Results and Discussion

Fecal indicator bacteria and enteric pathogens

We identified 84 studies, which reported forty-four unique fecal indicator bacteria and enteric pathogens found on hands (n=35,440 observations). The paper search selection process, including records identified and excluded is reported in Figure S2. Of the 44 unique microorganisms reported, 12 were pathogens (inclusive of enteric and opportunistic pathogens) and the other 32 were fecal indicator bacteria. The most common indicators were *E. coli* (56 studies, or 67%), fecal coliforms (24 studies, or 29%), and enterococci (9 studies, or 11%). The most commonly measured pathogens were adenovirus (5 studies) and norovirus (5 studies). All indicators reported are summarized in Table 1. We note that not including specific names of enteric pathogens in our search terms may have limited the number of papers identified reporting enteric pathogens.

Table 1: Pathogens and indicators measured on hands as reported in the included studies

Type of Micro-organsim	Microorganism	Total Number of Studies	Prevalence				Concentration				Countries, References
			Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Percent Positive (%, average)[1]	Range (%)	Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Mean Concentration (log_{10}CFU/hand, simple weighted average by sample size)	Range	
Bacteria	Aerobic Plate Count[2]	2	2	99	92	84 – 100	1	74	4.38	-	Ireland(15) U.S.(16)
	Bacillus spp	2	2	370	5.2	3 – 7.5	0	-	-	-	Mauritius(17) Mauritius(18)
	Bacteroidales Cow[2]	2	2	1185	93.3	89.6 – 97.5	1	914	3.80 log_{10} gene copies / hand	3.67 – 3.84 log_{10} gene copies / hand	Bangladesh(19) India(20)
	Bacteroidales General	5	5	1333	78.9	50 – 98.8	2	935	2.53 log_{10} gene copies / hand	2.44-2.8 log_{10} gene copies / hand	Bangladesh(21) India(22) Tanzania(23) Tanzania(24) India(20)
	Bacteroidales Human[2]	5	5	2039	21	3 – 32.2	1	271	1.93 log_{10} gene copies / hand	1.91-1.94 log_{10} gene copies / hand	Bangladesh(19) Tanzania(6) India(22) Tanzania(24) India(20)
	Camplyobacter jejuni	2	2	155	10.0	2.2 - 15	2	-110	1.46 log_{10} gene copies / hand	1.17 – 1.94 log_{10} gene copies / hand	Kenya(25) Uganda(26)

[1] For indicators with 2-9 studies, percent positive is calculated as the unweighted arithmetic mean of the percent positive values reported by the individual studies. For indicators with at least 10 studies (only *E. col* and fecal coliforms), percent positive was calculated using the explained meta-analysis and the 95% confidence interval is reported.

[2] Commonly used fecal indicator bacteria

Type of Micro-organsim	Microorganism	Total Number of Studies	Prevalence				Concentration				Countries, References
			Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Percent Positive (%, average)[1]	Range (%)	Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Mean Concentration (log_{10}CFU/hand, simple weighted average by sample size)	Range	
	Clostridium perfringens	1	0	-	-	-	1	900	1.54	-	Bangladesh(27)
	Coagulase negative *Staphylococcus spp.*	3	3	770	70.2	45 – 95.5	0	-	-	-	Mauritius(17) Mauritius(18) India(28)
	Commensal flora	1	1	133	31.5	-	0	-	-	-	India(29)
	Diarrheagenic *E. coli* (DEC)[3]	3	3	1006	7.52	0.3 – 19.6	1	222	1.25	-	Bangladesh(19) Tanzania(6) Tanzania(30)
	E. coli[2]	56	47	20288	62 [40, 82]	0.5 – 100	35	17999	1.16	-0.1 – 6.7	Pakistan(31) Kenya(25) India(32) India(33) Bangladesh(21) Bangladesh(34) Croatia(35) Tanzania(36) Netherlands(37) India, Mozambique(38) Great Britain(39) India(40) Bangladesh(41) Zimbabwe(42) Bangladesh(19) Democratic Republic of Congo(43)

[3] Diarrheagenic *E. coli* includes Enterohemorragic *E. coli* (EHEC, stx1, stx2, eaeA), Enteroinvasive *E. coli* (EIEC, ipaH), Enteropathogenic *E. coli* (EPEC), Enterotoxigenic *E coli* (ETEC, stib/ltib), Shiga-toxin producing *E. coli* (STEC)

Type of Micro-organsim	Microorganism	Total Number of Studies	Prevalence				Concentration				Countries, References
			Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Percent Positive (%, average)[1]	Range (%)	Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Mean Concentration (log_{10}CFU/hand, simple weighted average by sample size)	Range	
											India(44) Peru(45) Ethiopia(46) Kenya(47) Malawi(48) Bangladesh(49) Tanzania(50) Peru(51) Peru(52) Bangladesh(27) Great Britain(53) Tanzania(54) U. S.(55) Peru(56) India(29) Kenya(57) India(58) Indonesia(59) U. S.(16) Tanzanina(60) Mexico(61) Tanzania(30) Tanzania(62) Bangladesh(63) Zimbabwe(64) Zimbabwe(65) Indonesia(66) Mauritius(17) Tanzania(67) Tanzania(23) Tanzania(24) Bangladesh(68) Thailand(69) Bangladesh(70) India(71) Peru(72)

Type of Micro-organsim	Microorganism	Total Number of Studies	Prevalence				Concentration				Countries, References
			Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Percent Positive (%, average)[1]	Range (%)	Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Mean Concentration (log_{10}CFU/hand, simple weighted average by sample size)	Range	
											Kenya(73) Mauritius(18) India(28) Zambia(74)
	Enteroaggregative *E. coli* (EAEC)[4]	4	4	1278	11.3	2.0 – 19.6	2	272	1.34	1.25 – 1.73	India(33) Bangladesh(19) Tanzania(6) Tanzania(30)
	Enterobacter spp.	2	2	804	0.48	0.2 – 0.75	0	-	-	-	Great Britain(53) India(28)
	Enterobacteriaceae	1	1	80	37.5	20 – 45	1	30	2.69	2.28 – 3.08	Netherlands(37)
	Enterococci[2] (includes *Enterococcus* spp)	9	8	2114	60.1	2 - 100	6	585	1.73	1.00 – 2.60	India, Mozambique(38) Great Britain(39) Bangladesh(49) Great Britain(53) Tanzania(54) Tanzania(30) Tanzania(62) Tanzania(24) India(28)
	Enterococcus faecalis[2]	1	1	133	11	-	0	-	-	-	India(29)
	Fecal bacteria[2] (defined as total of	1	1	72	31	-	1	72	2.22	1.72 – 2.58	U. S.(75)

[4] Three studies reported AggR

Type of Micro-organsim	Microorganism	Total Number of Studies	Prevalence				Concentration				Countries, References
			Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Percent Positive (%, average)[1]	Range (%)	Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Mean Concentration (log_{10}CFU/hand, simple weighted average by sample size)	Range	
	fecal coliforms and enterococci)										
	Fecal coliform[2]	24	20	11794	66 [22, 100]	6 – 100	11	8162	1.25	0.12 – 8.29	Bangladesh(21) Ethiopia(76) Canada(77) Canada(78) U. S.(79) Bangladesh(34) Great Britain(39) U. S.(80) Zimbabwe(42) U.S.(81) Bangladesh(82) Bangladesh(83) U. S.(55) Botswana(84) U.S.(85) Pakistan(86) Mexico(61) India(22) U. S.(87) Peru(70) India(71) India(20) U. S.(88) Botswana(89)
	Fecal Streptococci[2]	6	4	4445	52.9	7 – 98	5	5454	1.85	0.16 – 4.40	Bangladesh(83) Botswana(90) Greece(91) Tanzania(23) Tanzania(67) Thailand(69)
	Klebsiella spp.	6	6	1427	11.2	0.3 – 33.3	1	3	4.65	4.37 – 4.93	Great Britain(39) Great Britain(53)

Type of Micro-organsim	Microorganism	Total Number of Studies	Prevalence				Concentration				Countries, References
			Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Percent Positive (%, average)[1]	Range (%)	Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Mean Concentration (log_{10}CFU/hand, simple weighted average by sample size)	Range	
											India(29) Tanzania(61) Mauritius(18) India(28)
	Methicillin resistant staphylococcus aureus	1	1		206	0.5	0	-	-	-	U. S.(92)
	Micrococcus spp.	3	3	576	22.2	3.0 – 42.7	0	-	-	-	U. S.(92) Mauritius(17) Mauritius(18)
	Pathogenic *E. coli*	4	4	1258	34.6	22.1 – 44.1	1	222	1.25	-	Bangladesh(19) Tanzania(6) Tanzania(30) Tanzania(24)
	Proteus spp.	1	1	200	1.5	-	0	-	-	-	Mauritius(17)
	Pseudomonas spp.	3	3	806	3.7	1.5 – 5.5	0	-	-	-	U. S.(92) Mauritius(17) India(28)
	Salmonella spp.	1	1	12	41.6	33.3 – 50	0	-	-	-	Mexico(61)
	Serratia spp.	1	1	12	83.3	-	0	-	-	-	Mexico(61)
	Shigella spp.	1	1	12	0	-	0	-	-	-	Mexico(61)
	Shigella spp. / EIEC	2	2	155	10.8	2.2 – 19	2	155	3.44 log_{10} gene copies / hand	-2.35 – 4.56 log_{10} gene	Kenya(25) Uganda(26)

Type of Micro-organsim	Microorganism	Total Number of Studies	Prevalence				Concentration				Countries, References
			Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Percent Positive (%, average)[1]	Range (%)	Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Mean Concentration (log_{10}CFU/hand, simple weighted average by sample size)	Range	
										copies / hand	
	Staphylococcus aureus	3	3	565	59.3	19 – 92	1	7	5.93	5.74 – 6.11	Benin(93) India(29) Mexico(61)
	Streptococcus Faecalis[2]	1	1	18	50	-	0	-	-	-	Croatia(35)
	Streptococcus spp.	3	3	388	15.8	0-37	1	6	4.9	-	Mauritius(18) Mexico(61) U. S.(92)
	Total coliform[2]	8	5	1266	60.8	27.5 – 97.8	4	1096	1.96	1.24 – 2.45	Peru(45) Peru(52) U. S.(94) Bangladesh(27) Peru(53) U.S.(16) Tanzania(60) Peru(72)
	Vibrio cholerae	1	1	70	14	12 – 16	0	-	-	-	Kenya(25)
Viruses	Adenovirus	5	5	576	22.1	4.5 – 50	2	155	3.92 log_{10} gene copies / hand	2.62 – 5.33 log_{10} gene copies / hand	Kenya(25) Uganda(26) Tanzania(6) Tanzania(30) Finland(95)
	Enterovirus	3	3	390	8.8	6.3 – 11.1	0	-	-	-	Tanzania(6) Tanzania(30) Tanzania(24)
	Hepatitis A virus	1	1	12	17	-	0	-	-	-	Mexico(61)

Type of Micro-organsim	Microorganism	Total Number of Studies	Prevalence				Concentration				Countries, References
			Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Percent Positive (%, average)[1]	Range (%)	Number of Studies	Number of Samples	Mean Concentration (log_{10}CFU/hand, simple weighted average by sample size)	Range	
	Norovirus[5]	5	5	1285	3.1	0 – 10	1 (1)	50 (88)	1.73 (0.2 log_{10} gene copies / hand)	-	India(33) Bangladesh(19) U. S.(16) Tanzania(62) Finland(95)
	Rotavirus	4	4	325	23.4	0 – 100	0	-	-	-	U.S.(96) Mexico(61) Tanzania(6) Tanzania(30)
Protozoa	*Giardia Lamblia*	2	2	926	35.3	2.3 – 67	0	-	-	-	Bangladesh(19) Mexico(61)
Multicellular animal parasites	Ascaris lumbricoides	1	1	336	10	-	0	-	-	-	Tanzania(60)
	Hookworm	1	1	336	2	-	-	-	-	-	Tanzania(60)
	Soil-transmitted helminths	2	2	466	8.7	0.87 - 16.6	2	466	1.68 eggs/hand	1 – 2.35 eggs/hand	South Africa(97) Kenya(98)

[5] Norovirus includes GI and GII

Prevalence of pathogen and fecal indicator contamination on hands

Of the 84 studies identified, 76 (90%) reported contamination prevalence rates for the target pathogen or indicator. The average prevalence rate across all 44 indicators was 37.9% (median: 29.5%), ranging from 0% (no detectable contamination) to 100% (detectable contamination on all study participants). *E. coli* and fecal coliform contamination on hands were common among the study populations. Overall, mean *E. coli* prevalence was 62% (range: 0.5 - 100%) and mean fecal coliform prevalence was 66% (range: 6 - 100%). Our findings confirm that hands are frequently contaminated with fecal bacteria, but contamination prevalence is highly variable between studies. Our finding of frequent contamination of hands is supported by previous work demonstrating the role of hands in connecting sources of fecal contamination (e.g. soil, floor, drain) with opportunities for subsequent exposures (e.g. mouth, bath, handwashing) (99).

Country income

Country income level, as defined by the World Bank's four income groups – low, lower-middle, upper-middle and high, was significantly correlated with hand contamination levels. Hands of people in low-income countries had significantly higher prevalence of *E. coli* and fecal coliforms than those in high-income countries. There were 28 countries included in this review (Figure S3), including 11 upper-middle/high income and 17 low/lower-middle income. Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and North America were overrepresented (30, 22, and 17 studies, respectively) while South America and the Middle East/North Africa were underrepresented (5 and 2 studies, respectively). There were no studies from East Asia. The mean [95% Confidence Interval] estimate was 69% [48% - 58%] *E. coli* prevalence in low-income versus 6% [2% - 12%] in high-income ($p = 5.74 \times 10^{-10}$) and 85% [49% - 100%] fecal coliform prevalence in low-income versus 18% [10% - 28%] in high-income ($p = 3.23 \times 10^{-13}$) (Figure 1, Figure S7). We noted substantial between-study heterogeneities within each subgroup, as indicated by the high I^2 values, which is an estimate of the proportion of observed variance attributable to study heterogeneity (*E. coli:* low-income: $I^2 = 91.3\%$; high-income: $I^2 = 99.6\%$; Fecal coliforms: low-income: $I^2 = 100\%$; high-income: $I^2 = 96\%$;). High heterogeneity suggests hand contamination prevalence is largely study or site-specific. The publication bias analysis showed major

asymmetry to the right (Figure S5); there are more low-precision studies measuring low prevalence than low-precision studies measuring high prevalence.

The observed trend that hand contamination is generally more prevalent in low-income countries than high-income countries may be attributable to differences in access to water, sanitation, and hygiene, including hand washing facilities with soap and water. Access to handwashing facilities is correlated with piped water access and with sociodemographic index (SDI; a composite measure including income per capita, education, and fertility) (100). Previous work has also demonstrated that hands are quickly re-contaminated after handwashing in many tropical low-income settings (within minutes), potentially due to high levels of fecal contamination on surfaces and in soils in the domestic environment (24,70).



Figure 1. *E. coli* prevalence on hands by country income level. Pooled estimates for all studies and subgroups were evaluated with an inverse variance heterogeneity (IVhet) model.

Urban compared to rural areas

There was no significant difference in *E. coli* prevalence between urban and rural areas (p = 0.110; Figure S9, Figure 2). The publication bias analysis (Figure S6) for the low/lower-middle income subgroup showed minor asymmetry between the urban and rural groups. Notably, comparisons of hand contamination between urban and rural settings could only be conducted for *E. coli* prevalence in low/lower-middle income countries because there were no studies that measured *E. coli* in rural areas in upper-middle/high income countries and too few studies available to assess differences in fecal coliform levels (low/lower middle income: 2 studies in urban, 7 studies in rural; upper-middle/high income: 10 studies in urban, 0 studies in rural). Although WASH coverage levels are typically higher in urban than in rural areas, there are substantial intra-urban access inequalities (101). This could explain why we observed no difference between urban versus rural hand contamination prevalence levels(102). Many studies included in this review from urban low-income settings were conducted in informal settlements in contrast to more established, wealthier urban communities. Populations living in densely populated, low-income communities often share sanitation facilities. Shared sanitation facilities have been shown to be less likely to be clean (in terms of presence of fecal matter, number of flies, and smell) than private facilities (103). Another potential explanation is that population density (persons per km^2) is correlated with higher rates of environmental fecal contamination, as shown in Egypt where *E. coli* drinking water contamination was increased in areas with the highest population densities (104).



Figure 2: *E. coli* prevalence Urban vs. Rural in low/lower-middle income countries

Adults compared to children

There were no clear differences in *E. coli* or fecal coliform prevalence between adults (16 years old and above) and children (birth to 15 years old) even when subgrouping by income level (Figures S27, S29, S31, S33, S35) (p = 0.21 (E. coli all), 0.09 (E. coli low-income only), 0.78 (fecal coliform all), 0.45 (fecal coliforms low-income only), 0.52 (fecal coliforms high income

only)). There were also no significant differences in prevalence between the hands of children under 5 years old and adult hands (p = 0.23 (E. coli all), 0.47 (E. coli low-income only), 0.66 (fecal coliform all), 0.56 (fecal coliforms high-income only)). A potential explanation is that hand hygiene behavior between adults and children is highly correlated (105). Hand contamination is also strongly influenced by environmental contamination. Similar levels of contamination between adults and children could be a result of how difficult it is to keep hands free of fecal contamination in high-disease burden settings lacking safely managed sanitation (24,54,70). The results align with other studies that have found no difference in contamination levels with direct comparisons between adults and children (25,45).

Climate classifications

E. coli prevalence was higher in tropical areas (classification A; 0.69 [95% CI 0.41, 0.93]) than in temperate areas (classification C; 0.28 [95% CI 0.09, 0.51]) (p = 0.015). Two fecal coliform comparisons had significant differences (tropical areas, A vs. temperate areas, C; tropical areas, A vs. dry areas, B), but country income was a confounding factor for both comparisons. A recent study in Kenya found that high 7-day temperature was associated with decreased *E. coli* levels on hands (106). A review on the associations between ambient temperature and enteric infections found increased risks in bacterial enteric infections and decreased risks in viral infections for every 1ºC temperature rise (107). Our results also suggest that temperature may influence hand contamination levels. This analysis could be improved by taking into account the time of year a study was conducted (rainy season, dry season, hot, or cold months), but this information was not readily available.

Gender

Although analysis by gender was intended, very few of the identified studies reported gender. Three studies reported stratified prevalence values for males and females, while 5 additional studies reported a comparison between genders. Within 7 of these studies, which all enrolled school children, 5 found that male students had higher levels of fecal indicator bacteria, one found that females had higher levels of fecal indicator bacteria, and one found no statistical difference between genders. Potential reasons for higher rates of fecal contamination on male

hands relative to female hands include differences in hygiene and/or interactions with the environment (playing sports and/or in soil) (108–110).

Sampling methods

Among the 84 studies, 51 (61%) used hand rinse samples, 19 (23%) used swab samples, 13 (15%) used impressions, and 1 study (1%) did not report the method used (see SI for method details). Most studies that employed a culture-based method used membrane filtration or IDEXX Quanti-Tray; however, the lower detection limit ranged from 1 CFU/hand to 175 CFU/hand (when reported). Rinse samples had a higher mean prevalence for *E. coli* (0.69 [95% CI 0.46, 0.89]) than swab samples (0.24 [95% CI 0.00, 0.60]). Similarly, rinse samples had a higher mean prevalence for fecal coliform (0.84 [95% CI 0.35, 1.00]) than impression samples (0.27 [95% CI 0.08, 0.48]) (*E. coli* rinse vs. swab: $p = 0.03$; Fecal coliform rinse vs. impression: $p = 2.32 \times 10^{-05}$; Figures S37-S43). These findings show that hand rinse sampling may be more sensitive at recovering fecal indicator bacteria from hands than swabs and possibly impression plates, in line with prior research and what has been reported for hand microbiome studies (111,112). Standardization of sampling methods could improve the sensitivity of studies and facilitate the identification and assessment of risk factors for hand contamination.

Conclusion

Hand contamination was highest in low/lower-middle income countries where diarrheal and enteric infections are also more common. In low/middle income countries, hand contamination was equally prevalent in rural and urban communities, emphasizing the need for hand hygiene across both settings. Given the role of hands in transferring fecal microbes between people and the environment, we suggest hands can be viewed as sentinel indicators of human exposure to enteric pathogens. However, there is a need to develop and implement standardized sampling and analysis methods, including molecular methods to detect specific pathogens on hands, as most studies have been limited to measuring fecal indicator bacteria with culture-based methods. Standardized molecular methods to multiplex detection of clinically relevant pathogens on hands would improve our understanding of the role of hands in human exposure to protozoan, bacteria, and viral pathogens and help to identify factors influencing hand contamination.

Supporting Information. Detailed description of methods, all results, PRISMA-P checklist. table of all papers included. Data extracted from papers included in this review is publicly available on Open Science Framework at this link: https://osf.io/j6wb4/.

References

1. Julian TR. Environmental transmission of diarrheal pathogens in low and middle income countries. Environ Sci Process Impacts. 2016 Aug 10;18(8):944–55.

2. Mattioli M, Davis J, Boehm AB. Hand-to-Mouth Contacts Result in Greater Ingestion of Feces than Dietary Water Consumption in Tanzania: A Quantitative Fecal Exposure Assessment Model. Environ Sci Technol. 2015 Feb 3;49(3):1912–20.

3. Pickering AJ, Ercumen A, Arnold BF, Kwong LH, Parvez SM, Alam M, et al. Fecal Indicator Bacteria along Multiple Environmental Transmission Pathways (Water, Hands, Food, Soil, Flies) and Subsequent Child Diarrhea in Rural Bangladesh. Environ Sci Technol. 2018 17;52(14):7928–36.

4. Black RE, Dykes AC, Anderson KE, Wells JG, Sinclair SP, Gary GW, et al. HANDWASHING TO PREVENT DIARRHEA IN DAY-CARE CENTERS1. Am J Epidemiol. 1981 Apr;113(4):445–51.

5. Vila-Guilera J, Ciric L, Parikh P, Dasgupta R, Lakhanpaul M. 120 Comparing faecal transmission pathways contributing to enteric infections in infants in rural India. BMJ Paediatr Open. 2021 Apr 1;5(Suppl 1):A36.

6. Mattioli MC, Pickering AJ, Gilsdorf RJ, Davis J, Boehm AB. Hands and Water as Vectors of Diarrheal Pathogens in Bagamoyo, Tanzania. Environ Sci Technol. 2013 Jan 2;47(1):355–63.

7. Curtis V, Cairncross S. Effect of washing hands with soap on diarrhoea risk in the community: a systematic review. Lancet Infect Dis. 2003 May 1;3(5):275–81.

8. Solomon ET, Gari SR, Kloos H, Alemu BM. Handwashing effect on diarrheal incidence in children under 5 years old in rural eastern Ethiopia: a cluster randomized controlled trial. Trop Med Health. 2021 Dec;49(1):26.

9. Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Ehiri JE, Arikpo D, Meremikwu MM, Critchley JA. Hand-washing promotion for preventing diarrhoea. Cochrane Infectious Diseases Group, editor. Cochrane Database Syst Rev [Internet]. 2021 Jan 7 [cited 2022 Nov 29];2021(1). Available from: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/14651858.CD004265.pub4

10. Barendregt JJ, Doi SA, Lee YY, Norman RE, Vos T. Meta-analysis of prevalence. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2013 Nov;67(11):974–8.

11. Doi SAR, Barendregt JJ, Khan S, Thalib L, Williams GM. Advances in the meta-analysis of heterogeneous clinical trials I: The inverse variance heterogeneity model. Contemp Clin Trials. 2015 Nov;45:130–8.

12. Furuya-Kanamori L, Barendregt JJ, Doi SAR. A new improved graphical and quantitative method for detecting bias in meta-analysis. Int J Evid Based Healthc. 2018 Dec;16(4):195–203.

13. Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in *R* with the **metafor** Package. J Stat Softw. 2010;36(3):1–48.

14. Society NG. Köppen Climate Classification System [Internet]. National Geographic Society. 2019 [cited 2020 Sep 2]. Available from: http://www.nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/koppen-climate-classification-system/

15. Gorman R, Bloomfield S, Adley CC. A study of cross-contamination of food-borne pathogens in the domestic kitchen in the Republic of Ireland. Int J Food Microbiol. 2002 Jun 5;76(1):143–50.

16. Li Y, Fraser A, Chen X, Cates S, Wohlgenant K, Jaykus LA. Microbiological analysis of environmental samples collected from child care facilities in North and South Carolina. Am J Infect Control. 2014 Oct 1;42(10):1049–55.

17. Padaruth SK, Biranjia-Hurdoyal SD. Hygiene practices and faecal contamination of the hands of children attending primary school in Mauritius. Int Health. 2015 Jul 1;7(4):280–4.

18. Ubheeram J, Biranjia-Hurdoyal SD. Effectiveness of hand hygiene education among a random sample of women from the community. J Prev Med Hyg. 2017 Mar;58(1):E53–5.

19. Fuhrmeister ER, Ercumen A, Pickering AJ, Jeanis KM, Ahmed M, Brown S, et al. Predictors of Enteric Pathogens in the Domestic Environment from Human and Animal Sources in Rural Bangladesh. Environ Sci Technol. 2019 Sep 3;53(17):10023–33.

20. Schriewer A, Odagiri M, Wuertz S, Misra PR, Panigrahi P, Clasen T, et al. Human and Animal Fecal Contamination of Community Water Sources, Stored Drinking Water and Hands in Rural India Measured with Validated Microbial Source Tracking Assays. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2015 Sep 2;93(3):509–16.

21. Boehm AB, Wang D, Ercumen A, Shea M, Harris AR, Shanks OC, et al. Occurrence of Host-Associated Fecal Markers on Child Hands, Household Soil, and Drinking Water in Rural Bangladeshi Households. Environ Sci Technol. Lett. 2016 Oct 19;393–8.

22. Odagiri M, Schriewer A, Daniels ME, Wuertz S, Smith WA, Clasen T, et al. Human fecal and pathogen exposure pathways in rural Indian villages and the effect of increased latrine coverage. Water Res. 2016 Sep 1;100:232–44.

23. Pickering AJ, Davis J, Walters SP, Horak HM, Keymer DP, Mushi D, et al. Hands, Water, and Health: Fecal Contamination in Tanzanian Communities with Improved, Non-Networked Water Supplies. Environ Sci Technol. 2010 May 1;44(9):3267–72.

24. Pickering AJ, Julian TR, Mamuya S, Boehm AB, Davis J. Bacterial hand contamination among Tanzanian mothers varies temporally and following household activities. Trop Med Int Health TM IH. 2011 Feb;16(2):233–9.

25. Bauza V, Madadi V, Ocharo R, Nguyen TH, Guest JS. Enteric pathogens from water, hands, surface, soil, drainage ditch, and stream exposure points in a low-income neighborhood of Nairobi, Kenya. Sci Total Environ. 2020 Mar 20;709:135344.

26. Byrne DM, Hamilton KA, Houser SA, Mubasira M, Katende D, Lohman HAC, et al. Navigating Data Uncertainty and Modeling Assumptions in Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment in an Informal Settlement in Kampala, Uganda. Environ Sci Technol. 2021 Apr 20;55(8):5463–74.

27. Islam MS, Mahmud ZH, Islam MS, Zaman RU, Islam MR, Gope PS, et al. Faecal contamination of commuters' hands in main vehicle stations in Dhaka city, Bangladesh. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2016 Jun 1;110(6):367–72.

28. Vishwanath R, Selvabai AP, Shanmugam P. Detection of bacterial pathogens in the hands of rural school children across different age groups and emphasizing the importance of hand wash. J Prev Med Hyg. 2019 Jun 28;60(2):E103–8.

29. Kavitha E, Srikumar R, Muthu G, Sathyapriya T. Bacteriological profile and perception on hand hygiene in school-going Children. J Lab Physicians. 2019;11(4):300–4.

30. Mattioli M, Boehm AB, Davis J, Harris AR, Mrisho M, Pickering AJ. Enteric Pathogens in Stored Drinking Water and on Caregiver's Hands in Tanzanian Households with and without Reported Cases of Child Diarrhea. PLoS ONE. 2014 Jan 2;9(1):e84939–e84939.

31. Amir M, Riaz M, Chang YF, Akhtar S, Yoo S, SHEIKH A, et al. Impact of unhygienic conditions during slaughtering and processing on spread of antibiotic resistant Escherichia coli from poultry. Microbiol Res. 2017 Nov 13;8:35–40.

32. Bauza V, Majorin F, Routray P, Sclar GD, Caruso BA, Clasen T. Child feces management practices and fecal contamination: A cross-sectional study in rural Odisha, India. Sci Total Environ. 2020 Mar 20;709:136169.

33. Berendes D, Kirby A, Clennon JA, Raj S, Yakubu H, Leon J, et al. The Influence of Household- and Community-Level Sanitation and Fecal Sludge Management on Urban Fecal Contamination in Households and Drains and Enteric Infection in Children. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2017 Jun 7;96(6):1404–14.

34. Contreras JD, Islam M, Mertens A, Pickering AJ, Kwong LH, Arnold BF, et al. Longitudinal Effects of a Sanitation Intervention on Environmental Fecal Contamination in a Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural Bangladesh. Environ Sci Technol. 2021 Jun 15;55(12):8169–79.

35. Ćurin K, Pavić S. Hygienic conditions in elementary and secondary schools in the county of Split-Dalmatia. Arh Hig Rada Toksikol. 1999;

36. Davis J, Pickering AJ, Rogers K, Mamuya S, Boehm AB. The effects of informational interventions on household water management, hygiene behaviors, stored drinking water quality, and hand contamination in peri-urban Tanzania. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2011 Feb;84(2):184–91.

37. de Wit JC, Rombouts FM. Faecal micro-organisms on the hands of carriers: Escherichia coli as model for Salmonella. Zentralblatt Hyg Umweltmed Int J Hyg Environ Med. 1992 Oct;193(3):230–6.

38. Devamani C, Norman G, Schmidt WP. A Simple Microbiological Tool to Evaluate the Effect of Environmental Health Interventions on Hand Contamination. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2014 Nov;11(11):11846–59.

39. Dodrill L, Schmidt WP, Cobb E, Donachie P, Curtis V, Barra M de. Male commuters in north and south England: risk factors for the presence of faecal bacteria on hands. BMC Public Health. 2011 Jan 12;11:31–31.

40. Dutta S, Mondal SK, Saha MR, Sengupta PG, Gupta DN, Ghosh S, et al. Isolation of Escherichia coli to detect faecal contamination of infants and their mothers in West Bengal. J Diarrhoeal Dis Res. 1997 Sep;15(3):173–6.

41. Ercumen A., Mertens A., Arnold B.F., Benjamin-Chung J., Hubbard A.E., Ahmed M.A., et al. Effects of Single and Combined Water, Sanitation and Handwashing Interventions on Fecal Contamination in the Domestic Environment: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural Bangladesh. Environ Sci Technol. 2018;52(21):12078–88.

42. Friedrich MND, Julian TR, Kappler A, Nhiwatiwa T, Mosler HJ. Handwashing, but how? Microbial effectiveness of existing handwashing practices in high-density suburbs of Harare, Zimbabwe. Am J Infect Control. 2017 Mar 1;45(3):228–33.

43. George CM, Cirhuza LB, Birindwa A, Williams C, Beck S, Julian T, et al. Child hand contamination is associated with subsequent pediatric diarrhea in rural Democratic Republic of the Congo (REDUCE Program). Trop Med Int Health. 2021 Jan;26(1):102–10.

44. Ghuliani A, Kaul M. Contamination of weaning foods and transmission of E. coli in causation of infantile diarrhea in low income group in Chandigarh. Indian Pediatr. 1995 May;32(5):539–42.

45. Gil AI, Lanata CF, Hartinger SM, Mäusezahl D, Padilla B, Ochoa TJ, et al. Fecal contamination of food, water, hands, and kitchen utensils at the household level in rural areas of Peru. J Environ Health. 2014 Feb;76(6):102–6.

46. Gizaw Z, Yalew AW, Bitew BD, Lee J, Bisesi M. Effects of local handwashing agents on microbial contamination of the hands in a rural setting in Northwest Ethiopia: a cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ Open. 2022 May;12(5):e056411.

47. Greene LE, Freeman MC, Akoko D, Saboori S, Moe C, Rheingans R. Impact of a School-Based Hygiene Promotion and Sanitation Intervention on Pupil Hand Contamination in Western Kenya: A Cluster Randomized Trial. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2012 Sep 5;87(3):385–93.

48. Grimason AM, Masangwi SJ, Morse TD, Jabu GC, Beattie TK, Taulo SE, et al. Knowledge, awareness and practice of the importance of hand-washing amongst children attending state run primary schools in rural Malawi. Int J Environ Health Res. 2014 Jan 2;24(1):31–43.

49. Harris AR, Pickering AJ, Harris M, Doza S, Islam MS, Unicomb L, et al. Ruminants Contribute Fecal Contamination to the Urban Household Environment in Dhaka, Bangladesh. Environ Sci Technol. 2016 May 3;50(9):4642–9.

50. Harris A.R., Pickering A.J., Boehm A.B., Mrisho M., Davis J. Comparison of analytical techniques to explain variability in stored drinking water quality and microbial hand contamination of female caregivers in Tanzania. Environ Sci Process Impacts. 2019;21(5):893–903.

51. Hartinger S, Lanata C, Hattendorf J, Verastegui H, Gil A, Wolf J, et al. Improving household air, drinking water and hygiene in rural Peru: a community-randomized–controlled trial of an integrated environmental home-based intervention package to improve child health. Int J Epidemiol. 2016 Dec 1;45(6):2089–99.

52. Hartinger SM, Lanata CF, Hattendorf J, Gil AI, Verastegui H, Ochoa T, et al. A community randomised controlled trial evaluating a home-based environmental intervention package of improved stoves, solar water disinfection and kitchen sinks in rural Peru: rationale, trial design and baseline findings. Contemp Clin Trials. 2011 Nov;32(6):864–73.

53. Judah G, Donachie P, Cobb E, Schmidt W, Holland M, Curtis V. Dirty hands: bacteria of faecal origin on commuters' hands. Epidemiol Infect. 2010 Mar;138(3):409–14.

54. Julian TR, Pickering AJ. A Pilot Study on Integrating Videography and Environmental Microbial Sampling to Model Fecal Bacterial Exposures in Peri-Urban Tanzania. PLoS ONE [Internet]. 2015 Aug 21 [cited 2020 Nov 10];10(8). Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4546663/

55. Julian TR, Pickering AJ, Leckie JO, Boehm AB. Enterococcus spp on fomites and hands indicate increased risk of respiratory illness in child care centers. Am J Infect Control. 2013 Aug;41(8):728–33.

56. Kalter HD, Gilman RH, Moulton LH, Cullotta AR, Cabrera L, Velapatiño B. Risk Factors for Antibiotic-Resistant Escherichia coli Carriage in Young Children in Peru: Community-Based Cross-Sectional Prevalence Study. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2010 May;82(5):879–88.

57. Kim S, Brown AC, Murphy J, Oremo J, Owuor M, Ouda R, et al. Evaluation of the impact of antimicrobial hand towels on hand contamination with Escherichia coli among mothers in Kisumu County, Kenya, 2011–2012. Water Res. 2019 Jun 15;157:564–71.

58. Kundu A., Smith W.A., Harvey D., Wuertz S. Drinking water safety: Role of hand hygiene, sanitation facility, and water system in semi-urban areas of India. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2018;99(4):889–98.

59. Kusuma A, Eryando T, Susanna D. Escherichia coli contamination of babies' food-serving utensils in a district of West Sumatra, Indonesia. WHO South-East Asia J Public Health. 2012 Jan 1;1(1):20.

60. Makata K, Ensink J, Ayieko P, Hansen C, Sichalwe S, Mngara J, et al. Hand hygiene intervention to optimise soil-transmitted helminth infection control among primary school children: the Mikono Safi cluster randomised controlled trial in northwestern Tanzania. BMC Med. 2021 Dec;19(1):125.

61. Martínez-Bastidas T, Campo NC del, Mena KD, Campo NC del, León-Félix J, Gerba CP, et al. Detection of pathogenic micro-organisms on children's hands and toys during play. J Appl Microbiol. 2014;116(6):1668–75.

62. Mattioli M, Davis J, Mrisho M, Boehm AB. Quantification of Human Norovirus GII on Hands of Mothers with Children under the Age of Five Years in Bagamoyo, Tanzania. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2015 Sep 2;93(3):478–84.

63. Monira S, Zohura F, Bhuyian MSI, Parvin T, Barman I, Jubyda FT, et al. Fecal Sampling of Soil, Food, Hand, and Surface Samples from Households in Urban Slums of Dhaka, Bangladesh: An Evidence-Based Development of Baby Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Interventions. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2022 Sep 14;107(3):720–3.

64. Navab-Daneshmand T, Friedrich MND, Gächter M, Montealegre MC, Mlambo LS, Nhiwatiwa T, et al. Escherichia coli Contamination across Multiple Environmental Compartments (Soil, Hands, Drinking Water, and Handwashing Water) in Urban Harare: Correlations and Risk Factors. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2018 Jan 22;98(3):803–13.

65. Ngure FM, Humphrey JH, Mbuya MNN, Majo F, Mutasa K, Govha M, et al. Formative research on hygiene behaviors and geophagy among infants and young children and implications of exposure to fecal bacteria. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2013 Oct;89(4):709–16.

66. Otsuka Y, Agestika L, Harada H, Sriwuryandari L, Sintawardani N, Yamauchi T. Comprehensive assessment of handwashing and faecal contamination among elementary school children in an urban slum of Indonesia. Trop Med Int Health. 2019;24(8):954–61.

67. Pickering AJ, Boehm AB, Mwanjali M, Davis J. Efficacy of Waterless Hand Hygiene Compared with Handwashing with Soap: A Field Study in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2010 Feb;82(2):270–8.

68. Pickering A.J., Ercumen A., Arnold B.F., Kwong L.H., Parvez S.M., Alam M., et al. Fecal Indicator Bacteria along Multiple Environmental Transmission Pathways (Water, Hands, Food, Soil, Flies) and Subsequent Child Diarrhea in Rural Bangladesh. Environ Sci Technol. 2018;52(14):7928–36.

69. Pinfold JV. Faecal contamination of water and fingertip-rinses as a method for evaluating the effect of low-cost water supply and sanitation activities on faeco-oral disease transmission. I. A case study in rural north-east Thailand. Epidemiol Infect. 1990 Oct;105(2):363–75.

70. Ram PK, Jahid I, Halder AK, Nygren B, Islam MS, Granger SP, et al. Variability in Hand Contamination Based on Serial Measurements: Implications for Assessment of Hand-Cleansing Behavior and Disease Risk. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2011 Apr 5;84(4):510–6.

71. Reddi SGDN, Naveen Kumar R, SubbaRao GM, Vishnu Vardhana Rao M, Sudershan RV. Bacteriological quality of drinking water at point of use and hand hygiene of primary food preparers: implications for household food safety. J Water Sanit Hyg Dev. 2016 May 10;6(2):224–30.

72. Rothstein JD, Mendoza AL, Cabrera LZ, Pachas J, Calderón M, Pajuelo MJ, et al. Household Contamination of Baby Bottles and Opportunities to Improve Bottle Hygiene in Peri-Urban Lima, Peru. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2019 Apr;100(4):988–97.

73. Saboori S, Greene LE, Moe CL, Freeman MC, Caruso BA, Akoko D, et al. Impact of regular soap provision to primary schools on hand washing and E. coli hand contamination

among pupils in Nyanza Province, Kenya: a cluster-randomized trial. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2013 Oct;89(4):698–708.

74. Winter JC, Darmstadt GL, Boehm AB, Davis J. The impact of on-premises piped water supply on fecal contamination pathways in rural Zambia. Npj Clean Water. 2021 Dec;4(1):47.

75. Kellogg DS, Rosenbaum PF, Kiska DL, Riddell SW, Welch TR, Shaw J. High fecal hand contamination among wilderness hikers. Am J Infect Control. 2012 Nov;40(9):893–5.

76. Budge S, Hutchings P, Parker A, Tyrrel S, Tulu T, Gizaw M, et al. Do domestic animals contribute to bacterial contamination of infant transmission pathways? Formative evidence from Ethiopia. J Water Health. 2019 Aug 26;17(5):655–69.

77. Carabin H, Gyorkos TW, Joseph L, Payment P, Soto JC. Comparison of methods to analyse imprecise faecal coliform count data from environmental samples. Epidemiol Infect. 2001 Apr;126(2):181–90.

78. Carabin H, Gyorkos TW, Soto JC, Joseph L, Payment P, Collet JP. Effectiveness of a Training Program in Reducing Infections in Toddlers Attending Day Care Centers. Epidemiology. 1999;10(3):219–27.

79. Carrasco L, Mena KD, Mota LC, Ortiz M, Behravesh CB, Gibbs SG, et al. Occurrence of faecal contamination in households along the US–Mexico border. Lett Appl Microbiol. 2008;46(6):682–7.

80. Ekanem EE, DuPont HL, Pickering LK, Selwyn BJ, Hawkins CM. Transmission dynamics of enteric bacteria in day-care centers. Am J Epidemiol. 1983 Oct;118(4):562–72.

81. Holaday B, Pantell R, Lewis C, Gilliss CL. Patterns of fecal coliform contamination in day-care centers. Public Health Nurs Boston Mass. 1990 Dec;7(4):224–8.

82. Huda TMdN, Schmidt WP, Pickering AJ, Unicomb L, Mahmud ZH, Luby SP, et al. Effect of Neighborhood Sanitation Coverage on Fecal Contamination of the Household Environment in Rural Bangladesh. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2019 Mar;100(3):717–26.

83. Islam MMM, Hofstra N, Islam MdA. The Impact of Environmental Variables on Faecal Indicator Bacteria in the Betna River Basin, Bangladesh. Environ Process. 2017 Jun 1;4(2):319–32.

84. Kaltenthaler EC, Drasar BS, Potter CW. The use of microbiology in the study of hygiene behaviour. Microbios. 1996;88(354):35–43.

85. Laborde DJ, Weigle KA, Weber DJ, Kotch JB. Effect of fecal contamination on diarrheal illness rates in day-care centers. Am J Epidemiol. 1993 Aug 15;138(4):243–55.

86. Luby SP, Agboatwalla M, Billhimer W, Hoekstra RM. Field trial of a low cost method to evaluate hand cleanliness. Trop Med Int Health. 2007;12(6):765–71.

87. Petersen NJ, Bressler GK. Design and modification of the day care environment. Rev Infect Dis. 1986 Aug;8(4):618–21.

88. Van R, Marrow AL, Reves RR, Pickering LK. Environmental Contamination in Child Day-Care Centers. Am J Epidemiol. 1991 Mar 1;133(5):460–70.

89. Van R, Wun CC, Morrow AL, Pickering LK. The Effect of Diaper Type and Overclothing on Fecal Contamination in Day-care Centers. JAMA. 1991 Apr 10;265(14):1840–4.

90. Kaltenthaler E, Pinfold J. Microbiological methods for assessing handwashing practice in hygiene behaviour studies. J Trop Med Hyg. 1995 May 1;98:101–6.

91. Kyriacou A, Drakopoulou S, Georgaki I, Fountoulakis M, Mitsou E, Lasaridi KE, et al. Screening for faecal contamination in primary schools in Crete, Greece. Child Care Health Dev. 2009;35(2):159–63.

92. Mason MR, Morawski BM, Bayliss RL, Noor FM, Jama SH, Clabots CL, et al. Prevalence, Characteristics, and Epidemiology of Microbial Hand Contamination Among Minnesota State Fair Attendees (2014). Front Public Health. 2020 Dec 16;8:574444.

93. Ahoyo TA, Fatombi KJ, Boco M, Aminou T, Dramane KL. Impact de la qualité de l'eau et de l'assainissement sur la santé des enfants en milieu périurbain au Bénin : cas des zones sanitaires Savalou-Banté et Dassa-Glazoué. Médecine Trop Rev Corps Santé Colon. 2011 Juin;71(3):281–5.

94. Holaday B, Waugh G, Moukaddem VE, West J, Harshman S. Diaper type and fecal contamination in child day care. J Pediatr Health Care Off Publ Natl Assoc Pediatr Nurse Assoc Pract. 1995 Apr;9(2):67–74.

95. Oristo S, Rönnqvist M, Aho M, Sovijärvi A, Hannila-Handelberg T, Hörman A, et al. Contamination by Norovirus and Adenovirus on Environmental Surfaces and in Hands of Conscripts in Two Finnish Garrisons. Food Environ Virol. 2017 Mar 1;9(1):62–71.

96. Keswick BH, Pickering LK, DuPont HL, Woodward WE. Survival and detection of rotaviruses on environmental surfaces in day care centers. Appl Environ Microbiol. 1983 Oct;46(4):813–6.

97. Cranston I, Potgieter N, Mathebula S, Ensink JHJ. Transmission of Enterobius vermicularis eggs through hands of school children in rural South Africa. Acta Trop. 2015 Oct 1;150:94–6.

98. Steinbaum L, Swarthout J, Mboya J, Pickering AJ. Following the Worms: Detection of Soil-Transmitted Helminth Eggs on Mothers' Hands and Household Produce in Rural Kenya. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2017 Nov 8;97(5):1616–8.

99. Wang Y, Moe CL, Null C, Raj SJ, Baker KK, Robb KA, et al. Multipathway Quantitative Assessment of Exposure to Fecal Contamination for Young Children in Low-Income Urban Environments in Accra, Ghana: The SaniPath Analytical Approach. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2017 Oct 11;97(4):1009–19.

100. Brauer M, Zhao JT, Bennitt FB, Stanaway JD. Global Access to Handwashing: Implications for COVID-19 Control in Low-Income Countries. Environ Health Perspect. 2020 May 15;128(5):057005-1-057005–5.

101. UNICEF. SNAPSHOT OF GLOBAL AND REGIONAL URBAN WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE INEQUALITIES [Internet]. p. 6–7. [accessed 2022 Nov 25]. Available from: https://www.unicef.org/media/91561/file/Snapshot-of-global-and-regional-urban-water-sanitation-and-hygiene-inequalities.pdf

102. Nadimpalli ML, Marks SJ, Montealegre MC, Gilman RH, Pajuelo MJ, Saito M, et al. Urban informal settlements as hotspots of antimicrobial resistance and the need to curb environmental transmission. Nat Microbiol. 2020 Jun;5(6):787–95.

103. Heijnen M, Routray P, Torondel B, Clasen T. Shared Sanitation versus Individual Household Latrines in Urban Slums: A Cross-Sectional Study in Orissa, India. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2015 Aug 5;93(2):263–8.

104. Fakhr AE, Gohar MK, Atta AH. Impact of Some Ecological Factors on Fecal Contamination of Drinking Water by Diarrheagenic Antibiotic-Resistant Escherichia coli in Zagazig City, Egypt. Int J Microbiol. 2016;2016:1–9.

105. Lee MS, Hong SJ, Kim YT. Handwashing with soap and national handwashing projects in Korea: focus on the National Handwashing Survey, 2006-2014. Epidemiol Health. 2015 Aug 31;37:1–9.

106. Powers JE, Mureithi M, Mboya J, Campolo J, Swarthout JM, Pajka J, et al. Effects of high temperature and heavy precipitation on drinking water quality and child hand contamination levels in rural kenya [Internet]. Microbiology; 2022 Oct [cited 2022 Nov 29]. Available from: http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2022.10.04.510863

107. Chua PLC, Ng CFS, Tobias A, Seposo XT, Hashizume M. Associations between ambient temperature and enteric infections by pathogen: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Planet Health. 2022 Mar;6(3):e202–18.

108. Mbouthieu Teumta GM, Niba LL, Ncheuveu NT, Ghumbemsitia MT, Itor POB, Chongwain P, et al. An Institution-Based Assessment of Students' Hand Washing Behavior. BioMed Res Int. 2019 Dec 28;2019:e7178645.

109. Guzek D, Skolmowska D, Głąbska D. Analysis of Gender-Dependent Personal Protective Behaviors in a National Sample: Polish Adolescents' COVID-19 Experience (PLACE-19) Study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020 Aug;17(16):1–22.

110. Another US airport travel hazard - dirty hands [Internet]. EurekAlert! [cited 2020 Dec 5]. Available from: http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2003-09/asfm-aua091103.php

111. Nagel Gravning GE, Røtterud OJ, Bjørkøy S, Forseth M, Skjerve E, Llarena AK, et al. Comparison of four sampling methods for microbiological quantification on broiler carcasses. Food Control. 2021 Mar 1;121:107589.

112. Zhang QQ, Ye KP, Xu XL, Zhou GH, Cao JX. Comparison of Excision, Swabbing and Rinsing Sampling Methods to Determine the Microbiological Quality of Broiler Carcasses. J Food Saf. 2012;32(1):134–9.