Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Part 2 - Hand hygiene and other hygiene measures: systematic review and meta-analysis.

Al-Ansary L, Bawazeer GA, Beller, EM, Clark J, Conly JM, Del Mar C, Dooley E, Ferroni E, Glasziou P, Hoffmann T, Jefferson T, Thorning S, van Driel ML, Jones MA

Al-Ansary, Lubna; Dept of Family and Community, College of Medicine, King Saud University.

Bawazeer, Ghada; College of Pharmacy, King Saud University.

Beller, Elaine; Centre for Research in Evidence Based Practice (CREBP), Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University.

Clark, Justin; Centre for Research in Evidence-Based Practice (CREBP), Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University.

Conly, John; Department of Medicine, Microbiology, Immunology & Infectious Diseases, University of Calgary and Alberta Health Services.

Del Mar, Chris; Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University.

Dooley, Elizabeth; Institute of Evidence-Based Healthcare, Bond University.

Ferroni, Eliana; Regione Veneto, Azienda Zero.

Glasziou, Paul; Centre for Research in Evidence Based Practice (CREBP), Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University.

Hoffman, Tammy; Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University.

Jefferson, Tom; Cochrane Vaccines Field.

Thorning, Sarah; Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service.

van Driel, Mieke; Primary Care Clinical Unit, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Queensland.

Jones, Mark; Centre for Research in Evidence Based Practice (CREBP), Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

OBJECTIVE: To assess the effectiveness of hand hygiene, surface disinfecting, and other hygiene interventions in preventing or reducing the spread of illnesses from respiratory viruses.

DESIGN: Update of a systematic review and meta-analysis focussing on randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster-RCTs (c-RCTs) evidence only.

DATA SOURCES: Eligible trials from the previous Cochrane review, search of the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, PubMed, Embase and CINAHL from 01 October 2010 to 01 April 2020, and forward and backward citation analysis of included studies.

DATA SELECTION: RCTs and c-RCTs involving people of any age, testing the use of hand hygiene methods, surface disinfection or cleaning, and other miscellaneous barrier interventions. Face masks, eye protection, and person distancing are covered in Part 1 of our systematic review. Outcomes included acute respiratory illness (ARI), influenza-like illness (ILI) or laboratory-confirmed influenza (influenza) and/or related consequences (e.g. death, absenteeism from school or work).

DATA EXTRACTION AND ANALYSIS: Six authors working in pairs independently assessed risk of bias using the Cochrane tool and extracted data. The generalised inverse variance method was used for pooling by using the random-effects model, and results reported with risk ratios (RR) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

RESULTS: We identified 51 eligible trials. We included 25 randomised trials comparing hand hygiene interventions with a control; 15 of these could be included in meta-analyses. We pooled 8 trials for the outcome of ARI. Hand hygiene showed a 16% relative reduction in the number of participants with ARI (RR 0.84, 95% CI 0.82 to 0.86) in the intervention group. When we considered the more strictly defined outcomes of ILI and influenza, the RR for ILI was 0.98 (95% CI 0.85 to 1.14), and for influenza the RR was 0.91 (95% CI 0.61 to 1.34). Three trials measured absenteeism. We found a 36% relative reduction in absentee numbers in the hand hygiene group (RR 0.64, 95% CI 0.58 to 0.71). Comparison of different hand hygiene interventions did not favour one intervention type over another. We found no incremental effects of combining hand hygiene with using face masks or disinfecting surfaces or objects.

CONCLUSIONS: Despite the lack of evidence for the impact of hand hygiene in reducing ILI and influenza, the modest evidence for reducing the burden of ARIs, and related absenteeism, justifies reinforcing the standard recommendation for hand hygiene measures to reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Funding for relevant trials with an emphasis on adherence and compliance with such a measure is crucial to inform policy and global pandemic preparedness with confidence and precision.

INTRODUCTION

Viral acute respiratory infections (ARIs) represent a huge burden on global health, whether during an epidemic, pandemic, or in non-epidemic situations [1]. Preventing the virus from spreading amongst people via a combination of social and physical interventions may be the only option to reduce the spread of outbreaks.

This systematic review is the second part of a review of physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Part 1 of the review examined the effectiveness of masks, eye protection, with or without person distancing [2]. This part examines the effectiveness of other physical interventions (such as hand hygiene, surface disinfecting, and other multi-component hygiene interventions) that may reduce spread by limiting the transfer of viral particles on to and from surfaces.

The last update of the Cochrane review in 2011 [3] included 23 randomised trials on hand hygiene and other hygiene measures. It was not possible to perform trial meta-analysis due to poor reporting and heterogeneity. Case-control trials were sufficiently homogenous to enable meta-analysis which provided evidence that handwashing for a minimum of 11 times a day prevented cases of SARS during the 2003 epidemic (odds ratio (OR) 0.54, 95% CI 0.44 to 0.67). Many randomised trials have been published in the past decade, and this has prompted us to include this higher-level evidence in this review.

METHODS

Inclusion criteria

We included randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster-RCTs (C-RCTs) involving participants of all ages that tested interventions including hand hygiene (alone or with other physical interventions), surface or object disinfection, and any other physical barrier interventions with no language restriction. Face masks, eye protection, and person distancing were excluded as these were covered in Part 1 of our systematic review. We included only trials that reported an outcome measure of acute respiratory illness (ARI). Measures including influenza-like illness (ILI), influenza, or respiratory infections – with or without related consequences (e.g. days off work, complications, hospitalisation and death, if clearly reported as consequences of the respiratory illness) were eligible. Relevant RCTs from the previous versions of this Cochrane review were also included [3-5]. We excluded observational trials because of the number of available randomized datasets which we

hoped would provide stronger evidence. We plan a follow up of the Cochrane review with all studies included.

Search strategy

We identified relevant RCTs and C-RCTs from our 2011 Cochrane Review [3]. These earlier trials were analysed using word frequency to create a new search string that was used to search PubMed [6]. This search string was converted using the Polyglot Search Translator [7] and was also used to search the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Embase and CINAHL. The searches were conducted from 01 October 2010 to 01 April 2020. Search strings for all databases are presented Appendix 1. We used Scopus to perform backwards and forward citation analysis for all new studies retrieved. We screened search and citation analysis results using the RobotSearch tool to remove all obvious non-RCTs [8]. Three authors (JC, MJ, ST) independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of the identified studies to assess eligibility for inclusion. We resolved discrepancies by consensus.

Risk of bias assessment

Three pairs of authors worked independently (TJ/EB, LA/GB, MJ/EF) to assess risk of bias using the Cochrane risk of bias tool for randomised trials (RoB 1.0). We resolved disagreements by discussion. See Part 1 of our systematic review for further details on the risk of bias methodology [2].

Data extraction and analysis

Three pairs of authors independently (TJ/EB, LA/GB, MJ/EF) to study data using a standard template that was developed and applied for previous versions of this Cochrane review, but revised to reflect our focus on RCTs and cRCTs only for this update. We resolved any discrepancies in the data extractions by discussion. We extracted and reported descriptions of interventions using the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) template [9]. We entered data on outcomes into RevMan software [10] and meta-analysed using the generalised inverse variance random-effects model. The random-effects model was chosen because we expected clinical heterogeneity due to differences in pooled interventions and outcome definitions, and methodological heterogeneity due to pooling of RCTs and C-RCTs. Where possible, we pooled estimates from C-RCTs accounting for clustering. Treatment effects were reported as risk ratios (RR) with 95% confidence interval

(CI) and P values. We used the I^2 statistic and chi-square test to assess statistical heterogeneity [11]. Relevant results from study types that could not be pooled were reported descriptively. Because all the authors consider themselves as past patients or potential future patients, formal opinion of patient or public representation was not sought in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

RESULTS

Results of the search

We searched four databases (see appendix 1) and retrieved 1486 records. Backwards (screening of the reference lists) and forwards citation analysis, undertaken in Scopus, on our initial list of included trials, retrieved 1694 records (n = 3180 records). We removed 706 duplicate records for a total of 2474 records that were screened by title and abstract. We excluded 2351 records following title and abstract screening. We obtained full text publications for 123 records. During full text screening and data extraction, we excluded 92 studies as not meeting inclusion criteria. We included 31 trials reported in 31 references, 20 trials from the previous review were also added, for a total of 51 trials. For a detailed description of our screening process, see the PRISMA flow diagram in Figure 1. We also searched two trials registers [12, 13] and identified 42 additional trials, of these, we identified three ongoing trials.

Risk of bias

Reporting of sequence generation and allocation concealment was poor in 30% to 50% of studies across the categories of intervention comparisons. Due to the nature of the interventions being compared, blinding of treatment allocation after randomisation was rarely achieved. Most outcomes were assessed by study participants. This meant that outcome assessment was not blinded and therefore at high risk of bias. Some studies had laboratory-confirmed outcomes which we considered were likely to be at low risk of bias. We found no evidence of selective reporting of outcomes within the included studies. We believe publication bias is unlikely, as the included studies demonstrated a range of effects, both positive and negative, over all sizes of study. Risk of bias assessment for individual studies are shown on forest plots (Figures 2, 3, S1, S2 and S3). Figure 4 presents an overall summary of risk of bias for included studies.

Hand hygiene versus control

Fifteen trials compared hand hygiene interventions with control [14-29] and provided sufficient data for meta-analysis. Populations included adults, children and families, in settings such as schools, childcare centres, homes, and offices. None were conducted during pandemics, although a few studies were conducted during peak influenza seasons. Table 1 presents characteristics of the included trials. Table 2 presents interventions investigated in the trials. Viral illness outcome definitions as reported by authors are in Table 3.

Pooling of eight trials [14-19, 21] for the broad outcome of acute respiratory illness (ARI) showed a 16% relative reduction in the numbers of participants with ARI in the hand hygiene group (risk ratio (RR) 0.84, 95% CI 0.82 to 0.86) (Figure 2). However, when considering the more strictly-defined outcomes of influenza-like illness (ILI) and laboratory-confirmed influenza (influenza) [15, 16, 20, 22-28], the results were heterogeneous and not as strongly in favour of hand hygiene (RR 0.98, 95% CI 0.85 to 1.14 for ILI; RR 0.91, 95% CI 0.61 to 1.34 for influenza). Three trials quantified absenteeism from school or work [17, 23, 30] and demonstrated a 36% relative reduction in the absentee numbers in the hand hygiene group (RR 0.64, 95% CI 0.58 to 0.71). All 15 trials could be pooled for analysis of the composite outcome 'ARI or ILI or influenza', each study contributing the most comprehensive outcome reported only once. This showed a statistically significant 10% relative reduction of participants with a respiratory illness in favour of hand hygiene (95% CI 0.84 to 0.96) but with high heterogeneity (Figure 2).

We considered that studies in children might show a different effect from studies in adults or households, so we looked at the nine studies conducted in children [14, 17, 19-21, 25-28] (Figure S3). The result was consistent with the overall one, with RR for intervention to control being 0.92 (95%CI 0.84 to 1.01) with high heterogeneity.

A further 10 trials that compared hand hygiene to control [31-40] presented insufficient information to include in meta-analyses. The results of these trials were consistent with the findings from our meta-analysis. Characteristics and results from these studies are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Comparisons of different types of hand hygiene interventions

Five trials compared different hand hygiene interventions in a variety of settings, such as schools, low-income neighbourhoods and workplaces. There was considerable variation in interventions and insufficient information in trial reports to enable meta-analysis of these

results (see Tables 1, 2 and 3 for details of the trials, interventions and outcomes). These trials looked at interventions such as soap and water, hand sanitiser, body wash and skin wipes, with or without additional hygiene education. One trial [41] compared different frequencies of handwashing in a kindergarten and found that compulsory handwashing every hour with an alcohol-based hand gel reduced absenteeism due to ILI more than handwashing every two hours or handwashing just before lunch. Morton et al [42] showed that using an alcohol gel as an adjunct to handwashing was more effective than handwashing alone in a primary school setting. However, this was not confirmed in another trial where both groups also received hygiene education [43]. Savolainen-Kopra et al [44] found no difference between soap and water and an alcohol-based hand rub. In low-income neighbourhoods in Pakistan, plain soap was equally effective as antibacterial soap in preventing ARIs in children aged under 5 years [45].

Hand hygiene and masks versus control

Seven trials compared a combined intervention of hand hygiene and face masks with control (see Table 1, 2 and 3). These trials were carried out in households [15, 22, 26, 46] (4 trials), university student residences [47, 48] (2 trials), and a group of pilgrims at the annual Hajj [49] (1 trial). Pooling did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between groups for the outcomes of ILI and influenza. However, the number of trials and events was lower than for the comparison of hand hygiene alone versus control, therefore CIs were wide. For ILI, the RR for intervention to control was 0.97 (95% CI 0.80 to 1.19) with high heterogeneity, and for influenza it was 0.97 (95% CI 0.69 to 1.36) (Figure 3)

Hand hygiene and masks versus hand hygiene alone

Three trials studied the incremental benefit of masks in addition to hand hygiene on the outcomes of ILI and influenza in households [15, 22, 26]. When pooled there was no statistically significant difference between groups for either outcome (RR for intervention to control for ILI was 1.03, 95% CI 0.69 to 1.53; and for influenza the RR was 0.99, 95% CI 0.69 to 1.44) (Figure 4)

Hand hygiene and disinfection of surfaces, objects, or environment versus control

Seven trials compared an intervention consisting of hand hygiene and disinfection of surfaces, toys, linen or other components of the environment with a control (see Table 1). Variation in scope and type of interventions and insufficient data in trial reports precluded meta-analysis. Three trials in young children [50-52] found a reduction of respiratory infections or absences, but the other three trials found no difference between intervention

and control groups with children [53] [54], or in rates of respiratory infections in nursing home residents [55].

One study [56] compared disinfection of toys and linen in childcare centres (without a hand hygiene intervention) with a control. This trial found a statistically significant reduction in some respiratory viruses on surfaces, but not in coronaviruses.

Virucidal tissues versus placebo

Three trials included in 2 papers [57] [58] investigated the role of virucidal tissues (see Table 1, and supplementary Table S1 with authors' outcome definitions) in interrupting transmission of naturally occurring respiratory infections in households. The results were inconsistent and suggest that virucidal tissues do not play a major role in stopping people from passing on respiratory viruses within their household.

Complex hygiene interventions versus control

Four c-RCTs implemented complex, multi-modal sanitation, education, cooking and hygiene interventions (see Tables 1, 2 and S1). All four trials were conducted in low-income countries in settings with minimal to no access to basic sanitation. In one trial in 100 primary schools in Laos [59] clean water supply, sanitation facilities, handwashing equipment and drinking water filters were provided to the intervention schools as part of a Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) programme with hygiene education. The control schools received the intervention after the trial period. They did not find an effect on infections or absenteeism amongst the students and conclude that such interventions alone are insufficient. The study by Huda et al [60] in villages in Bangladesh used local 'promoters' to visit households with young children regularly to deliver hygiene education including handwashing, latrine use, faeces and waste disposal, and water storage. Although the intervention households showed more 'desired behaviour' this did not result in a measurable reduction of respiratory illness. In another study in urban Bangladesh [61], handwashing equipment (bucket, tap, soap) and point-of-use water treatment were provided to intervention households and community health promoters delivered a behavioural intervention in addition to an oral cholera vaccine. There was no impact of this large-scale intervention on respiratory illness. However, the prevalence of respiratory illness was lower in those who had access to soap and water, irrespective of assignment to intervention or control group. A comprehensive intervention in rural Peru delivered stoves, kitchen sinks, plastic bottles for solar water treatment and hygiene education to households [62]. They did not find an effect on respiratory infections in children and suggest persistent poor indoor air quality may play a role. Another study [63] conducted among healthy adults compared throat gargling with

water or povidine-iodine versus control. It was found that simple water gargling was effective in preventing and reducing the severity of upper respiratory tract infections.

Safety of hand hygiene and other hygiene measures

Of all the included randomised trials, only six reported any outcomes related to the safety of these measures. [21, 39, 41, 43, 44, 46]. Skin and hand irritation were the most commonly reported adverse outcome in three out of four trials [21, 39, 43]. Two trials stated that no adverse outcomes were encountered among the participants. [41, 44]

DISCUSSION

Statement of MAIN findings

The composite outcome of ‘ARI or ILI or influenza’, the outcome of ARI alone and the outcome of absenteeism showed a significant benefit from hand hygiene. A non-significant benefit in favour of hand hygiene for laboratory-confirmed influenza may reflect less effect for this specific virus or sample size issues for a more rigorous outcome measure. We did not find an effect of combined hand hygiene and masks interventions, although there were few trials, mostly small in size, so CIs are wide. Similarly, we did not find a benefit for the addition of masks to hand hygiene, again CIs are wide, and it is difficult to draw a conclusion from these data. There were too few trials comparing different types of hand hygiene interventions to be certain of any differences between soap and water, alcohol-based hand sanitisers, or other types of interventions.

The findings in this review with respect to hand hygiene should be considered generally relevant to viral respiratory infections, given that diverse population categories of adults, children and families were studied and in multiple congregate settings including schools, childcare centres, homes and offices. These represent real world settings where transmission of viral respiratory infections occurs. Most respiratory viruses including SARS-CoV-2 are considered to be predominantly spread via respiratory droplets and/or contact routes [64]. Data from studies of SARS-CoV-2 contamination of the environment based on the presence of viral RNA, suggests significant fomite contamination from the virus. [65] [66] Hand hygiene would be expected to be beneficial of benefit in reducing the spread of this virus given the Joint Mission on COVID-19 of 75,465 cases suggested the majority of transmissions occurred within families in close contact with each other [64].

Studies on the major coronavirus pathogens including SARS-CoV-2, indicate that they are relatively persistent on surfaces such as wood, glass, metal, and especially plastic, with

viability maintained from 4 hours to 9 days [67] and [68]. This family of viruses is very susceptible to the concentrations of alcohol commonly found in most hand sanitising preparations used for hand hygiene, suggesting biologic plausibility for their inactivation [67]. Similarly, the SARS-CoV-2 would be readily inactivated by most commonly used disinfectants.

A recent study from a designated COVID-19 hospital in Wuhan, China, suggested that contact was one of the major routes of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [69]. They found that poor hand hygiene, despite the use of full PPE, was independently associated with a risk of SARS-CoV-2 HCW transmission using multivariate logistic regression in a retrospective cohort study with a relative risk (RR) of 3.07 (95% CI 1.14-5.15) and 2.45 (95% CI 1.45-4.03), respectively, in a high risk and low risk clinical unit, which supports the overall findings of our review with specific reference to the COVID-19 virus.[69]

Strengths and weaknesses of the study

This update of our review focused on the evidence from RCTs, providing a higher level of certainty, compared with the previous version, which also meta-analysed observational studies. However, many of the trials were small and hence underpowered, and at high or unclear risk of bias due to poor reporting of methods, and lack of blinding. The populations, outcomes, comparators and interventions tested were heterogeneous. Interventions were often complex in their implementation (e.g. handwashing education aimed at different stakeholders with specific instructions) and adherence was often modest or not reported. Studies were either situated in households or more closely monitored and regulated environments such as day care centres, primary schools, or army training centres. Only three of the trials in this review were conducted in a healthcare setting: all in nursing homes [55] [37] [40], and included healthcare workers, limiting generalisability of the results to those settings. Although two trials took place during the years of the previous SARS pandemic (2002 to 2003), the interventions were not tailored to this situation, and reducing transmission of SARS was not mentioned in the trials [19, 45]. Questions about effectiveness during an outbreak with the magnitude of the current SARS CoV-2 pandemic therefore remain unanswered.

Relationship to other studies

There are several previous systematic reviews on hand hygiene and respiratory infections. Five reviewed the evidence in a community setting [70] [71] [72] [73] [74], and three focussed specifically on children [75] [76] [77]. The earliest review by Rabie et al in 2006 [70] included 8 studies and only 3 were randomised trials. Although each individual study

was suggestive of an impact of handwashing on ARI, the pooled estimate of 7 studies was described as “indicative”, as studies were few, of poor quality, and limited in geographical scope. The review by Warren-Gash, 2013 [71] included 16 studies (10 were randomised trials), showed mixed results with inconclusive. Wong et al [72] identified 10 RCTs and reported that the combination of hand hygiene with facemasks in the developed countries only (5 trials) had statistically significant effect on reducing laboratory-confirmed influenza (RR = 0.73; 95% CI = 0.53 to 0.99; I² = 0%; p = 0.05) and ILI outcomes (RR = 0.78; 95% CI = 0.68 to 0.90; I² = 0%; p = 0.0008), while hand hygiene alone did not show significant reduction in respiratory outcomes. This significant reduction in ILI and influenza for hand hygiene and facemasks was possibly based on the raw numbers without considering any cluster effects in the included cluster trials which produced narrow confidence intervals and possibly biased treatment effect estimates. Moreover, trials from the less developed countries were not included in the review and this significant effect was not sustained when all the trials identified in the review were combined. Saudners-Hastings et al, [73] reviewed all the studies on the effectiveness of personal protective measures (PPM) in interrupting pandemic influenza transmission but identified only 2 randomised trials [46] [78] which reported a significant effect of hand hygiene. In a recent review by Moncion et al [74], 7 randomised trials of hand hygiene compared to control were identified but the majority did not find statistically significant differences in SARs for laboratory-confirmed or possible influenza between hand hygiene and control groups.

Systematic reviews of RCTs on hand hygiene interventions among children [75] [76] or at a non-clinical workplace [77], identified heterogeneous trials with quality issues including small numbers of clusters and participants, inadequate randomisation and self-reported outcomes. Evidence of impact on respiratory infections was equivocal.

Unanswered questions and future research

Though the studies reviewed make it clear that hand hygiene has a modest effect, several questions remain unanswered. First, the high heterogeneity means there may be substantial differences in the effect of different interventions. The poor reporting limited our ability to extract the information needed to assess any “dose response” relationship. Second, the sustainability of hand washing is unclear: some programmes achieved 5 to 10 hand washings per day, but compliance may diminish with time, as motivation decreases or because of adverse effects from frequent hand washing. Third, there is still little information on combinations of hand washing with other interventions, and how those are best introduced and sustained. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, most interventions were

intensive within small organisations, and the ability to scale these up to national-level interventions is unclear.

CONCLUSIONS

The use of hand hygiene is an essential component of the WHO recommendations for epidemic and pandemic respiratory virus infections transmitted predominantly by the droplet and contact route, along with strict adherence with the use of personal protective equipment [79]. The benefits of hand hygiene found in our study have important implications for policymakers and support the recommendations for hand hygiene in the current WHO recommendations for COVID-19 [64].

The combined effect of the trials is small, but highly statistically significant. There is also considerable variation across trials, suggesting a different impact across implementation methods and settings. More research is urgently needed into the sources of variability of these effects. However, given the low cost and minimal disruption from good hand washing behaviour, we believe this small effect warrants continued promotion as part of a combined strategy to reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. No single strategy - other than prolonged isolation of the entire population - can block an epidemic spread. The alternative is combining multiple, partially effective interventions, such as hand washing, crowd reduction, or self-isolation of symptomatic patients, etc. This model is used in medical error reduction, where a common analogy is the "Swiss cheese model" whereby enough slices of cheese are needed to prevent the holes lining up, and an error occurring. Hand washing is clearly not a complete solution but adds one important layer of a combined strategy to reduce respiratory viral transmission.

Disclosure

- **Mr. Clark** has received a prize from Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) for developing the Polyglot Search Translator, a tool that is used in this review.
- **Dr Conly** holds grants from the Canadian Institutes for Health Research, Alberta Innovates-Health Solutions and was the primary local Investigator for a *Staphylococcus aureus* vaccine study funded by Pfizer for which all funding was provided only to the University of Calgary for the conduct of the trial. He received money from the Centers for Disease Prevention and Control to cover accommodations and airfare to attend a Think Tank Meeting related to Infection Prevention and Control in each of the years of 2017 and 2019.
- **Prof Del Mar** holds a grant from the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia for funding the Cochrane Acute Respiratory Infections Group. He and **Dr Tammy Hoffmann** hold various grants from NHMRC on improving antibiotic prescribing in primary care.
- During the conduct of the study, **Dr Elaine Beller**, **Dr Mark Jones** and other staff in the Institute lead by **Prof Paul Glasziou** received grants from NIHR and WHO to assist with the rapid update of this review.
- **Dr Jefferson's** full disclosure is available here: <https://restoringtrials.org/competing-interests-tom-jefferson/>
- **Dr. van Driel** is a member of Clinical Intervention Advisory Group advising the National Prescribing Service, Australia and has received personal fees and non-financial support from NPS Medicinewise for that. She has also received personal fees and non-financial support from Therapeutic Guidelines Ltd as a member of the writing group for the Respiratory Guidelines.
- All other authors have no additional interests to declare.

Funding NIHR grant number NIHR130721 and WHO 2020/1011941 (pending) to assist with the rapid update of this review. The funders had no role in any aspect of preparation of the manuscript.

Contributorship: All authors contributed equally to the design of the update, screening, extraction, interpretation and writing the manuscript which is approved by all authors. JC designed and carried out the searches and MJ and EB carried out the analysis.

Acknowledgements: The authors thank Dr Elizabeth Gibson for her assistance with data extraction.

REFERENCES

1. *The Global Impact of Respiratory Disease*. 2017, European Respiratory Society, on behalf of the Forum of International Respiratory Societies (FIRS): Sheffield.
2. Jefferson, T., 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 (Submitted manuscript)*. 2020.
3. Jefferson, T., et al., *Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses*. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2011(7).
4. Jefferson, T., et al., *Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses: systematic review*. BMJ, 2009. **339**: p. b3675.
5. Jefferson, T., et al., *Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses*. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2010(1).
6. Clark, J., et al., *A full systematic review was completed in 2 weeks using automation tools: a case study*. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2020. **121**: p. 81- 90.
7. Clark, J., et al., *Improving the translation of search strategies using the Polyglot Search Translator: a randomised controlled trial*. J Am Libr Assoc, 2020: p. In press.
8. Marshall, I.J., et al., *Machine learning for identifying Randomized Controlled Trials: An evaluation and practitioner's guide*. Research synthesis methods, 2018. **9**(4): p. 602-614.
9. Hoffmann, T.C., et al., *Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide*. BMJ : British Medical Journal, 2014. **348**: p. g1687.
10. *Review Manager Web (RevMan Web)*. 2019, The Cochrane Collaboration.
11. Higgins, J.P.T. and S.G. Thompson, *Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis*. Statistics in Medicine, 2002. **21**(11): p. 1539-1558.
12. *ClinicalTrials.gov*. 2020.
13. *International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP)*. 2020, World Health Organization.
14. Azor-Martinez, E., et al., *Effectiveness of a Hand Hygiene Program at Child Care Centers: A Cluster Randomized Trial*. Pediatrics, 2018. **142**(5).
15. Larson, E.L., et al., *Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on URIs and influenza in crowded, urban households*. Public Health Rep, 2010. **125**(2): p. 178-91.
16. Little, P., et al., *An internet-delivered handwashing intervention to modify influenza-like illness and respiratory infection transmission (PRIMIT): a primary care randomised trial*. Lancet, 2015. **386**(10004): p. 1631-9.
17. Nicholson, J.A., et al., *An investigation of the effects of a hand washing intervention on health outcomes and school absence using a randomised trial in Indian urban communities*. Trop Med Int Health, 2014. **19**(3): p. 284-292.
18. Millar, E.V., et al., *Reduction in Acute Respiratory Infection Among Military Trainees: Secondary Effects of a Hygiene-Based Cluster-Randomized Trial for Skin and Soft-Tissue Infection Prevention*. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol, 2016. **37**(9): p. 1118-20.
19. Sandora, T.J., et al., *A randomized, controlled trial of a multifaceted intervention including alcohol-based hand sanitizer and hand-hygiene education to reduce illness transmission in the home*. Pediatrics, 2005. **116**(3): p. 587-94.

20. Biswas, D., et al., *Effectiveness of a Behavior Change Intervention with Hand Sanitizer Use and Respiratory Hygiene in Reducing Laboratory-Confirmed Influenza among Schoolchildren in Bangladesh: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial*. Am J Trop Med Hyg, 2019. **101**(6): p. 1446-1455.
21. Correa, J.C., et al., *A cluster-randomized controlled trial of handrubs for prevention of infectious diseases among children in Colombia*. Revista Panamericana de Salud Publica/Pan American Journal of Public Health, 2012. **31**(6): p. 476-484.
22. Cowling, B.J., et al., *Facemasks and hand hygiene to prevent influenza transmission in households: a cluster randomized trial*. Ann Intern Med, 2009. **151**(7): p. 437-46.
23. Hubner, N.O., et al., *Effectiveness of alcohol-based hand disinfectants in a public administration: impact on health and work performance related to acute respiratory symptoms and diarrhoea*. BMC Infect Dis, 2010. **10**: p. 250.
24. Ram, P.K., et al., *Impact of Intensive Handwashing Promotion on Secondary Household Influenza-Like Illness in Rural Bangladesh: Findings from a Randomized Controlled Trial*. PLoS One, 2015. **10**(6): p. e0125200.
25. Roberts, L., et al., *Effect of infection control measures on the frequency of upper respiratory infection in child care: a randomized, controlled trial*. Pediatrics, 2000. **105**(4 Pt 1): p. 738-42.
26. Simmerman, J.M., et al., *Findings from a household randomized controlled trial of hand washing and face masks to reduce influenza transmission in Bangkok, Thailand*. Influenza Other Respir Viruses, 2011. **5**(4): p. 256-67.
27. Zomer, T.P., et al., *A hand hygiene intervention to reduce infections in child daycare: a randomized controlled trial*. Epidemiol Infect, 2015. **143**(12): p. 2494-502.
28. Stebbins, S., et al., *Reduction in the incidence of influenza A but not influenza B associated with use of hand sanitizer and cough hygiene in schools: a randomized controlled trial*. Pediatr Infect Dis J, 2011. **30**(11): p. 921-6.
29. DiVita, M.A., et al., *Impact of intensive handwashing promotion on household transmission of influenza in a low income setting: Preliminary results of a randomized controlled clinical trial*. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 2011. **85**(6): p. 381.
30. Azor-Martinez, E., et al., *Hand Hygiene Program Decreases School Absenteeism Due to Upper Respiratory Infections*. J Sch Health, 2016. **86**(12): p. 873-881.
31. Alzahr, A.A., et al., *The importance of hand hygiene education on primary schoolgirls' absence due to upper respiratory infections in Saudi Arabia. A cluster randomized controlled trial*. Saudi Med J, 2018. **39**(10): p. 1044-1049.
32. Arbogast, J.W., et al., *Impact of a Comprehensive Workplace Hand Hygiene Program on Employer Health Care Insurance Claims and Costs, Absenteeism, and Employee Perceptions and Practices*. J Occup Environ Med, 2016. **58**(6): p. e231-40.
33. Feldman, L., et al., *Routine chlorhexidine gluconate use onboard navy surface vessels to reduce infection: A cluster randomized controlled trial*. Am J Infect Control, 2016. **44**(12): p. 1535-1538.
34. Gwaltney, J.M., Jr., P.B. Moskalski, and J.O. Hendley, *Interruption of experimental rhinovirus transmission*. J Infect Dis, 1980. **142**(6): p. 811-5.
35. Ladegaard, M.B. and V. Stage, *[Hand-hygiene and sickness among small children attending day care centers. An intervention study]*. Ugeskr Laeger, 1999. **161**(31): p. 4396-400.

36. Talaat, M., et al., *Effects of hand hygiene campaigns on incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza and absenteeism in schoolchildren, Cairo, Egypt*. Emerg Infect Dis, 2011. **17**(4): p. 619-25.
37. Temime, L., et al., *Impact of a multicomponent hand hygiene-related intervention on the infectious risk in nursing homes: a cluster randomized trial*. American journal of infection control, 2018. **46**(2): p. 173-179.
38. Turner, R.B., et al., *Efficacy of organic acids in hand cleansers for prevention of rhinovirus infections*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother, 2004. **48**(7): p. 2595-8.
39. Turner, R.B., et al., *A randomized trial of the efficacy of hand disinfection for prevention of rhinovirus infection*. Clin Infect Dis, 2012. **54**(10): p. 1422-6.
40. Yeung, W.K., W.S. Wilson Tam, and T.W. Wong, *Clustered randomized controlled trial of a hand hygiene intervention involving pocket-sized containers of alcohol-based hand rub for the control of infections in long-term care facilities*. Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology, 2011. **32**(1): p. 67-76.
41. Pandepong, D., et al., *Appropriate time-interval application of alcohol hand gel on reducing influenza-like illness among preschool children: a randomized, controlled trial*. Am J Infect Control, 2012. **40**(6): p. 507-11.
42. Morton, J.L. and A.A. Schultz, *Healthy Hands: Use of alcohol gel as an adjunct to handwashing in elementary school children*. J Sch Nurs, 2004. **20**(3): p. 161-7.
43. Priest, P., et al., *Hand sanitiser provision for reducing illness absences in primary school children: A cluster randomised trial*. PLoS Medicine, 2015. **11**(8).
44. Savolainen-Kopra, C., et al., *Hand washing with soap and water together with behavioural recommendations prevents infections in common work environment: an open cluster-randomized trial*. Trials, 2012. **13**: p. 10.
45. Luby, S.P., et al., *Effect of handwashing on child health: a randomised controlled trial*. Lancet, 2005. **366**(9481): p. 225-33.
46. Suess, T., et al., *The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in the prevention of influenza transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised trial; Berlin, Germany, 2009-2011*. BMC Infect Dis, 2012. **12**: p. 26.
47. Aiello, A.E., et al., *Mask use, hand hygiene, and seasonal influenza-like illness among young adults: a randomized intervention trial*. J Infect Dis, 2010. **201**(4): p. 491-8.
48. Aiello, A.E., et al., *Facemasks, hand hygiene, and influenza among young adults: a randomized intervention trial*. PLoS One, 2012. **7**(1): p. e29744.
49. Aelami, M.H., et al., *Implementation of an educational intervention among Iranian Hajj pilgrims for the prevention of influenza-like illness*. Antimicrobial Resistance and Infection Control, 2015. **4**.
50. White, C.G., et al., *Reduction of Illness Absenteeism in Elementary Schools Using an Alcohol-free Instant Hand Sanitizer*. The Journal of School Nursing, 2001. **17**(5): p. 248-265.
51. Ban, H.Q., et al., *Effects of Multiple Cleaning and Disinfection Interventions on Infectious Diseases in Children: A Group Randomized Trial in China*. Biomed Environ Sci, 2015. **28**(11): p. 779-87.
52. Carabin, H., et al., *Effectiveness of a training program in reducing infections in toddlers attending day care centers*. Epidemiology, 1999. **10**(3): p. 219-27.
53. Kotch, J.B., et al., *Evaluation of an hygienic intervention in child day-care centers*. Pediatrics, 1994. **94**(6 Pt 2): p. 991-4.

54. Sandora, T.J., M.C. Shih, and D.A. Goldmann, *Reducing absenteeism from gastrointestinal and respiratory illness in elementary school students: a randomized, controlled trial of an infection-control intervention*. *Pediatrics*, 2008. **121**(6): p. e1555-62.
55. McConeghy, K.W., et al., *Implementing a Pilot Trial of an Infection Control Program in Nursing Homes: Results of a Matched Cluster Randomized Trial*. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*, 2017. **18**(8): p. 707-712.
56. Ibfelt, T., et al., *Effect of cleaning and disinfection of toys on infectious diseases and micro-organisms in daycare nurseries*. *J Hosp Infect*, 2015. **89**(2): p. 109-15.
57. Farr, B.M., et al., *Two randomized controlled trials of virucidal nasal tissues in the prevention of natural upper respiratory infections*. *Am J Epidemiol*, 1988. **128**(5): p. 1162-72.
58. Longini, I.M., Jr. and A.S. Monto, *Efficacy of virucidal nasal tissues in interrupting familial transmission of respiratory agents. A field trial in Tecumseh, Michigan*. *Am J Epidemiol*, 1988. **128**(3): p. 639-44.
59. Chard, A.N., et al., *Impact of a school-based water, sanitation, and hygiene intervention on school absence, diarrhea, respiratory infection, and soil-transmitted helminths: results from the WASH HELPS cluster-randomized trial*. *J Glob Health*, 2019. **9**(2): p. 020402.
60. Huda, T.M., et al., *Interim evaluation of a large scale sanitation, hygiene and water improvement programme on childhood diarrhea and respiratory disease in rural Bangladesh*. *Soc Sci Med*, 2012. **75**(4): p. 604-11.
61. Najnin, N., et al., *Impact of a Large-Scale Handwashing Intervention on Reported Respiratory Illness: Findings from a Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial*. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, 2019. **100**(3): p. 742-749.
62. Hartinger, S.M., 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. **45**(6): p. 2089-2099.
63. Satomura, K., et al., *Prevention of Upper Respiratory Tract Infections by Gargling: A Randomized Trial*. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 2005. **29**(4): p. 302-307.
64. WHO. *Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) technical guidance: Infection prevention and control / WASH*. Technical guidance 2020; Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/infection-prevention-and-control>.
65. Cheng, V.C.C., et al., *Escalating infection control response to the rapidly evolving epidemiology of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) due to SARS-CoV-2 in Hong Kong*. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*, 2020: p. 1-6.
66. Ong, S.W.X., et al., *Air, Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From a Symptomatic Patient*. *JAMA*, 2020.
67. Kampf, G., et al., *Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents*. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 2020. **104**(3): p. 246-251.
68. van Doremalen, N., et al., *Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1*. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2020.

69. Ran, L., et al., *Risk Factors of Healthcare Workers with Corona Virus Disease 2019: A Retrospective Cohort Study in a Designated Hospital of Wuhan in China*. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2020.
70. Rabie, T. and V. Curtis, *Handwashing and risk of respiratory infections: a quantitative systematic review*. Tropical Medicine & International Health, 2006. **11**(3): p. 258-267.
71. Warren-Gash, C., E. Fragaszy, and A.C. Hayward, *Hand hygiene to reduce community transmission of influenza and acute respiratory tract infection: a systematic review*. Influenza and other respiratory viruses, 2013. **7**(5): p. 738-749.
72. Wong, V.W.Y., B.J. Cowling, and A.E. Aiello, *Hand hygiene and risk of influenza virus infections in the community: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. Epidemiology and infection, 2014. **142**(5): p. 922-932.
73. Saunders-Hastings, P., et al., *Effectiveness of personal protective measures in reducing pandemic influenza transmission: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. Epidemics, 2017. **20**: p. 1-20.
74. Moncion, K., et al., *Effectiveness of hand hygiene practices in preventing influenza virus infection in the community setting: A systematic review*. Canada communicable disease report = Relevé des maladies transmissibles au Canada, 2019. **45**(1): p. 12-23.
75. Willmott, M., et al., *Effectiveness of hand hygiene interventions in reducing illness absence among children in educational settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. Archives of disease in childhood, 2016. **101**(1): p. 42-50.
76. Mbakaya, B.C., P.H. Lee, and R.L.T. Lee, *Hand Hygiene Intervention Strategies to Reduce Diarrhoea and Respiratory Infections among Schoolchildren in Developing Countries: A Systematic Review*. International journal of environmental research and public health, 2017. **14**(4): p. 371.
77. Zivich, P.N., A.S. Gancz, and A.E. Aiello, *Effect of hand hygiene on infectious diseases in the office workplace: A systematic review*. American Journal of Infection Control, 2018. **46**(4): p. 448-455.
78. Azor-Martinez, E., et al., *The impact of common infections on school absenteeism during an academic year*. Am J Infect Control, 2014. **42**(6): p. 632-7.
79. *WHO Guidelines: Infection prevention and control of epidemic-and pandemic prone acute respiratory infections in health care*. 2014, Geneva, Switzerland: WHO Publications.

APPENDIX

Search strings for data bases run on 01/04/2020

PubMed

("Influenza, Human"[Mesh] OR "Influenzavirus A"[Mesh] OR "Influenzavirus B"[Mesh] OR "Influenzavirus C"[Mesh] OR Influenza[tiab] OR "Respiratory Tract Diseases"[Mesh] OR "Bacterial Infections/transmission"[Mesh] OR Influenzas[tiab] OR "Influenza-like"[tiab] OR ILI[tiab] OR Flu[tiab] OR Flus[tiab] OR "Common Cold"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "common cold"[tiab] OR colds[tiab] OR coryza[tiab] OR coronavirus[Mesh] OR "sars virus"[Mesh] OR coronavirus[tiab] OR Coronaviruses[tiab] OR "coronavirus infections"[Mesh] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome"[Mesh] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome"[tiab] OR "severe acute respiratory syndromes"[tiab] OR sars[tiab] OR "respiratory syncytial viruses"[Mesh] OR "respiratory syncytial virus, human"[Mesh] OR "Respiratory Syncytial Virus Infections"[Mesh] OR "respiratory syncytial virus"[tiab] OR "respiratory syncytial viruses"[tiab] OR rsv[tiab] OR parainfluenza[tiab] OR ((Transmission[tiab]) AND (Coughing[tiab] OR Sneezing[tiab])) OR ((respiratory[tiab] AND Tract[tiab]) AND (infection[tiab] OR Infections[tiab] OR illness[tiab])))

AND

("Hand Hygiene"[Mesh] OR handwashing[tiab] OR hand-washing[tiab] OR ((Hand[tiab] OR Alcohol[tiab]) AND (wash[tiab] OR Washing[tiab] OR Cleansing[tiab] OR Rinses[tiab] OR hygiene[tiab] OR rub[tiab] OR Rubbing[tiab] OR sanitiser[tiab] OR sanitizer[tiab] OR cleanser[tiab] OR disinfected[tiab] OR Disinfectant[tiab] OR Disinfect[tiab] OR antiseptic[tiab] OR virucid[tiab])) OR "gloves, protective"[Mesh] OR Glove[tiab] OR Gloves[tiab] OR Masks[Mesh] OR "respiratory protective devices"[Mesh] OR facemask[tiab] OR Facemasks[tiab] OR mask[tiab] OR Masks[tiab] OR respirator[tiab] OR respirators[tiab] OR "Protective Clothing"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "Protective Devices"[Mesh] OR "patient isolation"[tiab] OR ((school[tiab] OR Schools[tiab]) AND (Closure[tiab] OR Closures[tiab] OR Closed[tiab])) OR Quarantine[Mesh] OR quarantine[tiab] OR "Hygiene intervention"[tiab] OR "Mouthwashes"[Mesh] OR gargling[tiab] OR "nasal tissues"[tiab] OR "Eye Protective Devices"[Mesh] OR Glasses[tiab] OR Goggle[tiab] OR "Eye protection"[tiab] OR Faceshield[tiab] OR Faceshields[tiab] OR Goggles[tiab] OR "Face shield"[tiab] OR "Face shields"[tiab] OR Visors[tiab])

AND

("Communicable Disease Control"[Mesh] OR "Disease Outbreaks"[Mesh] OR "Disease Transmission, Infectious"[Mesh] OR "Infection Control"[Mesh] OR Transmission[sh] OR "Prevention and control"[sh] OR "Communicable Disease Control"[tiab] OR "Secondary transmission"[tiab] OR ((Reduced[tiab] OR Reduce[tiab] OR Reduction[tiab] OR Reducing[tiab] OR Lower[tiab]) AND (Incidence[tiab] OR Occurrence[tiab] OR Transmission[tiab] OR Secondary[tiab])))

AND

(Randomized controlled trial[pt] OR controlled clinical trial[pt] OR randomized[tiab] OR randomised[tiab] OR placebo[tiab] OR "drug therapy"[sh] OR randomly[tiab] OR trial[tiab] OR groups[tiab])

NOT

(Animals[Mesh] not (Animals[Mesh] and Humans[Mesh]))

NOT

("Case Reports"[pt] OR Editorial[pt] OR Letter[pt] OR Meta-Analysis[pt] OR "Observational Study"[pt] OR "Systematic Review"[pt] OR "Case Report"[ti] OR "Case series"[ti] OR Meta-Analysis[ti] OR "Meta Analysis"[ti] OR "Systematic Review"[ti])

CENTRAL

([mh "Influenza, Human"] OR [mh "Influenzavirus A"] OR [mh "Influenzavirus B"] OR [mh "Influenzavirus C"] OR Influenza:ti,ab OR [mh "Respiratory Tract Diseases"] OR Influenzas:ti,ab OR "Influenza-like":ti,ab OR ILI:ti,ab OR Flu:ti,ab OR Flus:ti,ab OR [mh ^"Common Cold"] OR "common cold":ti,ab OR colds:ti,ab OR coryza:ti,ab OR [mh coronavirus] OR [mh "sars virus"] OR coronavirus:ti,ab OR Coronaviruses:ti,ab OR [mh "coronavirus infections"] OR [mh "severe acute respiratory syndrome"] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome":ti,ab OR "severe acute respiratory syndromes":ti,ab OR sars:ti,ab OR [mh "respiratory syncytial viruses"] OR [mh "respiratory syncytial virus, human"] OR [mh "Respiratory Syncytial Virus Infections"] OR "respiratory syncytial virus":ti,ab OR "respiratory syncytial viruses":ti,ab OR rsv:ti,ab OR parainfluenza:ti,ab OR ((Transmission) AND (Coughing OR Sneezing)) OR ((respiratory:ti,ab AND Tract) AND (infection:ti,ab OR Infections:ti,ab OR illness:ti,ab)))

AND

([mh "Hand Hygiene"] OR handwashing:ti,ab OR "hand-washing":ti,ab OR ((Hand:ti,ab OR Alcohol:ti,ab) AND (wash:ti,ab OR Washing:ti,ab OR Cleansing:ti,ab OR Rinses:ti,ab OR hygiene:ti,ab OR rub:ti,ab OR Rubbing:ti,ab OR sanitiser:ti,ab OR sanitizer:ti,ab OR cleanser:ti,ab OR disinfected:ti,ab OR Disinfectant:ti,ab OR Disinfect:ti,ab OR antiseptic:ti,ab OR virucid:ti,ab)) OR [mh "gloves, protective"] OR Glove:ti,ab OR Gloves:ti,ab OR [mh Masks] OR [mh "respiratory protective devices"] OR facemask:ti,ab OR Facemasks:ti,ab OR mask:ti,ab OR Masks:ti,ab OR respirator:ti,ab OR respirators:ti,ab OR [mh ^"Protective Clothing"] OR [mh "Protective Devices"] OR "patient isolation":ti,ab OR ((school:ti,ab OR Schools:ti,ab) AND (Closure:ti,ab OR Closures:ti,ab OR Closed:ti,ab)) OR [mh Quarantine] OR quarantine:ti,ab OR "Hygiene intervention":ti,ab OR [mh Mouthwashes] OR gargling:ti,ab OR "nasal tissues":ti,ab OR [mh "Eye Protective Devices"] OR Glasses:ti,ab OR Goggle:ti,ab OR "Eye protection":ti,ab OR Faceshield:ti,ab OR Faceshields:ti,ab OR Goggles:ti,ab OR "Face shield":ti,ab OR "Face shields":ti,ab OR Visors:ti,ab)

AND

([mh "Communicable Disease Control"] OR [mh "Disease Outbreaks"] OR [mh "Disease Transmission, Infectious"] OR [mh "Infection Control"] OR "Communicable Disease Control":ti,ab OR "Secondary transmission":ti,ab OR ((Reduced:ti,ab OR Reduce:ti,ab OR Reduction:ti,ab OR Reducing:ti,ab OR Lower:ti,ab) AND (Incidence:ti,ab OR Occurrence:ti,ab OR Transmission:ti,ab OR Secondary:ti,ab)))

Embase

('influenza'/exp OR Influenza:ti,ab OR 'Respiratory Tract Disease'/exp OR Influenzas:ti,ab OR Influenza-like:ti,ab OR ILI:ti,ab OR Flu:ti,ab OR Flus:ti,ab OR 'Common Cold'/de OR "common cold":ti,ab OR colds:ti,ab OR coryza:ti,ab OR 'coronavirus'/exp OR 'SARS coronavirus'/exp OR coronavirus:ti,ab OR Coronaviruses:ti,ab OR 'coronavirus infection'/exp OR 'severe acute respiratory syndrome'/exp OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome":ti,ab

OR "severe acute respiratory syndromes":ti,ab OR sars:ti,ab OR 'Pneumovirus'/exp OR 'Human respiratory syncytial virus'/exp OR "respiratory syncytial virus":ti,ab OR "respiratory syncytial viruses":ti,ab OR rsv:ti,ab OR parainfluenza:ti,ab OR ((Transmission) AND (Coughing OR Sneezing)) OR ((respiratory:ti,ab AND Tract) AND (infection:ti,ab OR Infections:ti,ab OR illness:ti,ab)))

AND

('hand washing'/exp OR handwashing:ti,ab OR hand-washing:ti,ab OR ((Hand:ti,ab OR Alcohol:ti,ab) AND (wash:ti,ab OR Washing:ti,ab OR Cleansing:ti,ab OR Rinses:ti,ab OR hygiene:ti,ab OR rub:ti,ab OR Rubbing:ti,ab OR sanitiser:ti,ab OR sanitizer:ti,ab OR cleanser:ti,ab OR disinfected:ti,ab OR Disinfectant:ti,ab OR Disinfect:ti,ab OR antiseptic:ti,ab OR virucid:ti,ab)) OR 'protective glove'/exp OR Glove:ti,ab OR Gloves:ti,ab OR 'mask'/exp OR 'gas mask'/exp OR facemask:ti,ab OR Facemasks:ti,ab OR mask:ti,ab OR Masks:ti,ab OR respirator:ti,ab OR respirators:ti,ab OR 'protective clothing'/de OR 'protective equipment'/exp OR "patient isolation":ti,ab OR ((school:ti,ab OR Schools:ti,ab) AND (Closure:ti,ab OR Closures:ti,ab OR Closed:ti,ab)) OR 'Quarantine'/exp OR quarantine:ti,ab OR "Hygiene intervention":ti,ab OR 'mouthwash'/exp OR gargling:ti,ab OR "nasal tissues":ti,ab OR 'eye protective device'/exp OR Glasses:ti,ab OR Goggle:ti,ab OR "Eye protection":ti,ab OR Faceshield:ti,ab OR Faceshields:ti,ab OR Goggles:ti,ab OR "Face shield":ti,ab OR "Face shields":ti,ab OR Visors:ti,ab)

AND

('Communicable Disease Control'/exp OR 'epidemic'/exp OR 'disease transmission'/exp OR 'Infection Control'/exp OR "Communicable Disease Control":ti,ab OR "Secondary transmission":ti,ab OR ((Reduced:ti,ab OR Reduce:ti,ab OR Reduction:ti,ab OR Reducing:ti,ab OR Lower:ti,ab) AND (Incidence:ti,ab OR Occurrence:ti,ab OR Transmission:ti,ab OR Secondary:ti,ab)))

AND

(random* OR factorial OR crossover OR placebo OR blind OR blinded OR assign OR assigned OR allocate OR allocated OR 'crossover procedure'/exp OR 'double-blind procedure'/exp OR 'randomized controlled trial'/exp OR 'single-blind procedure'/exp NOT ('animal'/exp NOT ('animal'/exp AND 'human'/exp)))

CINAHL

((MH "Influenza, Human+") OR (MH "Orthomyxoviridae+") OR TI Influenza OR AB Influenza OR (MH "Respiratory Tract Diseases+") OR TI Influenzas OR AB Influenzas OR TI Influenza-like OR AB Influenza-like OR TI ILI OR AB ILI OR TI Flu OR AB Flu OR TI Flus OR AB Flus OR (MH "Common Cold+") OR TI "common cold" OR AB "common cold" OR TI colds OR AB colds OR TI coryza OR AB coryza OR (MH "coronavirus+") OR (MH "sars virus+") OR TI coronavirus OR AB coronavirus OR TI Coronaviruses OR AB Coronaviruses OR (MH "coronavirus infections+") OR (MH "severe acute respiratory syndrome+") OR TI "severe acute respiratory syndrome" OR AB "severe acute respiratory syndrome" OR TI "severe acute respiratory syndromes" OR AB "severe acute respiratory syndromes" OR TI sars OR AB sars OR (MH "respiratory syncytial viruses+") OR TI "respiratory syncytial virus" OR AB "respiratory syncytial virus" OR TI "respiratory syncytial viruses" OR AB "respiratory syncytial viruses" OR TI rsv OR AB rsv OR TI parainfluenza OR AB parainfluenza OR ((Transmission) AND (Coughing OR Sneezing)) OR ((TI respiratory OR AB respiratory AND Tract) AND (TI infection OR AB infection OR TI Infections OR AB Infections OR TI illness OR AB illness)))

AND

((MH "Handwashing+") OR TI handwashing OR AB handwashing OR TI hand-washing OR AB hand-washing OR ((TI Hand OR AB Hand OR TI Alcohol OR AB Alcohol) AND (TI wash OR AB wash OR TI Washing OR AB Washing OR TI Cleansing OR AB Cleansing OR TI Rinses OR AB Rinses OR TI hygiene OR AB hygiene OR TI rub OR AB rub OR TI Rubbing OR AB Rubbing OR TI sanitiser OR AB sanitiser OR TI sanitizer OR AB sanitizer OR TI cleanser OR AB cleanser OR TI disinfected OR AB disinfected OR TI Disinfectant OR AB Disinfectant OR TI Disinfect OR AB Disinfect OR TI antiseptic OR AB antiseptic OR TI virucid OR AB virucid)) OR (MH "gloves+") OR TI Glove OR AB Glove OR Gloves OR (MH "Masks+") OR (MH "respiratory protective devices+") OR TI facemask OR AB facemask OR TI Facemasks OR AB Facemasks OR TI mask OR AB mask OR TI Masks OR AB Masks OR TI respirator OR AB respirator OR TI respirators OR AB respirators OR (MH "Protective Clothing") OR (MH "Protective Devices+") OR TI "patient isolation" OR AB "patient isolation" OR ((TI school OR AB school OR TI Schools OR AB Schools) AND (TI Closure OR AB Closure OR TI Closures OR AB Closures OR TI Closed OR AB Closed)) OR (MH "Quarantine+") OR TI quarantine OR AB quarantine OR TI "Hygiene intervention" OR AB "Hygiene intervention" OR (MH "Mouthwashes+") OR TI gargling OR AB gargling OR TI "nasal tissues" OR AB "nasal tissues" OR (MH "Eye Protective Devices+") OR TI Glasses OR AB Glasses OR TI Goggle OR AB Goggle OR TI "Eye protection" OR AB "Eye protection" OR TI Faceshield OR AB Faceshield OR TI Faceshields OR AB Faceshields OR TI Goggles OR AB Goggles OR TI "Face shield" OR AB "Face shield" OR TI "Face shields" OR AB "Face shields" OR TI Visors OR AB Visors)

AND

((MH "Infection Control+") OR (MH "Disease Outbreaks+") OR (MH "Infection Control+") OR TI "Communicable Disease Control" OR AB "Communicable Disease Control" OR TI "Secondary transmission" OR AB "Secondary transmission" OR ((TI Reduced OR AB Reduced OR TI Reduce OR AB Reduce OR TI Reduction OR AB Reduction OR TI Reducing OR AB Reducing OR TI Lower OR AB Lower) AND (TI Incidence OR AB Incidence OR TI Occurrence OR AB Occurrence OR TI Transmission OR AB Transmission OR TI Secondary OR AB Secondary)))

AND

((MH "Clinical Trials+") OR (MH "Quantitative Studies") OR TI placebo* OR AB placebo* OR (MH "Placebos") OR (MH "Random Assignment") OR TI random* OR AB random* OR TI ((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) W1 (blind* or mask*)) OR AB ((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) W1 (blind* or mask*)) OR TI clinic* trial* OR AB clinic* trial* OR PT clinical trial)

08/04/2020

Table 1: Overview of characteristics of included studies.

Study	Study period	Population	Comparison (see Table 2 for details of interventions)	Baseline use of intervention	Reported outcomes (see Table S1 for details of definitions)	Results	Adherence
HAND HYGIENE							
Alzaher 2018; c-RCT Saudi Arabia	January to March 2018	496 Girls aged 6-12 yo in 4 primary schools in Riyadh	HW workshop and posters vs usual practice	Not reported	% Absence days due to URI	0.39% and 0.72% in intervention group schools; 0.86% and 1.39% in control schools	Not reported
Arbogast 2016; c-RCT USA	February 2014 to March 2015	1386 Employees ≥18yo in 3 facilities of a health insurance company in Ohio	Hand sanitiser + wipes + hand foam vs none; both groups received education + signage about HW	> 50% of control carry HS, use HS at work and public places, 30% use HS at home, 40% carry HS throughout the day (Figure 4)	1: Health insurance claims for preventable illnesses per employee 2: Absences per employee	1: 0.30 claims in intervention; 0.37 in control (27% relative reduction, p=0.03) 2: 1.45 in intervention; 1.53 in control (5.0% relative reduction in intervention, p=0.30)	Estimated: per employee per day: HS 1.8 to 3.0 times; soap 2.1 to 4.4 times. Wipes at desk 1.4 to 1.5 times per week.
Azor-Martinez 2016;* RCT Spain	October 2009 to May 2010	1341 children 4-12 yo in 5 Primary schools in Almeria Province	Handwashing with soap & water plus hand sanitiser vs usual handwashing practices	Both groups used hand sanitizer before study started (C=10.7%, I=11.8%)	% absence days due to URI	1.15% in intervention; 1.68% in control. Significantly lower in intervention (p<0.001)	Not reported, but mentioned children who washed hands correctly showed 11% decrease in URIs
Azor-Martinez 2018*; c-RCT Spain	November 2013 to June 2014	911 Children 0-3 yo in day care centres; excluded children with chronic illness or immune-suppressant medication in metropolitan Almeria	Educational and Hand hygiene (HH) with soap & water or HH with sanitiser vs usual hand-washing procedures.	All groups attended 1-hr workshop on hand-washing practices	1: RI incidence rate ratio (primary); 2: Percentage difference in absenteeism days	1: HH soap vs control 0.94 (95%CI 0.82 to 1.08); HH sanitiser vs control 0.77 (95%CI 0.68 to 0.88); HH soap vs HH sanitiser 1.21 (95%CI 1.06 to 1.39); 2: HH soap 3.25% vs control 4.2% (p<0.001); HH sanitiser 3.9% vs control 4.2% (p=0.026); HH soap 3.25% vs HH sanitiser 3.9% (p<0.001)	Compliance not measured. Estimated that each child used hand sanitiser 6-8 times per day

Biswas 2019*; c-RCT Bangladesh	June to September 2015 (influenza season)	10,855 students aged 5 to 10 yo in 24 Primary schools (number not reported) in Dhaka	Hand sanitiser and respiratory hygiene education and cough/sneeze hygiene vs no intervention	Baseline HW events were similar between groups, both groups have equal% of schools implementing hand hygiene curriculum, less in control group have curriculum on respiratory hygiene	1.ILI incidence rate (at least 1 episode); 2.Laboratory-confirmed influenza	1: 22 per 1000 student-weeks in intervention; 27 per 1000 student-weeks in control, not statistically significantly different. 2: 3 per 1000 student-weeks in intervention; 6.2 per 1000 student-weeks in control, p=0.01	HW observed; sanitiser used in 91% of events, 4.3mL per child per day; cough/sneeze etiquette observed in 33% of intervention and 2% of control group
Correa 2012*; c-RCT Colombia	16 April to 18 December 2008 (three school terms)	Children aged up to 5y in 42 child-care facilities in six towns in Bogotá and five neighbouring towns	Alcohol-based handwash in addition to handwashing vs usual handwashing practice	Hand hygiene (HH) infrastructure is similar between groups	1: ARIs in 3 rd trimester of follow-up (≥ 2 of the following symptoms ≥ 24 hours, for ≥ 2 days: runny, stuffy, or blocked nose or noisy breathing; cough; fever, hot sensation, or chills; and/or sore throat. Ear pain was considered an ARI.	1: Hazard ratio for intervention to control 0.93 (95%CI 0.57 to 0.83)	Median hand soap-water (HSW) frequency at trial end in control centers was 3 times/day. From start to end of trial, median number of applications per child rose from 3.5 to 4.5 in preschools and from 3.5 to 5.5 in community centers
Cowling 2009*; c-RCT Hong Kong	January to September 2008	407 adults with influenza A/B and 794 household members in 259 households In Hong Kong	HH (136 households); facemask + hand hygiene (137 households); education (134 control households)	Not reported	2: Secondary attack ratio 3: Laboratory-confirmed influenza ILI definition 1 4: ILI definition 2	2: HH 5; HH+masks 7; control 10 3: HH 16; HH+masks 21; control 19 4: HH 4; HH+masks 7; control 5	At the final home visit, the intervention groups reported higher adherence to the interventions than the control group
DiVita 2011 (conference abstract); RCT Bangladesh	2009-2010	274 index case patients and their household members in rural setting	Handwashing stations with soap and motivation vs none	Not reported	1: Secondary attack rate (SAR) for laboratory-confirmed influenza 2: SAR for ILI	1: SAR higher in intervention group (11.0% vs 7.5%) 2: SAR higher in intervention group (14.2% vs 11.9%)	Not reported
Feldman 2016; c-RCT Israel	May to September 2014	Ships in a naval base (697 sailors)	Hand disinfection + soap and water installed vs none	Not reported	1: Number of respiratory infections; 2: Number of off-duty days	1: 11 in each group 2: 112 in intervention; 104 in control	Disinfectant mean 8.2mL per sailor per day

Gwaltney 1980; RCT USA	November 1978 and January 1979	Healthy volunteers experimentally exposed to rhinovirus at University of Virginia, Charlottesville	Virucidal hand wash vs placebo	Not reported	1: Number with illness after immediate exposure; 2: Number with illness after 2-hour delay in exposure (Illness defined as symptom score ≥ 5 and nasal discharge)	1: 0 of 8 in intervention; 7 of 7 in control 2: 1 of 10 in intervention; 6 of 10 in control	Not reported
Hubner 2010*; RCT Germany	March 2005 to April 2006	1230 Public administration employees, at Ernst-Moritz-Arndt University Greifswald	Hand disinfection provided vs none	Study recruited those who do not already apply hand disinfection at work	Odds ratios (95% CI) (intervention:control) 1: Influenza 2: Common cold 3: Sinusitis 4: Sore throat 5: Fever 6: Cough	1: 1.02 (0.20 to 5.23) 2: 0.35 (0.17 to 0.71) 3: 1.87 (0.52 to 6.74) 4: 0.62 (0.31 to 1.25) 5: 0.38 (0.14 to 0.99) 6: 0.45 (0.22 to 0.91)	Mean hand disinfection frequency >5 times/d in 19%, 3-5 time/d in 59.8%, 1-2 times/d in 20.5% per person month
Ladegaard 1999; RCT Denmark	Not reported?	475 children 0-6 years in day care centers	Hand hygiene and education	Not reported	Sick days during the 'effect period'	2.22 days/child in the intervention group vs 3.36 days/ child in the control group	Not reported
Larson 2010*; c-RCT USA	November 2006 to July 2008	509 primarily Hispanic households with at least 3 people and a preschool or elementary school child in New York city	1 education; 2 education with alcohol-based hand sanitizer; 3 education with hand sanitizer and face masks	Not reported	Incidence rate ratios (episodes per 1000 person weeks) for: 1: URI 2: ILI 3: Influenza 4: Secondary attack rates URI/ILI/influenza 5: ILI/influenza	1; HS 29; HS+masks 39; control 35 2: HS 1.9; HS+masks 1.6; control 2.3 3: HS 0.6; HS+masks 0.5; control 2.3 4: HS 0.14; HS+masks 0.12; control 0.14 5: HS 0.02; HS+masks 0.02; control 0.02	Compliance was poor: Gp-2 used HS occasionally (44.2%), gp-3 used HS 1-2 times within the previous 24 hr (56.9). Gp-2 used a mean of 11.6 ounces HS/month, while gp-3 used a mean of 12.1 ounces/month of HS. Compliance with mask was poor (two masks/day/ILI episode (range: 0-9))
Little 2015*; RCT England	Jan 17, 2011, to March 31, 2013	20,066 Adults ≥ 18 yo in the community	Bespoke automated web-based motivational	Not clearly reported	Number of episodes of RTIs in index participants (risk ratio)	Risk ratio for intervention to control	Questionnaire response rate was 84%

		recruited through GP practices	intervention, with tailored feedback, vs none			0.86 (95%CI 0.83 to 0.89, p<0.001)	
Luby 2005; RCT Pakistan	April 2002 to April 2003	Households in 36 Squatter settlements in Karachi	Antibacterial soap or plain soap and education about HW provided weekly vs none	At baseline all households purchased an average of 1 bar hand soap per week.	1: Cough or difficulty breathing in children <15yrs (episodes/100 person-weeks); 2: Congestion or coryza in children <15yrs (episodes/100 person-weeks); 3: Pneumonia in children <5yrs (episodes/100 person-weeks)	All comparisons significantly lower than control 1: 4.21 in antibacterial soap group; 4.16 in plain soap group; 8.50 in control 2: 7.32 in antibacterial soap group; 6.87 in plain soap group; 14.78 in control 3: 2.42 in antibacterial soap group; 2.20 in plain soap group; 4.40 in control	Not reported, but soap bar consumption increased (3.3 soap bar/week)
Millar 2016*: c-RCT USA	May 2010 to Jan 2012	Around 30,000 healthy males, army trainees (18-42yo) in Georgia	Standard promotion of handwashing, enhanced promotion, and promotion plus a once-weekly application of chlorhexidine-based body wash	Not reported	Incidence rates of ARI over 20 months	37.7 HH; 29.3 enhanced; 35.3 standard; RR for HH to standard 1.07 (95%CI 1.03 to 1.11); RR for enhanced to HH 0.78 (95%CI 0.75 to 0.81)	Not reported
Morton 2004; RCT-Crossover study USA	Not reported	253 elementary school children from 17 classrooms in Northern New England	Alcohol gel plus education vs regular hand washing	Not reported	Absence due to infectious illness	Results not stated numerically	Not reported
Nicholson 2014*: c-RCT India	October 22 2007 to August 2 2008	Children 5 yo in low-income urban communities in Mumbai	Combination hand washing promotion with provision of free soap	Not reported	Target children: 1: Episodes of ARI (per 100 person weeks); 2: School absence	1: 16 in intervention; 19 in control 2: 1.2 in intervention; 1.7 in control 3: 10 in intervention; 11 in control	Soap consumption to be 45g per household/week in control compared with 235g in intervention households

					Families: 3: Episodes of ARI		
Pandejpong 2012; c-RCT Thailand	December 2009 to February 2010	1437 preschool-age children in a kindergarten in Bangkok	Alcohol handgel every hour or every 2 hours or once before lunch (3 groups)	Not reported	Absent days due to confirmed ILI/present days	0.017 in the every hour group; 0.025 in every 2 hours group; 0.026 in before lunch group. Statistically significant difference between every hour group and before lunch group, and between every hour and every two hours groups	Not reported
Priest 2014; c-RCT New Zealand	April to September 2009	In 68 primary schools in cities of Christchurch, Dunedin, Invercargill	Hand hygiene education for all and hand sanitiser in intervention group	Baseline self-reported overall family hand hygiene was 87.1% in control, 84.7% in HS group.	1: % Absence days due to respiratory illness; 2: % Absence days due to any illness	1: 0.84% in intervention group; 0.80% in control (p=0.44) 2: 1.21% in intervention group; 1.16% in control (p=0.35)	Average hand sanitiser solution dispensed per child in the intervention schools was 94 ml (SD19).
Ram 2015*; RCT Bangladesh	June 2009 to December 2010	Index case-patients with ILI (fever with cough or sore throat) who were only symptomatic person in their household (rural)	Promoting intensive handwashing in households to prevent transmission of ILI	Not reported	1: Secondary attack ratio for intervention to control for ILI; 2: Laboratory-confirmed influenza	1: 1.24 (95% CI 0.93 to 1.65) 2: 2.40 (95%CI 0.68 to 8.47)	Median per capita soap consumption of 2.3g (interquartile range: 1.7 to 3.2g) in the first 12 days of enrolment
Roberts 2000*; c-RCT Australia	March and November 1996	Children aged ≤3yo attending 23 child-care centres at least 3 days a week in Australian Capital Territory	Handwashing programme with training for staff and children	Not reported	Incidence rate ratio for ARI (runny nose, cough and blocked nose)	IRR 0.92 for intervention to control (95%CI 0.86 to 0.99)	HW group 1 compliance rate 53%–69% HW group 2 compliance rate 70%–79%; HW group 3 compliance rate over 80%
Sandora 2005*; c-RCT USA	November 2002 to April 2003	292 families with 1 or more children 6 months to 5 yo who were in childcare for 10 or more hours a week in	Using a hand sanitiser (HS) and a programme of instruction on the transmissions of GI infections and ARIs in families.	Baseline use of HS: 36% in the control, 41% in intervention group. Control families were asked not to use hand	Incidence rates for ARI (episodes per person month) (2 of the following symptoms for 1 day or 1 of the following	0.43 in intervention; 0.42 in control	HS median use 5.2 times/day IRR in family consuming >2 oz HS per 2weeks vs. ≤2oz, IRR 0.81 (95% CI: 0.65–1.09; P .06)

		Massachusetts neighbourhoods		sanitizer during the study period	symptoms for 2 days: runny nose, cough, sneezing, stuffy or blocked nose, fever, sore throat). An illness episode had to be separated by 2 symptom-free days from a previous episode		
Savalainen 2012; c-RCT Finland	November 2008 to May 2010	683 people in 21 office work units in 6 corporations in Helsinki	Hand hygiene with soap and water (IR1 group), or with alcohol-based hand rub (IR2 group) or control (none); intervention groups also received education	Not clearly reported	1: Number of respiratory infection episodes/week; 2: Number of reported infection episodes/week; 3: Number of reported sick leave episodes/week	1: 0.076 in IR1; 0.085 in IR2; 0.080 in control, NS 2: 0.097 in IR1; 0.107 in IR2; 0.104 in control, NS 3: 0.042 in IR1; 0.035 in IR2; 0.035 in control. Significantly higher in IR1 compared with control	Soap or disinfectant usage per participant was: 6.1 in IR1; 6.9 in IR2; control: not reported
Simmerman 2011*; c-RCT Thailand	April 2008 to August 2009	442 index children with 1147 household members recruited in a Bangkok Paediatric outpatient department	Hand washing (HW), or hand washing plus paper surgical face masks (HW + FM) or control (none)	Not clearly reported	Odds ratios for secondary attack rates for influenza	OR for HW:control 1.20 (95%CI 0.76 to 1.88) OR for HW+masks:control 1.16 (95%CI 0.74 to 1.82)	Hand washing episodes/day on day 7: control: 3.9; HW: 4.7; HW+FM: 4.9
Stebbins 2011*; c-RCT USA	Jan 2007 to April 2008 influenza season	3360 children in 10 Pittsburgh elementary schools	Training in hand and respiratory (cough) hygiene. Hand sanitizer was provided and encouraged to be used regularly	Not reported	Incidence rate ratios for intervention to control for 1: Laboratory-confirmed Influenza (RT-PCR) ; 2: Influenza-A; 3: Absence	1: IRR 0.81 (95%CI 0.54 to 1.23) 2: 0.48 (95%CI 0.26 to 0.87) 3: 0.74 (95%CI 0.56 to 0.97)	Not reported

Talaat 2011; c-RCT Egypt	February 16 to May 12 2008	44,451 children in 60 elementary schools in Cairo	Children in the intervention schools were required to wash hands twice daily, and health messages were provided through entertainment activities	At baseline, schools no soap or hand- drying material. Hand washing, if done at all, was only performed by rinsing hands in water.	1: Number of absence days due to ILI; 2: Number of absence days	1: 917 in intervention; 1,671 in control ($p<0.001$) 2: 13,247 in intervention; 19,094 in control ($p<0.001$)	Not reported
Temime 2018; c-RCT France	April 2014 to April 2015	26 nursing homes in Paris	Hand hygiene with alcohol-based handrub, promotion, staff education, and local work groups vs none	Baseline quantity of consumed handrub solution in NHs was 4.5 mL per resident per day and did not differ between control and intervention groups	Incidence rate of acute respiratory infection clusters (5 or more people in same nursing home)	2 ARI clusters in intervention; 1 in control	Not reported
Turner 2004; RCT Canada	Not reported	Healthy volunteers' response to application of rhinovirus on hands; 85 in study 1 and 122 in study 2 in Winnipeg, Manitoba	Study 1: ethanol vs salicylic acid 3.5% or salicylic acid 1%; Study 2: skin cleanser wipe vs ethanol		% of volunteers Infected with rhinovirus	7% in each intervention group; 32% in control (study 1) 22% in intervention, 30% in control (study 2)	Not reported
Turner 2012; RCT USA	9 weeks in Fall 2009	212 Healthy volunteers from University of Virginia >18 years	Antiviral hand treatment vs no treatment	Not reported	1: Number of rhinovirus infections; 2: Common cold infections 3: Rhinovirus- associated illnesses	1: 49 in intervention; 49 in control, NS 2: 56 in intervention; 72 in control, NS 3: 26 in intervention; 24 in control, NS	All subjects (100%) applied at least 90% of the expected amount of hand treatment
Zomer 2015*; c-RCT Netherlands	September 2011 to April 2012	545 Children aged 6 months and 3.5yrs at start of the trial in 71 day care centres in Rotterdam, Gouda and Leiden	Four components: 1. HH products, paper towel dispensers, soap, alcohol-based hand sanitizer & hand cream provided for 6 months 2. Training & booklet	At baseline, compliance in intervention DCCs was 53% vs. 63% in control DCCs (OR 0.59, 95% CI 0.37– 0.94).	1: Incidence rate ratio for intervention to control for common cold ; 2: The common cold was defined as a blocked or runny nose with at least 1 of the following symptoms:	1: IRR 1.07 (95%CI 0.97 to 1.19) 2: 8.2 episodes per child year in intervention; 7.4 episodes per child year in control	At 6 months follow-up, compliance was 59% vs. 44%, respectively (baseline-corrected OR 4.13, 95% CI 2.33– 7.32)

			3. 2 team training sessions aimed at HH improvement 4. Posters and stickers for caregivers and children as reminders		coughing, sneezing, fever, sore throat, or earache		
Yeung 2011; c-RCT Hong Kong	April to November 2007	Staff in aged care facilities in Hong Kong	Alcohol-based hand gel + materials + education vs control (basic life support workshop)	Soap and water hand hygiene used at baseline	Difference between pre-study period and post-study in pneumonia infections recorded in residents	0.63/1000 reduction in intervention group; 0.16/1000 increase in control	Overall HH adherence was 33.3%
HAND HYGIENE AND MASKS							
Aelami 2015 (conference abstract); RCT Saudi Arabia	2012 Hajj season	664 Iranian pilgrims during Annual Hajj to Makkah	Education on personal hygiene including a hygienic package with alcohol-based handrub (gel or spray), surgical masks, soap, paper handkerchiefs, and user instructions versus none	Not reported	Proportion with ILI (defined as presence of $\geq$ two of the following during their stay: fever, cough, and sore throat)	52% in intervention; 55.3% in control (p<0.001)	Not reported
Aiello 2010*; C-RCT USA	Nov 2006 to Mar 2007	1297 university students living in residence halls at University of Michigan	Residence halls were randomly assigned to 1 of 3 groups—face mask use, face masks with hand hygiene, or control— for 6 weeks.	55% of study participants own HS. All arms received HH education	1: ILI (defined as cough and $\geq$ 1 constitutional symptom (fever, chills, or body aches)); 2: Laboratory-confirmed influenza A or B. Tested with cell cultures and RT-PCR	Significant reduction in ILI cases in both intervention groups compared with control over weeks 3 – 6. No significant differences between FM and FM+HH	Not reported
Aiello 2012*; C-RCT USA	2007–2008 Influenza season	1,111 students residing in university residence halls (N = 37) at University of Michigan	Residence halls were randomly assigned to 1 of 3 groups—face mask use (FM), face masks with hand hygiene (FM+HH), or control— for 6 weeks.	Baseline hand hygiene and hand sanitisers use was similar across all groups	1: Clinical ILI (presence of cough and $\geq$ 1 of fever/feverishness, chills, or body aches); 2: Laboratory-confirmed influenza A or B. Throat swab	1: Non-significant reductions in FM group compared with control over all weeks. Significant reduction in FM+HH group compared with control in weeks 3 – 6.	Mask use: FM+HH wore masks 5.08 hours per day (SD, 2.23); mask group 5.04 hours per day [SD, 2.20] HS use: FM+HH 4.49 times per day (SD, 4.10)

					specimens were tested for influenza A or B using real-time polymerase chain reaction (Rt-PCR)	2: Non-significant reductions in both intervention groups compared with control.	M only:1.29 times per day (SD, 1.77); Control: 1.51 times per day (SD, 2.25)
Cowling 2009*; c-RCT Hong Kong	January 2 to September 30, 2008	407 patients with influenza A/B and 794 household members in 259 households	3 groups: 1 Control = lifestyle measures; 2 control plus enhanced hand hygiene; 3 control plus enhanced hand hygiene (HH) plus facemasks (HH+mask)	Not reported	1: Secondary attack ratio (SAR); 2: Laboratory-confirmed influenza; 3: ILI definition 1; 4: ILI definition 2	1: HH 5; HH+masks 7; control 10 2: HH 16; HH+masks 21; control 19 3: HH 4; HH+masks 7; control 5	Adherence to the interventions was low
Larson 2010*; c-RCT USA	November 2006 to July 2008	509 primarily Hispanic households with at least 3 people and a preschool or elementary school child in upper Manhattan	1: education (control); 2: education with alcohol-based hand sanitizer (HS); 3: education with hand sanitizer and face masks(HS+mask)	Not reported	Incidence rate ratios (episodes per 1000 person weeks) for: 1: URI; 2: ILI; 3: Influenza Secondary attack rates (SAR for: 4: URI/ILI/influenza; 5: ILI/influenza	1: HS 29; HS+masks 39; control 35 2: HS 1.9; HS+masks 1.6; control 2.3 3: HS 0.6; HS+masks 0.5; control 2.3 4: HS 0.14; HS+masks 0.12; control 0.14 5: HS 0.02; HS+masks 0.02; control 0.02	Compliance was poor: Gp-2 used HS occasionally (44.2%), Gp-3 used HS 1-2 times within the previous 24 hr (56.9%). Gp-2 used a mean of 11.6 ounces HS/month,Gp-3 used a mean of 12.1 ounces/month of HS. Compliance with mask was poor (two masks/day/ILI episode (range: 0–9)
Simmerman 2011*; c-RCT Thailand	April 2008 to April 2009	Households with a febrile influenza-positive child; 442 index cases and 1147 household members recruited in a Bangkok Paediatric outpatient department	Control, handwashing or handwashing plus paper surgical facemasks	Not clearly reported	Odds ratios for secondary attack rates for influenza	OR for HW:control 1.20 (95%CI 0.76 to 1.88) OR for HW+masks:control 1.16 (95%CI 0.74 to 1.82)	Hand washing episodes/day on day 7: control: 3.9; HW: 4.7; HW+FM: 4.9. Mask use: average of 12 masks/person /week with a mean 211 min/mask/day

Suess 2012*; c-RCT Germany	Two influenza seasons 2009-2010 2010-2011	84 Households with influenza index case In Berlin	Facemask + Hand hygiene vs facemasks only vs none	Not clearly reported. But mentioned hand washing had been generally recommended already before the pandemic	1: Secondary attack rates in household contact; 2: Laboratory-confirmed influenza; 3: ILI	1: Mask 9; Mask+HH 15; control 23 2: Mask 9; Mask+HH 9; control 17	Adherence was described as good for adults and children, contacts and index cases
HAND HYGIENE AND SURFACE / OBJECT DISINFECTION							
Ban 2015; c-RCT China	October 2010 to September 2011	408 children <5yo In two Kindergartens In Xiantao city	Antibacterial products for hand hygiene, surface cleaning and disinfection provided to families and kindergartens	Not clearly reported	1: Respiratory illness; 2: Cough and expectoration	1: OR 0.47 for intervention to control (95%CI 0.38 to 0.59) 2: OR 0.56 (95%CI 0.48 to 0.65)	Adherence was described as high
Carabin 1999; c-RCT Canada	September 1 1996 to November 30 1997	1729 children in 47 day care centers in south central Quebec area	One off hygiene education and materials vs none	At baseline most of the kindergartens in both groups had some level of the intervention such as washing toys, use of diluted bleach to clean toys.	Difference in incidence rate for URTI (cluster-level result)	0.28 episodes per 100 child-days lower in intervention group (95%CI 1.65 lower to 1.08 higher)	Not reported
Chard 2019; c-RCT Laos	2014 to 2017	3993 children in 100 primary schools in Saravane Province	Complex sanitation intervention and education vs none	No schools had handwashing facilities as baseline (Chard 2018)	Pupil-reported symptoms of respiratory infection over 1 week	NS difference between groups. 29% of intervention group, 32% control, adjusted risk ratio 1.08 (95%CI 0.95 to 1.23)	Reported adherence as ratio between groups (RR 0.97 (95% CI 0.84, 1.11), fulfilling ≥75% of intervention outcomes was considered adherence.
Ibfelt 2015; c-RCT Denmark	December 2012 to April 2013	587 children aged 6 months to 3 years in 12 day-care nurseries in Copenhagen	Disinfectant washing of linen and toys by commercial company every 2 weeks vs usual care	Not reported	Presence of respiratory viruses on surfaces	Statistically significant reduction in intervention group in adenovirus, rhinovirus, RSV, metapneumovirus, but not other viruses including coronavirus	Not reported

Kotch 1994; RCT USA		371 families with children in day care centers in Northern Carolina	Training in hand washing and diapering for care givers and all other staff	Washing hands after diapering (I: 79.2%, C: 87.5%). Washing toys daily (I: 45.4%, C: 56.5%)	Respiratory illness incidence rate in 1: children <24 mos; 2: children ≥24 mos	1: 14.78 episodes per child-year in intervention; 15.66 in control 2: 12.87 in intervention; 11.77 in control	Not reported
McConeghy 2017; RCT USA	October 1 2015 to May 31 2016	5 Nursing Homes in Colorado	Staff education, cleaning products and audit of compliance and feedback vs none	Not reported	Infection rates	Upper respiratory infections not reliably recorded or reported	The number of hand-washing occasions per NH resident was steady over time but differed by treatment facility (P=.03)
Sandora 2008*; c-RCT USA	November 2002 to April 2003	292 families with children attending 26 child-care centers in Avon-Ohio	Hand sanitiser and hand hygiene education materials supplied biweekly vs materials about good nutrition (control)	HS in home was 47% in control, 51% in intervention	Absence due to respiratory illness (multivariable analysis)	Rate ratio 1.10 for intervention to control (95%CI 0.97 to 1.24)	Not reported but HS use per classroom per week was 1.25 bottles
White 2001 DB-RCT USA	March to April 1999	769 children age 5-12 years from one private and two public elementary schools in California.	Participants were blinded to either hand rub with benzalkonium chloride or placebo, batches of 4 colour-coded bottles containing both.	All children attended a 22-minute on proper hand washing technique and cough/sneezing behaviour (4-min video)	ARI symptoms, laboratory testing of Laboratory: testing of virucidal and bactericidal activity of the product	30% to 38% decrease of illness and absenteeism (RR for illness absence incidence 0.69, RR for absence duration 0.71)	Reported that Large portion of the original study participants were lost due to a lack of compliance
OTHER (MISCELLANEOUS) INTERVENTIONS							
Hartinger 2016; c-RCT Peru	September 2008 to January 2010	534 children 51 rural communities in San Marcos province	Cooking and sanitation provision and education vs none	Not reported	Number of ARI episodes per child-year	NS difference between groups. Risk ratio for intervention to control 0.95 (95% CI 0.82, 1.10)	Compliance with SODIS was 60% with a steady decline throughout follow-up reaching 10% at end of study.
Huda 2012; c-RCT Bangladesh	2007 to 2009 (18 months)	1692 children in (unknown number of) household clusters	Sanitation provision and education vs none	Baseline handwashing 28%	Respiratory illness	12.6% in intervention group, 13.0% in control group. Not adjusted for multiple outcome	Improved frequency of handwashing in all groups

						measurements. No CIs reported	
Najnin 2019; c-RCT Bangladesh	September 24 2011 to August 31 2013	5877 households with 39,089 people in 60 geographic areas in Dhaka	Sanitation and behaviour change intervention (plus cholera vaccine) vs none	Presence of water, soap, or ash in handwashing location (47%). Handwashing at baseline was low	Respiratory illness in past 2 days	2.8% in intervention group, 2.9% in control. Adjusted risk ratio for intervention to control 0.82 (95%CI 0.69 to 0.98)	Uptake of the intervention increased during the study
Satomura 2005; RCT Japan	December 2002 to March 2003	387 subjects at 18 sites across Japan	Water gargling (WG) vs. povidone-iodine gargling (IG) vs. control. Frequency of gargling was 3 times/day for 60 days	All subject kept usual handwashing routine (measured at end as WG 6.5 times/d, IG 6.2/d control 6.2/d	Incidence of first upper respiratory tract infection (URTI) Severity of URTI symptoms	Incidence rate of first URTI as episodes/30 person-days was 0.17 WG, 0.24 in IG and 0.26 in control subjects. IR ratios against controls were 0.64 (95%CI 0.41– 0.99) and 0.89 (95%CI 0.60 –1.33)	None of the two gargling groups skipped gargling
VIRUCIDAL TISSUES							
Farr 1988; c-RCT USA Trial 1 and Trial 2	1983-1986	186 Charlottesville, Virginia families in trial 1 and 98 in trial 2	Trial 1: Virucidal nasal tissues vs placebo vs none; Trial 2: Virucidal nasal tissues vs placebo	Not reported	Respiratory illnesses per person over 24 weeks Trial 1; Trial 2	Trial 1: 3.4 in tissues group; 3.9 in placebo; 3.6 in no tissues; Trial 2: 3.4 in tissues group; 3.6 in placebo. NS differences	Families not using tissues regularly were excluded from analysis
Longini 1988; DB-PC RCT USA	August 1984 to March 1985	296 households in Tecumseh, Michigan	Virucidal nasal tissues vs placebo	Not reported	Secondary attack rate of viral infections (number of infections in household members of index case)	10.0 in intervention, 14.3 in placebo, NS.	Virucidal tissue group 82% using 'all the time' vs 71% in placebo group

*: Studies marked with * have been pooled in meta-analysis

NS: Not significantly different; yo: years old; mos: months; SAR: Secondary attack rate; ILI: Influenza-like illness; HH: hand hygiene; HS: hand sanitiser; HW: handwashing

Colour codes: Hand hygiene only (yellow), Both hand and masks (orange), Hand hygiene + surface / materials disinfection (green), Other / Complex (blue) and Virucidal tissues (grey)

Table 2 Description of interventions in included studies, using the items from the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) checklist.

Author Year	Brief name	Recipient	Why	What (materials)	What (procedures)	Who provided	How	Where	When and how much	Tailoring	Modification of intervention throughout trial	Strategies to improve or maintain intervention fidelity	Extent of intervention fidelity
HAND HYGIENE													
Alzaher 2018	Hand hygiene workshop	Primary schoolgirls	Targeted school children to improve hand hygiene to reduce school absences due to upper respiratory infections (URIs) and spread of infection in schools and to families	<p>6-minute video-clip of 2 siblings that attended school-based health education about hand hygiene</p> <p>Short interactive lecture about: common infections in schools, methods of transmission, handwashing procedure using soap and water including when to wash hands</p> <p>Puzzle games related to hand hygiene</p> <p>Posters with cartoon princesses' picture promoting hand washing</p>	Delivery of workshop and distribution of supporting materials (games and posters) to school and students	Study investigator delivered workshop	Delivered face to face in group format for the workshop	2 primary girls' schools in Saudi Arabia	1-hour once off workshop ; posters and games provided to school	Not described	Not described	Posters in restrooms as reminders of hand washing hygiene during 5-week follow-up period after workshop	Not reported
Arbogast 2016	Multi-modal hand hygiene intervention program in addition to control	Office buildings and the employees of health insurance company	Reduce hand-to-mouth germ transmission from shared workspaces and workplace	Alcohol-based hand sanitizer (PURELL Advanced, GOJO Industries Inc, Akron, Ohio) installed as wall-mounted dispensers, stands, or free-standing bottles	<p>Hand hygiene supplies installed in offices</p> <p>Replenishment product was made easily available to individual employees upon request via a simple process</p>	Not described, presumably study investigator arranged installations	Hand hygiene supplies provided in office environments and individually at staff	High traffic common areas of 2 US health insurance company offices (e.g. near	13.5-months overall Once off email video 11 days before	Sanitizer installed in high use areas of the offices	Not described	Employee survey at 4 months included questions hand hygiene practice	Intervention group employees: reported 40% more cleaning of work area regularly, significantly more likely

	of brief video		facilities and thereby health care claims and absenteeism through improved workplace hand hygiene	<p>One 8-ounce bottle of hand sanitizer (PURELL Advanced) per cubicle</p> <p>One 100-count canister of hand wipes (PURELL Wipes) per cubicle</p> <p>Replenishment products stored in supply room (in addition to existing foam handwash (GOJO Green Certified Foam Handwash) and an alcohol-based hand sanitizer foam wall-mounted dispenser (PURELL, GOJO Industries) already provided near the restroom exits prior to intervention)</p> <p>Identical soap in all restrooms</p> <p>Intervention and control group: Brief (<1-minute educational video) about proper hand hygiene technique, for both washing and sanitizing hands</p> <p>“Wash Your Hands,” signage promoting hand hygiene compliance, was already posted next to restroom exits at both</p>	<p>Monitoring of product shipments into sites</p> <p>Physical collection and full replacement of soap, sanitizer and wipes</p> <p>Intervention and control group: Educational video embedded at end of baseline online knowledge survey</p>		cubicles/ offices.	elevators, at entrances) and appropriate public spaces (e.g. coffee area, break rooms, conference rooms, training rooms, lobbies, reception areas); individual staff cubicles of mostly open plan offices (average 309 square feet). Office restrooms	<p>study hand hygiene supplies installed</p> <p>13 months of provision of supplies</p> <p>Two times evening collection and full replacement of products</p>			<p>compliance</p> <p>Monitoring of product shipments into the sites and physical collection of the soap, sanitizer, and wipes products two times in the study; collected samples were measured and usage rates were estimated</p>	<p>to keep the hand sanitizer with them and use it throughout the day; significant increases in hand sanitizer use for at risk activities¹</p> <p>Estimated use by average employee from sample collection: sanitizer 1.8 - 3.0 times / day, soap 2.1 - 4.4 times / day, wipes at their desk 1.4 to 1.5 times / week</p>
--	----------------	--	---	---	---	--	--------------------	--	---	--	--	---	---

¹ Before eating, after sneezing, coughing, handling money, using restroom, returning to desk and interacting with others who may be sick

				the control and intervention sites									
Azor-Martinez 2016	Handwashing program	Primary school children and their parents and teachers	Prevent transmission of upper respiratory infections (URIs) in schools and to families through nonpharmaceutical intervention (NPIs) of handwashing program in schools	<p>Brochure about handwashing awareness and habits</p> <p>Workshop content materials</p> <p>Stories, songs and classroom posters about hand hygiene and infection transmission</p> <p>Hand sanitizer (ALCO ALOE GEL hand sanitizer by Americo Govantes Burguete, S.L. Madrid, Spain containing 0.2% chlorhexidine digluconate, 1% phenoxythanol, 0.1% benzalkonium chloride, 5% aloe barbadensis, 70% Denat ethyl alcohol, excipients quantity sufficient for 100mL alcohol 70%, pH 7.0-7.5.)</p> <p>Informational poster about when and how to wash hands</p> <p>Written and verbal guidance to teachers, parents and students on properties, possible side effects and precautionary measures for gel use and storage</p>	<p>Brochure sent to parents by mail with study information sheet</p> <p>Workshop provided for pupils and teachers: frequent infections in schools, transmission and prevention, instructions on correct handwashing, (water and soap, soaping > 20 secs, drying hands), use of hand sanitizers and possible side effects</p> <p>Classroom activities linked to hand hygiene and infection transmission</p> <p>Reinforcement of hand hygiene by teachers</p> <p>Hand sanitizer dispensers fixed to walls with an informational poster about hand washing</p> <p>Supervision of younger children when using hand sanitizer and administration of sanitizer if needed</p> <p>Instruction of children in handwashing procedures after toilet and when dirty and correct hand sanitizer use²</p>	<p>Brochure sent by school administration</p> <p>Workshop and verbal and written information presumably provided by the study research assistant</p> <p>Classroom activities provided by research assistant and teachers</p> <p>Supervision and administration of hand sanitizer for younger children by teachers</p>	<p>Brochure sent by mail to individual parents</p> <p>Workshops and classroom activities delivered in groups face to face</p> <p>Teacher reinforcement of hand hygiene provided to class face to face</p> <p>Hand sanitizer use supervision was provided individually and face to face</p>	<p>Primary school classes in Spain – details not described</p>	<p>8 months overall</p> <p>One off brochure and installation of hand sanitizer dispensers</p> <p>2-hour workshop held 1 month before study commencement</p> <p>Fortnightly classroom activities</p> <p>As required teacher supervision and administration of hand sanitizer</p> <p>Daily reinforcement of hand hygiene by teachers</p>	<p>Supervision and administration of hand sanitizer as needed by teachers, especially for younger children</p>	<p>Not described</p>	<p>Daily reinforcement by teachers of hand hygiene</p> <p>Fortnightly support by research assistant promoting hand washing</p> <p>Self-reported correct handwashing procedure (water and soap, soaping > than 20 seconds, drying hands).</p>	<p>Self-reported correct handwashing included in analysis but not separately reported</p>

² after coming into classroom, before and after lunch, after break, after physical education, when they went home and after coughing, sneezing or blowing their noses

Azor-Martinez 2018	Educational and hand hygiene program: 2 active interventions: A: Soap and water (SWG) B: Hand sanitizer (HSG)	Day care centres (DCCs) and their attending children, their parents and DCC staff	Prevent transmission of respiratory infections (RIs) by improved hand hygiene of children, parents and staff through handwashing practices and use of hand sanitizer due to its bactericide and virucide properties	A. Liquid soap (no specific antibacterial components (pH = 5.5) OR B. Hand sanitizer (70% ethyl alcohol (pH = 7.0 to 7.5) for home use and in dispensers for school classroom Workshop content handout Stories, songs and posters about hand hygiene and infection transmission	Installation of liquid soap or hand sanitizer dispensers in classrooms Supervision and administration if required of hand sanitizer 3 hand hygiene workshops for parents and DCC staff: 1. Handwashing practices, hand sanitizer use, possible side effects and precautionary measures (HSG only) 2. RIs and their treatments 3. Fever Instructions to children, parents and DCC staff on usual hand-washing practices and protocols Classroom activities (stories and songs) about hand hygiene and infection transmission	Workshop delivered by researchers Research assistant provided hand hygiene materials to DCCs and parents Parents and staff supervised and administered sanitizer where indicated	Workshops delivered face to face in groups to parents and staff Workshop content emailed to attendees individually Individual face to face supervision of hand sanitizer use, as indicated	Classroom of DCCs (in Spain) for child interventions Workshops provided at DCCs	8 months overall Initial 1-hour workshop 1 month before study commencement 3 further identical sessions / DCC provided again 1 month apart Fortnightly classrooms and DCC activities Once off installation of dispensers As needed supervision of hand sanitizer use Dose of sanitizer: 1-2	Administration of hand sanitizer in the case of young children DCC staff could attend training at other DCC if unable to attend at own DCC	Not described	Not described Reported that no monitoring of compliance through continuous observation of hand hygiene behaviours was done but amount of hand sanitizer was measured	Families and/or DCC staff used 1660 L of hand sanitizer, estimated use by each child of dose 6-8 times / day
--------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	---	---------------	---	--

³ after toileting and when visibly dirty plus a protocol for particular circumstances: after coming into the classroom; before and after lunch; after playing outside; when they went home; after coughing, sneezing, or blowing their noses; and after diapering.

									ml/disinfection				
Biswas 2019	Hand sanitizer and respiratory hygiene education	Primary schools and their students and staff	Reduce community-wide influenza virus transmission by improving hand washing and respiratory hygiene and use of sanitizer in school children as contributors to community-wide virus transmission	Hand sanitizer (63% ethyl alcohol) in colourless, transparent 1.5-L local plastic bottles (manufactured by a local pharmaceutical company and was available commercially in Bangladesh (price: US\$ 5.75/L) Video clip on respiratory hygiene practices Behavioural change materials – 3 colour posters (see Appendix of paper) Curriculum materials for hygiene classes	Installation of hand sanitizer in wall dispensers in all classrooms and outside all toilets, refilled by field staff as needed Encouragement of use of sanitizer at 5 key times during the day ⁴ Hand and respiratory hygiene education provided ⁵ Integration of hygiene messages into school's hygiene curriculum Delivery of video clip on respiratory hygiene practice Behaviour change materials distributed and placed around schools Use of sanitizer by classroom teachers after training Training of selected teachers in consultation with head of school and management committee in key messages Communication of key messages by the selected teachers to other teachers	Selected teachers responsible for dissemination of intervention messages throughout were trained over 2 days in these messages, behaviour change communication, sanitizer use and practices for preventing spread of respiratory secretions Classroom teachers conveyed intervention messages during regular hygiene classes Field staff replaced supplies as needed	Hand sanitizer and education materials provided to schools Education provided in classrooms in groups and face to face	Primary schools (in Bangladesh) Sanitizer in each classroom and outside toilets Education in classroom	10 weeks Intervention messages conveyed in classrooms 3 times / week	Refills provided as needed	Not described	Structured field observation by 2 field staff of 5 hours / school observing handwashing and respiratory hygiene behaviors of children at 2 different locations in a classroom or outside Every other day, field staff measured the level of hand sanitizer in the morning and in the afternoon to calculate amount of hand sanitizer	Hand washing observed opportunities: IG 604/921 (66%) vs CG 171/ 802 (21%) Hand sanitizer used in 91% of observed handwashing events in intervention schools Average consumption of hand sanitizer/ child/day: 4.3 mL Observation of proper cough or sneeze etiquette: IG: 33% vs CG: 2%

⁴ 1) when entering into the classroom; 2) after sneezing, coughing, or blowing their nose; 3) after using the toilet/washroom; 4) before eating any food; and 5) when leaving the school at the end of the day.

⁵ what to do if hands were dirty, why students should wash their hands, benefits of washing hands and using hand sanitizer, procedure for washing hands using hand sanitizer, to cover mouth and nose with upper part of sleeve while coughing and/or sneezing

												used / day / school and enrolled children	
Correa 2012	Alcohol- based hand rubs (ABH)	Childcare centres and their staff and children	Reduce incidence and transmissio n of infection in children by improved hand hygiene where water is scarce including provision of ABH and training in hand hygiene teaching techniques	Dispensers of alcohol- based hand rubs (ABH) with ethanol 62.0%: (Purell®, GOJO Industries, Akron, Ohio, United States) Workshop materials ⁶ Visual reminders on ABH techniques in bathrooms and next to dispensers	ABH and training on proper use to staff and children Pre-trial ABH use workshop to teachers that followed recommended HH teaching techniques and instructed teachers to add ABH to routine HH and give preference to handwashing with soap and water (HSW) if hands visibly soiled Continuous refilling of ABH ABH technique refresher workshops (8 / centre) Monitoring of safety, proper use of ABH, amount of ABH used	Local representati ve of GOJO Industries Inc. provided dispensers and dispenser installations free of charge Fieldwork team delivered other components	Face to face training and provision of materials; group training	Childcare centres in Colombia (centres or communi ty homes) ABH in centres, classroom s and common areas dependin g on size Visual reminder s in bathroom s and next to dispenser s Worksho ps and training	8 months overall 1 ABH dispenser / centre with <14 children; 1 / classroom in larger centres; 1 / classroom + 1 for common areas in centres with > 28 children 1 workshop pre-trial to staff Monthly 30 minute	Refilled ABH as needed	Not describ ed	Visual reminder s and monthly refresher training Monitori ng of safety, proper use of ABH, amount of ABH used Semi- structure d survey on completi on of teachers' perceptio ns about changes in HH practices	Teachers at 7 intervention centres reported almost complete substitution of HSW for ABH and HSW decreased from 3 times / day to 1 / day and ABH rose to 6 / day. Teachers at remaining 14 centres reported partial substitution of HSW with ABH. Controls reported HSW 3 times / day

⁶ Boyce JM, Pittet D. Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee, HICPAC/ SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force Guideline for hand hygiene in healthcare settings Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/ IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2002;51(RR-16):1–45. Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/PDF/rr/rr5116.pdf>. [URL inactive]

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ World Bank, Bank-Netherlands Water Partnership, Water and Sanitation Program. Hand washing manual: A guide for developing a hygiene promotion program to increase handwashing with soap. Available from: <http://go.worldbank.org/PJTS4A53C0> [URL inactive]

California State Department of Education. Techniques for preventing the spread of infectious diseases. Sacramento: California State Department of Education; 1983.

Geiger BF, Artz L, Petri CJ, Winnail SD, Mason JW. Fun with handwashing education. Birmingham: University of Alabama; 2000.

Roberts A, Pareja R, Shaw W, Boyd B, Booth E, Mata JI. A tool box for building health communication capacity. Available from: <http://www.globalhealthcommunication.org/tools/29> [URL inactive]

Stark P. Handwashing technique. Instructor's packet. Learning activity package. Sacramento: California State Department of Education; 1982.

								presumably provided in centres	ABH technique refresher training (8 / centre) Biweekly monitoring			and use of HSW and ABH Measurement of consumption of resources and costs related to ABH use and HSW	Median no. of ABH applications / child rose from 3.5 to 4.5 in preschools and 3.5 to 5.5 in community centres
DiVita 2011	Household handwashing promotion	Householders with index patient with influenza-like-illness (ILI)	Prevent influenza transmission in households in resource-poor settings through provision of handwashing facilities and use of them at critical times for pathogen transmission	Handwashing stations with soap	Provision of handwashing stations Handwashing motivation to wash at critical times for pathogen transmission (e.g. after coughing or sneezing)	Not specifically described, presumably the researchers	Face to face provision of facilities in households 'Motivation' not described	Household in Bangladesh	Over 2 influenza seasons Once off provision of handwashing facilities Frequency of "motivation" not described	Not described	Not described	Not described	Not described
Feldman 2016	2 active interventions: A. Hand disinfection with chlorhexidine (CHG) + hygiene education	Naval ships and their sailors	Reduced infection transmission and improved hand hygiene (HH) in sailors who are at increased risk due to closed environment	Septadine solution (Floris, Misgav, Israel) 70% alcohol and 0.5% CHG; inactive materials: purified water, glycerin, propylene glycol, and methylene blue	Installation of CHG disinfection devices on ships alongside regular soap and water Supply and replenishment of CHG (sent to ships regardless of replenishment demands) Hygiene instruction by a naval physician (to both	Provision of CHG presumably by study team and funds Hygiene instruction by naval physician	CHG sent to ships directly Mode of hygiene instruction not described	Navy fast missile boats and patrol boats of naval base in Israel Dispensers installed in key locations	4 months Unlimited supply of CHG replenished on demand for 4-5 months Automatic amount	CHG replenished on demand	Not described	Total amount of CHG dispensed was tallied	Mean volume CHG: 8.2 mL / sailor / day (projected yearly cost \$45 / sailor)

	B. Hygiene education		ts, contact with shared surfaces and poor HH culture		intervention groups and study control group)			onboard (adjacent to heads [toilets], mess decks [dining rooms], common areas)	dispensed : 3 mL				
Gwaltney 1980	A. Virucidal hand preparation B. Placebo (no control)	Healthy young adults	Reduce infection rates by Interrupting viral spread by hand/self-inoculation route	A. Virucidal hand preparation: Aqueous iodine (2% iodine and 4% potassium iodide) B. Placebo: Aqueous solution of food colors (Kroger"; Kroger Co., Cincinnati, Ohio) mixed to resemble the color of iodine with 0.01% iodine and 0.02% potassium iodide to give an odour of iodine Masks	Immersion of each finger and thumb of both hands to proximal interphalangeal joint (interphalangeal joint of thumb) into designated preparation for 5 seconds ten air-dried for 5-6 min Exposure of recipients to donors either immediately after treatment or after 2-hour delay by hand contact with donor stroking fingers for 10 secs Masks worn by donors and recipients during procedure Recipients placed in single isolation rooms after second exposure till end of experiment	Researchers	Face to face and individually	US University	Exposure to donors on 3 consecutive days (days 2, 3 and 4) after initial exposure	Not described	Not described	Reported knowledge of hand preparation use as active, placebo or don't know	Active (n=24): 6 active 2 placebo 16 didn't know; Placebo (n=22): 6 active 7 placebo 9 don't know
Hubner 2010	Alcoholic hand disinfection	Employees (administrative officers)	Reduce absenteeism and spread of infection in administration employees with frequent customer	2 alcohol-based hand rubs (500 ml bottles) for desktop use to ensure minimal effort for use: 1. Amphisept E® (Bode Chemie, Hamburg, Germany) ethanol (80% w/w) based formula with antibacterial,	Provision of hand rub and instruction on use as needed at work only and in accordance with prevailing standard: at least 5 times/day, especially after toileting, blowing nose, before eating and after contact with ill colleagues,	Presumably provided or arranged by study team	In person to staff	Administration offices in Germany Hand rubs used at desk / work (not outside of work)	12 months overall Hand rub used as much needed for complete wetting	Hand rub use especially after toileting, blowing nose, before eating and after contact	Not described	Self-reported compliance with hand hygiene measures	Reported mean hand disinfection frequency times / day: >5: 19% 3-5: 59.8% 1-2: 20.5% <1: 0.7%

⁷ DIN EN 1500: Chemische Desinfektionsmittel und Antiseptika, Hygienische Händedesinfektion, Prüfverfahren und Anforderungen (Phase 2/Stufe 2). Brüssel: CEN, European Committee for Standardization 1997;1-20.

			contact and work with paper documents through improved hand hygiene	antifungal and limited virus inactivating activity. 2. for participants with skin problems: Sterillium® (Bode Chemie, Hamburg, Germany) 2-propanol (45% w/w), 1-propanol (30% w/w) and mecetronium etilsulfate (0.2% w/w), with a refatting effect and has activity against bacteria, fungi and enveloped viruses Hand cream: Baktolan® balm, water-in-oil emulsion with no non-antibacterial properties (Bode Chemie, Hamburg, Germany)	customers, and archive material				of the hands (at least 3 ml or a palmful) ⁸ at least 5 times / day	with ill colleagues, customers, and archive material			
Ladegaard 1999 [translated from Danish]	Hand hygiene program	Day care centres (DCCs) and their staff, children and parents of children	Reduce risk of infection in child care through increased hygienic education of day care professionals, motivation of day care facilities for regular hand hygiene and informing	Personnel Guide on recommendations for: hygiene, ventilation, out-of-stay care, stricter hygienic regulations in cases with selected diseases Fairy tale and poster "The Princess Who Won't Wash Hands" Colouring in drawings "Wash hands" song and rhymes T-shirt for children with the inscription	Staff meeting in each DCC and training in microbiological cause of infection spread guided by National Board of Health and Hygiene Education of children in handwashing (about bacteria and why and when to wash hands) Practical handwashing classes with 4-5 children at a time Provision of t-shirt, book and diploma to children	Research team presumably provided training	Face to face with training and activities by group with staff and children Information sent home to parents via children	On-site in DCCs	2 months intervention period 1-hour training of children	None described	None described	None described	None reported

⁸ DIN EN 12791: Chemische Desinfektionsmittel und Antiseptika, Chirurgische Händedesinfektionsmittel - Prüfverfahren und Anforderungen (Phase 2/Stufe 2). Brüssel: CEN, European Committee for Standardization 2005;1-31.

			parents about hand hygiene	“Clean hands - yes thank you” Diploma for children and book ““The Princess Who Won't Wash Hands” to also be used by parents with their child Informational leaflet for parents in envelope	Provision of leaflet for parents								
Little 2015	Web-based handwashing intervention	Householders (over 18) who were general practice patients	Prevent transmission of respiratory tract infections (RTIs) through improved hand hygiene to reduce spread via close contact (via droplets) and hand-to-face contact	Website-based program: provided information about importance of handwashing, developed a plan to maximise intention formation for handwashing, reinforced helpful attitudes and norms, addressed negative beliefs <i>[URL provided for demonstration version no longer active; see www.lifeguideonline.org/]</i>	Provision of link to website for direct log in Automated emails prompted participants to use sessions and complete monthly questionnaires and maintain handwashing	Researchers delivered web-based program and emails	Online individually	Households in England	4 months overall 4 weekly web-based sessions Monthly email questions to maintain handwashing over 4 months	Tailored feedback provided within web program	None described	Monthly emailed questions to maintain handwashing	None reported
Luby 2005	Handwashing promotion at neighbourhood level with 2 interventions at household level:	Neighbourhoods and their households	Improve handwashing and bathing with soap in settings where communicable diseases are leading causes of childhood morbidity	Slide shows, videotapes and pamphlets illustrating health problems from contaminated hands and specific handwashing instructions Soaps: 90 g white bars without brand names or symbols, same smell with identical	Handwashing promotion to neighbourhoods: Neighbourhood meetings of 10-15 householders (mothers) from nearby homes and monthly meetings for men Soap to households Fieldworker home visits: discussed importance of and correct handwashing (wet hands, lather them	Research team in collaboration with Health Oriented Preventive Education (HOPE) ¹⁰ Fieldworkers were trained in interviewin	Face to face in small groups and individually	Neighbourhoods and homes in Karachi, Pakistan	1-year weekly household visits 30 - 45 minute neighbourhood meetings 2-3 times/week first 2 months	Soap regularly replaced	None described	None described though soap use measured	Households mean use of study soap / week: 3.3 bars Average use / resident/ day: 4.4g

¹⁰ non-governmental organisation that supports community-based health and development initiatives

	A. antibacterial soap B. plain soap		and mortality	generic white wrappers with serial numbers matched to households A. Households: 2-4 white bars of 90g antibacterial soap containing 1.2% triclocarban (Safeguard Bar Soap: Procter & Gamble company (Cincinnati, OH, USA)) B. Households: Plain soap (no triclocarban) Soap packets	completely with soap, rub them together for 45 s, and rinse off completely) technique and promote regular handwashing habits ⁹ Encouragement of daily bathing with soap and water	g and handwashing promotion			then weekly for months 2-9, then monthly Monthly men's meetings first 3 months Weekly household visits				
Millar 2016 Additional details from Ellis (2010)	Skin and soft-tissue infection (SSTI) prevention intervention in addition to SSTI brief on entry also provided to control A. Enhanced standard B. chlorhexidine [CHG]	Military trainees	Improve personal hygiene practices to prevent infection, especially acute respiratory infection (ARI) in military trainees who are at increased risk	A. Enhanced standard: supplemental materials (a pocket card and posters in the barracks) B. CHG: CHG-based body wash (Hibiclens, Mölnlycke Health Care, Norcross, Georgia)	Provision of education and hygiene-based measures in addition to standard SSTI prevention brief upon entry: Enhanced standard: supplemental materials CHG: as for enhanced standard group plus a CHG-based body wash and instructions for use	Not described, presumably the researchers	Face to face and individually for body wash and pocket card Mode of education not described	US military training base	One off education on entry to training CHG: use of wash 1/week for entire training period (14 weeks)	None described	None described	None described	None described
Morton 2004	Healthy hands (alcohol gel as	Elementary schools and their	Prevent infections in elementary	Alcohol gel and dispensers: AlcoSCRUB® (60% ethyl alcohol) supplied	Healthy hands protocol introduced after 'Germ unit' education in classes	Gel provided by suppliers	Face to face training in classes	Elementary schools in US	46 days 0.5ml dispensed	Reinforcement teaching provided	One student was concerned	Usage of gel calculated	5 gel applications / day

⁹ after defaecation, after cleaning an infant who had defaecated, before preparing food, before eating, and before feeding infants

	handwashing adjunct)	children and staff	school-age children who are particularly vulnerable through adjunct use of alcohol gel and education based on Health Belief Model (HBM) (Kirscht 1974)	by Erie Scientific Company, Portsmouth, NH “Healthy Hands Rules” protocol ¹¹ (Figure 3 in paper) Healthy Hand Resource Manual for school nurse, available for parents Monthly newsletters to parents “Healthy Hands” refrigerator magnet for families (see Figure 2 in paper) Informational letter to local primary care providers, paediatricians, family practitioners, and advanced practice nurses “Germ Unit” curriculum and materials including Germ models and Glo Germ™	Daily reminders to children on public address system (in first week) then weekly reminders Review of protocol in each classroom after vacation by school nurse 2 classroom visits from school nurse “Healthy Hands” magnet provided to parents and guardians “Hand Checks on Wednesdays” to identify adverse effects of gel	Research team provided educational aspects Classroom teachers responsible for encouraging use of gel and reinforce protocol School nurse assisted monitoring and hand checks for adverse effects	and individual information on giving and monitoring	Wall-mounted near door entrance of each classroom at age-appropriate height	/ application Use of “special soap” according to “Healthy Hands Protocol” (Figure 3 in paper)	if gel usage indicated it was needed Germ unit education tailored for each grade level	ned gel was making her sick, so school nurse provided additional classroom visit to allay concerns		1 dispenser lasted 1 month
Nicholson 2014	Hand washing with soap (HWWS)	Households with 5-year olds and their mothers	Targeted 5-year-old children and their mothers as change agents to reduce incidence of	Initial supply of 5 bars of free soap (90g Lifebuoy bars) replenished on submission of empty wrappers Environmental cue reminders (wall hangers, danglers)	Provision of soap and social marketing programme (Life-buoy branding) to educate, motivate and reward children for HWWS at key times Weeks 1-17: handwashing occasions,	Dedicated team of ‘promoters’ delivered education and home visits Mothers provided	Face to face in groups Individually by mother to child	‘Classrooms’ held in community buildings Home visits of household	41 weeks Weekly ‘classrooms’ after school and home visits	Mothers were asked to provide and share handwashing tips with other mothers,	Technical difficulties with ‘soap acceleration sensors’ to	Registers for ‘classrooms’ and home visits where 3-week gaps in attendance	Soap consumption : IG vs CG 235g vs 45g

¹¹ “Healthy Hands” Rules (from Figure 3 in paper): Do use “special soap” when arrive to school, before lunch, after go to bathroom (only if soap and water not available), if rub nose or eyes or if fingers in mouth, if teacher asks. Do not: use “special soap” if hand dirt on them, put “special soap” on another student, play with ‘special soap”, put hands near eyes after using “special soap”.

			respiratory infections (and diarrhoeal disease) through handwashing using behaviour change principles (Claessen et al. 2008), including social norms for child and mother (Perkins 2003), using fear of contamination and disgust (Curtis & Biran 2001), peer pressure (Sidibe 2003), morale boosting and networking support	Rewards (e.g. stickers, coins, toy animals)	germ education, soap's importance in germ removal Week 18 on: encouragement of HWWS on 5 key occasions supported by environmental cues 'Classrooms' for children Home visits for mothers Parents' evenings to boost morale, build networks and run competition for compliance, assignment completion and folder decoration Establishment of a 'Good Mums' club for sharing HWWS tips Rewards provided by mothers Children encourages to advocate HWWS within families before meals Establishment of social norms for child and mother with pledges in front of peers	supplied rewards		ds in Mumbai, India	HWWS encouraged 5 key occasions : after defecation, before each of 3 meals and during bathing Week 18 on: handwashing on 5 occasions for 10 consecutive days 6 weekly parents' meetings	competitions held for mothers	measured HWWS behaviours prevented successful use	e triggered supervisors to ask participants to resume or be withdrawn Monitoring of soap resale on open market by use of unique identifiers on soap wrappers and twice weekly checks in local shops Collection of used soap wrappers as soap consumption measure	
Pandejpong 2012	3 active interventions (no control) different time-interval applications of alcohol hand gel:	Pre-school classes (students and teachers) and their parents	Targeted preschool children who can have high infection rates in ILI, have close interaction so at risk of airborne,	1 container of alcohol hand gel per classroom (active ingredients: ethyl alcohol, 70%; chlorhexidine gluconate, 1%; Irgasan, 0.3%) Cost of hand gel every 60	Instruction of teachers to: assist each child with dispensing hand gel at required time interval, store hand gel properly and refill gel as needed Monitoring of hand gel use at specified times	Teachers supervised, stored and refilled hand gel Instructions to teachers presumably provided by researchers	Face to face to schools, teachers and children Individual assistance to	Kindergarten school in Bangkok, Thailand	12 weeks overall 1 pump of gel per child per disinfection round at one of 3 time intervals	None described	Students whose families declined to participate were	2 research assistants monitored hand gel use every 60 or 120 minutes for the	Reported that compliance was ensured for each intervention Group Cost of hand gel every 60

	A. every 60 mins (q 60) B. every 120 mins (q 120) C. once before lunch (q lunch)		droplet, and contact transmission and are of increasingly younger ages through hand gel as a single strategy of convenient and effective disinfection	minutes was \$6.39 per child per 12-week period Leaflet describing risk factors for ILI for each family		Leaflets distributed through school Monitoring of use by 2 research assistants	children with hand gel Leaflets given to each family		of school day: A. every 60 mins (q 60) B. every 120 mins (q 120) C. once only before (q lunch), the school standard for hand hygiene		not asked to use alcohol hand gel These students remained in their classrooms and continued to follow the school standard for hand hygiene	duration of study Classroom teachers were required to co-sign after each disinfection round	minutes was \$6.39 per child per 12-week period
Priest 2015	Hand sanitiser provision (in addition to hand hygiene education session also provided to control group)	Primary schools and their students, teachers and administrative staff	Reduce person-to-person community transmission of infectious disease by targeting improved and additional hand hygiene of school children through supervised hand sanitiser provision as an	“No touch” dispensers (>60% ethanol) for each classroom which dispensed dose when hands were placed under an infrared sensor Supply of top up sanitiser as needed	Dispensers installed into each classroom Teachers asked to ensure that the children used sanitiser at particular times and to oversee general use (McKenzie 2010) Weekly classroom visits to top up of sanitiser and measure quantity used 30-min in-class hand hygiene education session provided (also to control group) plus instruction in hand sanitizer use	School liaison research assistants topped up sanitiser Teachers	Installation of dispensers to classrooms Supervision of children by teachers delivered face to face individually and as a class	City schools in New Zealand	20 weeks (2 school terms) Sanitizer to be used by students at least after coughing / sneezing blowing their nose, and as they leave for morning break and for	Children were able to use the sanitiser at any time they wished as well as key times (McKenzie 2010)	Change of sanitiser after week 10 to flavour less type of the same % ethanol in 41 of 396 classrooms (10%) (in 9 of 34 schools)	Weekly classroom visits by school liaison research assistants who recorded quantity of sanitiser used Total amount of sanitiser / classroom was measured	100% dispensing 45 ml / child Average hand sanitiser dispensed / child for 34 schools: 94 ml Median classroom difference in sanitiser usage between first 10 wk and second 10 wk among classes that

			alternative to improving and maintaining bathroom facilities						lunch break Approximately 0.45-ml of sanitiser dispensed per wash Weekly top up of sanitiser		due to children tasting it when eating, affecting use	Compliance defined as dispensing a volume equivalent to at least 45 ml per child of hand sanitiser solution over the trial period	switched products was -220ml
Ram 2015	Soap and Intensive handwashing promotion	Household compounds and its householders (adults and children) that had a household with influenza-like illness (ILL)	Reduce household transmission of ILL and influenza by promoting handwashing in households with householders with ILL as other householders who are well are at highest risk of exposure due to crowded and poorly ventilated homes. Followed constructs of Social Cognitive Theory and	Handwashing station in central location of each compound using: Large water container with a tap, Plastic case for soap, Bar of soap Cue cards depicting critical times for handwashing: after coughing or sneezing, after cleaning one's nose or child's nose, after defecation, after clearing a child who has defecated, before food preparation or serving, before eating	Handwashing station in each compound Didactic and interactive group-level education and skills training describing influenza symptoms, transmission, and prevention, promoting health and non-health benefits of handwashing with soap and identification of barriers and proposed solutions to handwashing with soap Daily surveillance including weighing of soap and replacing if ≥ 20 grams and re-supply of water in container if needed Posting of cue cards Asking householders to demonstrate handwashing with soap technique	Intervention staff arranged provision of handwashing station and presumably provided education Intervention staff conducted daily surveillance and reinforcement visits	All elements delivered face to face but at compound (facilities), group (education) and individual levels (reinforcement)	Household compounds in a rural area of Bangladesh consisting of several households with common courtyard, shared latrine, water source and cooking facilities	Initiation of intervention within 18 hours of study enrolment, then daily visits until 10 days following resolution of index case-patient's symptoms Day 1 set up of handwashing station	Daily surveillance included observation of individual handwashing reinforcement and modelling as needed	None described	Daily surveillance of facilities and reinforcement and modelling of handwashing behaviours including observed handwashing Cue cards in common areas of courtyard Presence or absence of soap during each of	Soap present for at least 7 days in all compounds and on all 10 days in 133 compounds (74%) Soap and water together were present 7 or more of first 10 days in 99% of compounds, with water and soap observed together on all 10 days in 99 (55%) Soap consumption per capita: Median: 2.3 gm

			the Health Belief Model (Glanz 2008) and behaviour change communication using social marketing concepts									first 10 days of surveillance from 180 household compounds	Maximal: 5 gm (on Day 7)
			Patterns and amount of soap use measured ¹²										
Roberts 2000	Education about infection control measures, handwashing, and aseptic nose wiping	Childcare centres and their staff and children	Reduce transmission of respiratory infections in childcare centres through improved infection control procedures	GloGerm (GloGerm, Moab, UT) Newsletters to staff Songs and rhymes on handwashing Plastic bags (sandwich bags available at supermarkets) to cover hand for nose wiping	Staff training in good health (developed by Kendrick 1994) and practical exercise of handwashing with GloGerm Fortnightly visits and newsletter to reinforce training and to communicate techniques Recommended handwashing technique as per guidelines of the time ¹³ and after toileting, before eating, after changing diaper (staff and child) and after wiping nose unless barrier used Teaching of technique to children and wash hands for infants	Training and reinforcement activities provided by one of the researchers Teachers delivered training to children based on their training	Face to face in groups for training and classes and individually as needed to children or staff	Childcare centres in Canberra, Australia	8 months overall 3-hour training in evening or 1-hour during lunch for new staff after study start Duration of handwashing: "count to 10" to wash and "count to 10" to rinse	Training for new staff provided as needed	None described	6 weekly compliance measured by recorded observation of recommended practice for 3 hours in morning in each centre, graded by quantiles of frequency of recommended handwas	Compliance was reported only in relation to analysis of outcomes High compliance reported for nose wiping and child handwashing

¹² Calculated by subtracting each day's soap weight from the previous day's weight. Maximum number of grams of soap consumed for each compound was identified and the day on which the maximum soap consumption was recorded. A per capita estimate of daily soap consumption was calculated

¹³ National Health and Medical Research Council. Staying Healthy in Child Care. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service; 1994.

												hing by children	
Sandora 2005	Healthy Hands Healthy Families	Families with an index child in out-of- home childcare	Reduce illness transmissio n in the home through multifactori al campaign centred on hand- hygiene education and hand sanitizer	Alcohol-based hand sanitizer: active ingredient: 62% ethyl alcohol (Purell Instant Hand Sanitizer; GOJO Industries, Inc, Akron OH) Hand-hygiene educational materials at home (fact sheets, toys, games)	Supply of hand sanitizer and hand-hygiene materials Biweekly telephone calls Biweekly educational materials	Study investigator	Not stated whether materials mailed or delivered in person	Homes in USA Sanitizer use in home	5 months overall Bi- weekly education al materials Sanitizer dispensed 1 mL each pump	None described	None describ ed	Recorded amount of hand sanitizer used (as reported by the primary caregiver)	Median frequency of reported times of hand sanitizer use: 5.2 / day 38% used >2oz of hand sanitizer / fortnight = 4-5 uses / day
Savolaine n-Kopra 2012 Further details from Savolaine n-Kopra (2010)	STOPFL U Enhanced hygiene 2 active interventi ons: IR1: soap and water wash IR2: alcohol- based hand rub	Office workers of office work units	Prevent transmissio n of respiratory infections in workplaces through enhanced hand hygiene with behavioural recommend ations to reduce transmissio n by droplets during coughing or sneezing	IR1: Liquid hand soap ("Erisan Nonsid" by Farnos Inc., Turku, Finland) IR2: in addition: Alcohol-based hand rub, 80% ethanol ("LV" by Berner Inc., Helsinki, Finland) Bottles of hand hygiene product (free of charge) to be used at home and in the office (IR2) Written instructions on hygiene for further reference	Toilets equipped with liquid hand soap (all groups) or alcohol-based hand rub (IR2) Guidance on other ways to limit transmission of infections, e.g. frequent handwashing in office and at home, coughing, sneezing into disposable handkerchief or sleeve, avoiding hand shaking Visits to work clusters and monitoring of materials availability Monthly electronic "information spot" about viral diseases for motivation to maintain hygiene habits Adherence activities	In collaboratio n with occupational health clinics servicing the corporation Specially trained research nurse provided guidance and visited worker clusters throughout intervention period	In person provision of soap or hand rub Guidance and written instructio ns given personally Face to face visits by study nurse	Office work units in corporati ons in Helsinki, Finland	15-16 months overall Monthly visits by nurse througho ut	Nurses assisted with any practical problem with interventi on as they arose New employee s received guidance on hand hygiene and habits	None describ ed	Adherenc e assessed by an electronic self- report survey of transmiss ion limiting habits 3 times (more details in protocol) Use of soap (IR1) and alcohol- based disinfecta nt (IR2) for personal use was recorded	Avoiding hand shaking became more common and remained high in both groups Recorded use for personal use smaller than predicted use based on hand hygiene instructions. Soap or disinfectant usage per participant: IR1: 6.1 IR2: 6.9

												Study nurse checked availability of soap and alcohol rub	
Stebbins 2011	“WHACK the Flu” (Hand sanitizer and training in hand and respiratory hygiene)	Elementary schools and their students and homeroom teachers	Targeted school-aged children as important sources of influenza transmission through improved cough etiquette and hand hygiene in schools including sanitizer as potential inexpensive nonpharmaceutical interventions (NPIs)	Hand sanitizer dispensers with 62% alcohol-based hand sanitizer from Purell® (GOJO Industries, Inc, Akron, OH) automatically dispensing 1 dose	<p>Delivery of grade-specific presentations on “WHACK the Flu” concepts and proper hand washing technique and sanitizer use: (W)ash or sanitize your hands often; (H)ome is where you stay when you are sick; (A)void touching your eyes, nose and mouth; (C)over your coughs and sneezes; and (K)eeep your distance from sick people <i>[provided URL no longer active]</i></p> <p>Desired frequency of hand wash use taught to student (see When and how much)</p> <p>Installation of hand sanitizer dispensers</p> <p>Refresher training at each school</p> <p>Reinforcement of message and monitoring of sanitizer</p>	Project staff provided education Homeroom teachers reinforced message and monitored proper use of sanitizer	Face to face at schools, presumably as a group in classes	Elementary schools (Pittsburgh, USA) Dispensers installed in each classroom and all major common areas	<p>Whole intervention over one influenza season</p> <p>Once off installation of hand sanitizer dispensers</p> <p>Once off 45-minute education presentation and once off refresher training at onset of influenza season</p> <p>Goal of use of 1 dose (0.6ml) of sanitizer 4 times / day¹⁴</p>	Encouraged to wash hands and/or use additional doses of hand sanitizer as needed	None reported	<p>Monthly teacher surveys of observed NPI-related behaviour in their students before, during, and after influenza season</p> <p>Measurement of hand sanitizer use at two week intervals throughout the intervention period</p>	<p>Teacher surveys of observed classroom NPI behaviour indicated successful adoption and maintenance of behaviours throughout influenza season</p> <p>Average sanitizer use: 2.4 times / day</p>

¹⁴ upon arrival, before and after lunch, and prior to departure

Talaat 2011	Intensive hand hygiene campaign	Schools and their students, teachers and parents	Reduce or prevent transmission of influenza viruses among children through intensive hand hygiene intervention campaign	<p>Soap supplied as needed</p> <p>Grade-specific student booklets each including a set of 12 games and fun activities that promoted hand washing</p> <p>Hand hygiene activities materials including: Games (e.g. How to escape from the germs) Puzzles Soap activities (e.g. soap drawing) Song specially developed to promote hand hygiene</p> <p>Teachers' guidebook including detailed description of the students' activities and methods to encourage students to practice these activities</p> <p>Posters with messages to wash hands with soap and water upon arriving at school, before and after meals, after using the bathroom, and after coughing or sneezing.</p> <p>Informational flyers for parents reinforcing the messages delivered at the schools</p>	<p>Establishment of a hand hygiene team in each school</p> <p>Provision of hand hygiene activities: Weekly exercises (e.g. games, aerobics, songs, experiments) School activities, (e.g. Obligatory hand washing under supervision, morning broadcast, parent meetings, students-parents information transfer) Specific school initiatives: (e.g. competitions and awards, hand-washing committee, school trips to soap factory and water purification plant)</p> <p>More details in Table 1 of paper</p> <p>Song played regularly</p> <p>Social worker weekly visits</p> <p>Distribution of flyers to parents</p>	<p>Hand hygiene team (3 teachers from social studies, arts, sports) and the school nurse) ensured all predesigned activities for the hand hygiene campaign were implemented</p> <p>6 independent social workers visited the schools</p>	Delivered face to face in groups and individually	<p>Elementary schools (grades 1-3) in Cairo, Egypt</p> <p>In school environment and classrooms</p> <p>Poster near sinks in classrooms and on playground</p>	<p>12 weeks overall</p> <p>Weekly hand hygiene campaign activities</p> <p>Weekly visits by social workers</p> <p>Twice daily obligatory supervised handwashing required students for ~45 seconds, followed by proper rinsing and drying with a clean cloth towel</p>	<p>Soap and hand-drying material provided by school administration if children didn't bring their own as was the custom or families couldn't afford it</p> <p>Schools could create own motivating activities such as selecting a weekly hand hygiene champion, developing theatre plays, and launching school contests for drawings and songs</p>	None described	<p>Observation by social works of hand hygiene activities, availability of soap and drying material, and students' handwashing during the day</p> <p>Schools created own activities to improve compliance</p>	<p>~93% of the students had soap and drying material available</p> <p>All but 2 intervention schools "had a rigorous system of ensuring that schoolchildren were washing their hands at least twice daily."</p>
Temime 2018	Multifaceted hand hygiene	Nursing home (NH)	Nursing homes and their	Dispensers and pocket-sized	Facilitated access to hand rub solution	Same nurse provided	Provision of materials	Nursing homes in France	1 year overall	If staff didn't score	None described	Estimated mean amount	Hand rub solution used:

	(HH) program (including alcohol-based hand rub)	staff, residents, visitors, and outside care providers	residents, staff and visitors and external providers have an increased risk of person-to-person transmission of pathogens and HH is a simple and cost-effective tool for infection control but compliance with HH is poor in nursing homes	containers of hand rub solution Posters promoting hand hygiene Developed local HH guidelines eLearning module on infection control and HH training with online quizzes requiring sufficient performance	Campaign to promote HH with posters and event organization Formation of local work groups in each NH Development of local HH guidelines Staff education using e-learning Monitoring of quantity of hand rub solution used	HH training for all NHs Provision of hand rub by NH Local work group developed guideline eLearning module and posters presumably developed by research team	face to face Education and quizzes via eLearning		One off provision of hand rub One off eLearning repeated if unsatisfactory performance	sufficiently in online quiz, they were invited to repeat the eLearning		of hand rub solution used per resident per day assessed as proxy for HH frequency, based on quantity of hand rub solution bought by NH (which was routinely monitored in all the NHs)	Baseline quantity of consumed hand rub solution was 4.5 mL / resident / day. Over the 1-year, mean quantity consumed significantly higher in intervention NH (7.9 mL / resident / day) than control (5.7 / resident / day)
Turner 2004 Clinical trial 1	3 active interventions no control: Product: A. ethanol B. salicylic acid C. salicylic acid with pyroglutamic acid	Healthy volunteers	Assess the residual virucidal activity of organic acids used in currently available over-the-counter skin products for the prevention of experimental rhinovirus colds	1.7 ml of hand products: A. 62% ethanol, 1% ammonium lauryl sulphate, and 1% Klucel) B. 3.5% salicylic acid, or vehicle containing C. 1% salicylic acid and 3.5% pyroglutamic acid	Disinfection of hands then application of test product then allowed to dry. 15 mins later, fingertips of each hand contaminated with 155 TCID ₅₀ of rhinovirus type 39 in a volume of 100 µl. Hands air dried for 10 min Intentional attempted inoculation with virus by contact with fingers, conjunctiva and nasal mucosa with fingers with right hand. Left hand eluted in 2ml of virus-collecting broth	Researchers	Face to face individually	Communities in Manitoba, Canada	1.7 ml of product applied See What for timing	Not described	Not described	Not described	Not described
Turner 2004	2 active interventions	Healthy volunteers	Assess the residual virucidal	Skin cleanser wipe containing: A.	Application of product to hands with towelette then allowed to dry.	Researchers	Face to face	Communities in	Dose not reported; see What	Not described	Not described	Not described	Not described

Clinical trial 2	ons (no control): Skin cleaner wipe product A. pyroglutamic acid B. ethanol		activity of organic acids used in currently available over-the counter skin products for the prevention of experimental rhinovirus colds	4% pyroglutamic acid formulated with 0.1% benzalkonium chloride B. 62% ethanol	15 mins later, fingertips of each hand contaminated with 106 TCID ₅₀ of rhinovirus type 39 in a volume of 100 µl. Intentional attempted inoculation with virus by contact with fingers, conjunctiva and nasal mucosa with fingers with right hand. Left hand eluted in 2ml of virus-collecting broth		individually	Manitoba, Canada	for timing Additional group challenge d 1 hr after application; final group challenge d 3 hrs after application (remained at study site and not allowed to use or wash hands between)				
Turner 2012	Antiviral hand lotion	Healthy adults	Reduce rhinovirus infection and illness through hand disinfection with ethanol and organic acid sanitizer	Lotion containing 62% ethanol, 2% citric acid, and 2% malic acid Daily diary	Provision of lotion and instructions for use Meetings with participants to check compliance	Staff of study site presumably supplied lotion Study site staff met with participant	Face to face and presumably individually but not specified	Study site at US University community	9 weeks Every 3 hours while awake and after hand washing for 9 weeks Compliance meetings twice weekly for first 5 weeks then weekly meetings	None reported	None reported	Self-reported daily diary of time of each product application Twice weekly for 5 weeks then weekly meetings with participants to reinforce compliance	“All subjects ... applied at least 90% of the expected amount of hand treatment” (p.1424)

									with participants			ce with treatment	
Yeung 2011	Multifaceted hand hygiene program (including alcohol-based hand rub)	Long-term care facilities (LTCFs) and their healthcare worker (HCWs)	Promote use of alcohol-based hand rub by staff in LTCFs as an effective, timely and low irritant method of hand hygiene in a high-risk environment	Free supply of pocket-sized containers of alcohol-based antiseptic hand rub (either World Health Organization formulation I (80% ethanol) or II (80% propanol) carried by each HCW (Supplier: Vickmans Laboratories) Replacement hand rub as required Hand hygiene seminar content Reminder materials (3-5 posters and specially designed ballpoint pens)	Provision of materials Provision of hand hygiene seminars to HCWs covering: indications, proper method and importance of antiseptic hand rubbing and washing according to World Health Organization (2006) guidelines Provision of feedback session Direct inobtrusive observation of hand hygiene adherence Training of observation staff	Study team delivered the materials, seminars and observer training Administrative staff of LTCF provided replacement hand rub and communicated with HCWs 6 registered nurses conducted direct observation of adherence after 2-hour training (100% inter-rater reliability)	Delivered face to face and individually for hand rub and pens; not described if education was individually or group but seminar implies as a group	LTCFs in Hong Kong Posters posted in common areas Adherence observations occurred in common rooms, resident rooms but not bathing or toilet areas	7 months overall Initial 2-week intervention period then 7 months of hand rub provision and reminders 3 identical seminars at start of intervention; each staff member to attend once Feedback session 3 months after start of intervention 2-hour training of observers Adherence observations either 9am-	Replacement of hand rub as required	As adherence dropped off in the middle months, the feedback session was delivered	Direct observation of HCW adherence to hand washing and antiseptic hand rubbing (recorded separately and anonymously) during bedside procedures or physical contact with residents 3,300 hand hygiene opportunities during 248.5 hours of observation on 92 days	90% attendance of seminars Hand rubbing with gel increased significantly from 1.5% to 15.9% Handwashing decreased significantly from 24.3% to 17.4% Control: 30% Overall handwashing adherence increased from 25.8% to 33.3%

									12pm or 3pm-6pm 1 LTCF at a time				
Zomer 2015	Hand hygiene (HH) products and training	Day care centres (DCCs) and their caregivers (staff)	Reduce infections in children attending DCCs through improved access to HH materials (Zomer 2013a) and compliance of their DCC caregivers to hand hygiene guidelines based on sociocognitive and environmental determinants of caregivers' HH behaviour ¹⁵ (Zomer 2013b)	HH products: dispensers for paper towels, soap, alcohol-based hand sanitizer and hand cream, with refills for 6 months Reminder posters and stickers for children and DCC caregivers Training materials including booklet	Provision of free HH products sponsored by SCA Hygiene Products, Sweden Provision of posters and stickers for children and staff Provision of training about Dutch national HH guidelines (2011) for mandatory HH ¹⁶ Distribution of training booklet Team training sessions aimed at goal-setting and formulating HH improvement activities (Erasmus 2010; Huis 2013)	Study team arranged supply of HH products and presumably provided training	Products provided to DCCs in person for staff use Mode of training not specified	DCCs in regions of The Netherlands	6 months overall Initial one-off supply of products 3 training sessions with 1-month interval 2 team training sessions	Replacement hand provided as required	None described	6-month follow-up observation of whether intervention dispensers and posters/stickers in use Survey of DCC caregivers HH Guidelines compliance observed at 1, 3 and 6 months follow-up: No. of HH actions / no. of opportunities	2 DCCs did not use any HH products Sanitizer products used in at least 1 of 2 groups in 94%, 89%, 86% and 45% of intervention DCCs Posters used in 86%, stickers in 74% DCC survey results: 79% attended at least 1 training session; 77% received HH guidelines booklet HH compliance at 6 months: IG 59% vs. CG: 44% (T. P. Zomer et

¹⁵ knowledge and awareness of HH guidelines, perceived importance of performing HH, perceived behavioural control (i.e. perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour), and habit

¹⁶ "According to the Dutch national guidelines, HH is mandatory for caregivers before touching/preparing food, before caregivers themselves ate or assisted children with eating, and before wound care; and after diapering, after toilet use/wiping buttocks, after caregivers themselves coughed/sneezed/wiped their own nose, after contact with body fluids (e.g. saliva, vomit, urine, blood, or mucus when wiping children's noses), after wound care, and after hands were visibly soiled." (p. 2495)

													al., unpublished data) All intervention DCCs received guidelines training; all but 2 received at least 1 team training
HAND HYGIENE AND MASKS													
Aelami 2015	Hygienic education and package	Religious pilgrims	Prevent influenza-like illness by reduced infection transmission through personal hygiene measures	Hygiene package of: alcohol-based hand rub (gel or spray) surgical masks soap paper handkerchiefs User instructions	Not clearly described but appears may have been distributed by trained physicians before departure to or on site of country of pilgrimage	Not described specifically	Not described but appears packages distributed face to face and individually	Not described if before departure (from Iran) or on site (in Saudi Arabia)	Once off during Hajj season	Not described	Not described	Not described	None described
Aiello 2010	2 active interventions: A. Face mask (FM) B. Face mask and hand hygiene (FM+HH)	Students living in university residences	Reduce the incidence of and mitigate influenza-like illness (ILI) by use of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) of personal protection measures	7 Face masks (standard medical procedure masks with ear loops TECNOL procedure masks; Kimberly-Clark) 7 Resealable plastic bags for mask storage when not in use (e.g. eating) and for disposal Alcohol-based hand sanitizer (62% ethyl alcohol in a gel base, portable 2 oz squeeze bottle, 8 oz pump) Hand hygiene education (proper hand hygiene practices and	Weekly supply of masks through student mailboxes Provision of basic hand hygiene education through an email video link, the study website and written materials; instruction to wear mask as much as possible; education in correct mask use, change of masks daily, use of provided resealable bags for mask storage and disposal Provision of replacement supplies for which	Not described except education provided via study website <i>[URL not provided]</i> “Trained staff” for compliance monitoring Study-affiliated residence hall staff provided replacement supplies	Education via email and study website; provision of masks and sanitizer in person to residences	US University Residence Halls	One off education, 6 weeks (excluding spring break) of face mask and/or hand hygiene measures which commenced at “the beginning of the influenza season just after identification of	Mask wearing during sleep optional and encouraged outside of residence	University spring break occurred during weeks 4 and 5 of the study, with most students leaving campus and travelling and were not	Weekly web-based student survey included: self-reported average number of times hands washed / day and average duration of handwashing to obtain composite	Average mask use hours/day: FM+HH 2.99 vs 3.92 in FM Average handwashing times/day: FM+HH 6.11 vs 8.18 for FM vs 8.75 for control group Daily washing secs/day: FM+HH 20.65 vs

				cough etiquette) via emailed video, study website, written materials detailing appropriate hand sanitizer and mask use	students signed for on receipt				the first case of influenza on campus" (p.496). Replacement supplies provided as needed		required to continue protective measures in that time	"optimal handwashing" score (at least 20 secs $\geq$ 5 /day); average no of mask hours/day /week; average hand sanitizer use / day / week and amount used. Trained staff in residence hall common areas observed silently and anonymously improper mask use, instances of hand sanitizer use	23.15 for FM vs 22.35 for control Hand sanitizer use times/day: FM+HH: 5.2 vs 2.31 for FM vs 2.02 for control No. of proper mask wearing participants / hour of observation: FM+HH: 2.26 FM: 1.94
Aiello 2012	2 interventions A. Face mask (FM) B. Face mask and hand sanitizer	Students living in university residences	Prevent influenza-like illness (ILI) and laboratory confirmed influenza by use of non-pharmaceut	Packets of 7 standard medical procedure masks with ear loops (TECNOL™ procedure masks, Kimberly-Clark, Roswell GA) and plastic bags for storage during interruptions in mask use (e.g., while	Intervention materials and educational video provided Supply of masks and instructions on wearing Provision of replacement masks or sanitizers as needed on site	Trained study staff available at tables in each residence hall for surplus masks and sanitizer	Hygiene packs delivered to student mailboxes; face to face supply also available	US University Residence Halls	One off educational video at start Weekly supply of hygiene packs	Students encouraged but not obliged to wear masks outside of	1-week University spring break during the study when majority	Weekly student survey including compliance (e.g. masks hours/day , frequenc	Self-reported mask wearing: No significant difference Sanitizer use:

	(FM+HH)		ical interventions (NPIs) of personal protection measures (e.g. face masks and hand hygiene).	eating, sleeping) and for daily disposal Hand sanitizer (2 oz squeeze bottle, 8 oz pump bottle with 62% ethyl alcohol in a gel base) Replacement face masks and hand sanitizer Educational video: proper hand hygiene and use of standard medical procedure face masks		and for observing compliance			Masks to be worn at least 6 hours/day Study staff available on site with replacement supplies as needed for duration of intervention (6 weeks, excluding spring break)	residence hall	y of students left campus	y and amount of sanitizer use, number of hand washes/day, duration of hand washing (secs) Observed compliance completed by trained study staff who daily and anonymously observed mask wearing in public areas of residences	Significantly more in FM+HH than FM or control groups More results in S1 of paper. Staff observed an average of 0.0007 participants properly wearing a mask for each hour of observation
Cowling 2009	2 active interventions in addition to control of lifestyle education A. Enhanced hand hygiene (HH) B. Face masks and enhanced	Householders with index patient with influenza	Reduce transmission of influenza in households through personal protective measures	A. and B. Liquid soap for each kitchen and bathroom: 221 mL Ivory liquid hand soap [Proctor & Gamble, Cincinnati, Ohio]) Alcohol hand rub in individual small bottles (100 mL World Health Organization Recommended Formulation I, 80% ethanol, 1.45% glycerol, and 0.125% hydrogen peroxide	Home visits Provision of soap, hand rub and masks as applicable and when to use them HH: Education about efficacy of hand hygiene Demonstration of proper handwashing and antiseptics techniques +FM:	Trained study nurse provided interventions	Face to face to householders	Households in Hong Kong	Initial home visit scheduled within 2 days (ideally 12 hrs) of index case identification. Further home visits day 3 and 6, 7	Not described	Not described	Monitoring of adherence during home visits Evaluation of adherence on final visit by interview or self-reported practices and	Most initial visits completed within 12 hrs Intervention groups "reported higher adherence ... than the control group. Self-reported data were consistent

	hygiene (FM+HH)			<p>[Vickmans Laboratories, Hong Kong, China]</p> <p>B. Adults: Box of 50 surgical facemasks (Tecnol–The Lite One [Kimberly-Clark, Roswell, Georgia]) to each household member or a box of C. Children 3-7: 75 pediatric masks</p>	<p>Education about efficacy of surgical facemasks in reducing disease spread to household contacts if all parties wear masks</p> <p>Demonstration of proper wearing and hygienic disposal</p> <p>All groups: Provision of education about the importance of a healthy diet and lifestyle, both in terms of illness prevention (for household contacts) and symptom alleviation (for the index case)</p>				<p>day follow-up</p> <p>HH: Use of liquid soap after every washroom visit, sneezing or coughing, when their hands were soiled; Use rub: when first returning home and immediately after touching any potentially contaminated surfaces</p> <p>FM: masks worn as often as possible at home (except eating or sleeping) and when the index patient was with the household</p>			<p>counting of amount of soap and rub left in bottles and remaining masks for FM group</p> <p>with measurements of amount of soap, alcohol hand rub, and facemasks used.” (p.443) (see Table 6 in paper) “Adherence to the hand hygiene intervention was slightly higher in the hand hygiene group than the facemask plus hand hygiene group.”</p> <p>Median masks used: Index: 9 Contact: 4</p> <p>More details in paper and Appendices</p>
--	------------------------	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

									d members outside of the househol d				
Larson 2010	2 active interventi ons in addition to control of URI education : A. Alcohol- based hand sanitizer (HS) B. Face masks and hand sanitizer (FM+HS)	Hispanic househol ders with at least 1 preschool or elementar y school child	Reduce incidence and secondary transmissio n of URIs and influenza through non- pharmaceut ical household level interventio ns	A. and B. 2-month supply of hand sanitizer in 8-, 4- and 1-ounce containers: Purell® (Johnson & Johnson, Morris Plains, New Jersey) B. 2-month supply of masks: Procedure Face Masks for adults and children, (Kimberly-Clark, Roswell, Georgia) Replacement supplies at least once every 2 months Disposable thermometers Educational materials about URI prevention, treatment and vaccination (written Spanish- or English- language)	Provision of materials and instructions for when to use including demonstration for use and observation of return demonstration by householder B. mask worn when householder had: “temperature of $\geq 37.8^{\circ}\text{C}$ and cough and/or sore throat in the absence of a known cause other than influenza.” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) definition of the time) Home visits to reinforce adherence, replenish supplies and record use, answer questions B. Telephone calls to reinforce mask use: when 19 The household caretaker was instructed to wear a mask when he/she was within 3 feet of a All groups: Received URI educational materials	4 trained bilingual research assistants (RAs) with minimum baccalaurea te degree and experience in community -based research; procedures were practised with each other until demonstrat ed proficiency	Face to face to househol ders	Househol ds in New York, USA	19-month follow-up Initial home visit then at least every 2 months Sanitizer for use at home, work and school B. Telephon e calls days 1,3,6 Masks worn for 7 days when within 3 feet of person with ILL or no symptom s	Change masks between interactio ns with person with ILL Househol ders questions and misconce ptions addressed on home visits	None describ ed	RA Home visits for adherenc e with random accompa niment by project manager, who also made random calls to househol ders Telephon e calls to reinforce mask use Used bottles and / or face masks monitore d for usage	Sanitizer use (mean oz / month) HH: 12.1 FM+HH: 11.6 Mask compliance was “poor”: 22/44 (50%) used within 48 hours of onset Mask users reported mean mask use of 2
Simmerm an 2011	2 active interventi ons: A. Hand- washing education	Househol ds with a febrile, influenza -positive child	Decrease influenza virus transmissio n in household	A. and B. Hand-washing kit per household including graduated dispenser with standard unscented liquid hand	A. and B. Provision of intensive hand-washing education on initial home visit to household members with 5 approaches:	Study nurse conducted home visits, provided education and	Educatio n provided face to face as a group to	In homes (in Bangkok, Thailand)	Provision of kits a once off at initial home visit	B. no face masks while earring or sleeping	None describ ed	Self- monitorin g diary recording hand- washing	Reported average hand- washing episodes/day :

	and hand-washing kit (HW) B. hand-washing education , hand-washing kit and face masks (HW+FM)		with a febrile influenza-positive child through promoted use of hand washing or hand washing with face mask use	soap (Teepol brand. Active ingredients: linear alkyl benzene sulfonate, potassium salt, and sodium lauryl ether sulphate) Replacement soap as needed Written materials from education including pamphlets and posters attached near sinks in household B. Box of 50 standard paper surgical face masks and 20 paediatric face masks (Med-con company, Thailand #14IN-20AMB-30IN).	discussion, individual hand washing training, self-monitoring diary, provision of soap, and provision of written materials (Kaewchana et al 2012) Individual hand-washing training (‘why to wash’, ‘when to wash’, and ‘how to wash’ in 7 hand-washing steps described in Thailand Ministry of Public Health (MOPH) guidelines B. Provision of education of benefits of and appropriate face mask wearing Soap replaced as needed More details (Kaewchana et al. 2012)	monitoring activities	household member and individually for hand-washing training		conducted within 24 hours of enrolment Subsequent home visits on days 3, 7 and 21 90-day supply of hand-washing supplies 30-minute education provided at initial home visit	as impractical and could hinder breathing in ill child Impromptu education and training provided by nurses as questions arose		frequency >20 secs and face mask use for that group. Reinforcement of messages by nurses on subsequent home visits Amount of household liquid soap and number of face masks used	HW: 4.7 HW+FM: 4.9 Parents had highest frequency (5.7) others (4.8), siblings (4.3) index cases (4.1) Average soap used / week: HW: 54 ml/person HW+FM: 58.1 ml/person B. mask use: 12/person/week Mask wearing median mins/day: 211 Parents: 153 other relations: 59, index patients: 35 or siblings: 17
Suess 2012	2 active interventions in addition to written information: A. Mask / Hygiene (MH)	Households with an influenza positive index case in the absence of	Prevent influenza transmission in households through easily applicable and accessible non-	A. Alcohol based hand-rub (Sterilium™, Bode Chemie, Germany) A. and B. Surgical facemasks in two different sizes: Children < 14 years (Child’s Face Mask,	A. Provision of hand-rub and masks A. and B. provision of masks only Provision of thermometer and how to use it	Study personnel arranged provision of materials, rang the participants , visited the homes, demonstrated	Provision of materials in person to households Initial telephone delivery	Households in Berlin, Germany	Over 2 consecutive flu seasons Day 1 households received all necessary	Adult masks worn if masks for under 14-year olds did not fit properly If other household	In the season 2010/11 participants also recorded number of	Self-reported daily adherence with facemasks, i.e. if they wore masks “always”,	Face mask use (median/individual): MH: 12.6 M: 12.9 Daily adherence was good, reaching a

	B. Mask (M)	further respiratory illness within the preceding 14 days	pharmaceutical interventions (NPI) - such as facemasks or hand hygiene measures	Kimberly-Clark, USA) and Adults (Aérokyn Masques, LCH Medical Products, France). Written information provided on correct use of intervention and on infection prevention (Seuss 2011) (Tips and information on the new flu A/H1N1) [URL provided is no longer active] Digital tympanic thermometer General written information on infection prevention	Mask fit assessed (at first household visit) Information provided by telephone and written instructions at home visit on proper use of interventions and recommendations to sleep in a different room than the index patient, not to take meals with the index patient, etc (Seuss 2011) In person demonstration of interventions at first home visit All participating households received general written information on infection prevention	ed and assessed fit of masks,	of information. Face to face home visits		material instructions Household visits no later than 2 days after symptom onset of the index case then days 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 (5 times) or on days 3, 4, 6, 8 (4 times) depending on the day of recruitment Hand rub use: after direct contact with the index patient (or other symptomatic household members), after at-risk activities or contact ¹⁷ Mask use: at all	d members developed fever (> 38.0° C), cough, or sore throat they were asked to adopt the same preventive behaviour as the index patient	masks used per day	“mostly”, “sometimes”, or “never” as instructed. Participants of the MH households additionally noted the number of hand disinfections per day. Exit questionnaire about (preventive) behaviour during the past 8 days, general attitudes towards NPI, the actual amount of used intervention materials and - if applicable - problems	plateau of over 50% in nearly all groups from the third day on MH Hand rub use (median): 87ml (Seuss 2011) MH mean frequency of daily hand disinfection: 7.6 (S.D.=6.4) times per day See paper and Seuss (2011) for more results
--	-------------	--	---	---	--	-------------------------------	---	--	---	--	--------------------	--	--

¹⁷ having touched household items being used by the index patients and/or other symptomatic household contacts, and after coughing/sneezing, before meals, before preparing meals and when returning home

									times when index patient and/or any other household member with respiratory symptoms were together in one room			with wearing facemasks.	
									Regular change of facemasks, not worn during the night or outside the household			Used intervention material per household member was calculated by dividing the amount used per household by the number of household members	
												See paper and Suess 2011 for more details	
HAND HYGIENE AND SURFACE / OBJECT DISINFECTION													
Ban 2015	Hand hygiene and surface cleaning or disinfection	Kindergartens and the families of their students	Reduce transmission of infection in young children from contaminated surfaces or hands through	Antibacterial products for hand hygiene and surface cleaning or disinfection: Liquid Antimicrobial Soap for handwashing (0.2%-0.3% parachlorometaxyleneol)	Provision of products to kindergartens and families Instruction of parents or guardians and teachers in hand hygiene techniques and use of antibacterial products	Research team provided products and instructions and monitoring	Materials provided to kindergartens and families in person and presumably instructio	In kindergartens (hard surfaces) and families' homes (Xiantao, China)	1 year overall Daily handwashing with soap before eating, after using	Families and teachers could contact study management at any time as needed	Not described	Close contact with teachers and families for monitoring e.g. Unscheduled	Consumption of products by person (mL/person day) Liquid soap: 7.7 Sanitizer: 1.4 Bleach: 25.0

			hand hygiene and surface cleaning or disinfection	Instant Hand Sanitizer for hand disinfecting (72%-75% ethanol), Antiseptic-Germicide (4.5%-5.5% parachlorometaxlenol , diluting before use) Bleach (4.5%-5.0% sodium hypochlorite, diluting before use) for surface disinfecting Produced by Wheathfields Lohmann (Guangzhou) Company Ltd.	Daily cleaning of kindergartens with products At least twice / week cleaning of homes and weekly cleaning or disinfecting of items such as children's toys, house furnishings, frequently touched objects (doorknobs, tables or desks), kitchen surfaces (utensils, cutlery, countertops, chopping boards, sinks, floors, etc.), bathroom surfaces (toilet, sink, floor, etc.) Monitoring activities		ns in person to families and staff		bathroom , nose blowing and outdoor activities Hand sanitizer carried daily Kindergarten cleaning daily Home cleaning at least twice / week	Exchange of empty bottles for new ones at any time		parents' meetings, quarterly home visits, phone interviews, and monthly cell phone messages Monthly survey of consumption of products by volume, total usage, person usage	Antiseptic-germicide: 12.5
Carabin 1999	Hygiene program	Day care centres (DCCs) and their staff and children	Reduce infections in at risk children in day care centres (under 3 years old) with inexpensive , easily implementable and practical interventions	Hygiene materials and documents, e.g. colouring books, handwashing posters, hygiene videotapes, Materials for training Reimbursement of equivalent of 1 full-time educator's salary Bleach (diluted 1:10) for toy and play area cleaning	Provision of comprehensive hygiene training session to entire DCC staff, especially the educators of participating classrooms Training in recommendations for hygiene practices: i. toy cleaning ii. handwashing technique and schedule iii. use of creative reminder cues for handwashing iv. open window for daily period v. sandbox and play area cleaning Payment of salary of educator for the day to encourage participation	Training appears to have been provided by study team	Appears staff trained as a group, i.e. "entire DCC staff"	Day care centres in Canada Location of training not described except may have been off-site from DCCs since 1 DCC did not "send" staff to training	15-month trial Once off 1-day training Toy cleaning at least every 2 days Handwashing at least after DCC arrival, after outside play, after bathroom	Teachers to use creative reminder cues for handwashing with children	Not described	Follow-up telephone questionnaire for DCC directors about following training recommendations	Use of materials: Colouring book: 22/24 Poster: 23/24 Videotapes: 18/24 Staff meetings: 19/24 Increased frequency of toy cleaning: 6/24 Use of rake and shovel for sandpit: 17/24 Frequency of cleaning sandbox: 14/24

					DCC meetings to discuss training session with all staff				, before lunch Open windows at least 30 mins/day Biweekly cleaning of sandbox / play area				
Chard 2019 (additional details from Chard 2018)	Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene for Health and Education in Laotian Primary Schools (WASH HELPS)	Primary schools and their students	Prevent the spread of pathogens within schools through improved water supply and hygiene facilities and improved WASH habits in children at home and throughout the life course	<p>For each school: Water supply for school compound: (borehole, protected dug well with pump, or gravity-fed system).</p> <p>Water tank to supply toilet and handwashing station.</p> <p>School sanitation facilities (3 toilet compartments)</p> <p>Handwashing facilities: 2 sinks with tapped water and supply of soap available (1 bar of soap/pupil)</p> <p>3 group handwashing tables with soap and water</p> <p>At least 1 drinking water filter per classroom</p> <p>Schedules of daily group handwashing, compound and toilet cleaning</p>	<p>Provision of school: Water supply, Sanitation facilities, Handwashing facilities (individual and group), Drinking water filters</p> <p>Behaviour change education and promotion including daily group hygiene activities.</p> <p>Daily handwashing and cleaning schedules</p>	<p>UNICEF paid for materials</p> <p>School and teachers conducted daily handwashing activities with children</p> <p>Students participated in daily group cleaning activities</p>	<p>Facilities provided within schools</p> <p>Children participated in group handwashing and cleaning</p>	<p>Primary schools and their classrooms (in Laos)</p>	<p>Once off provision of water and hygiene facilities</p> <p>Daily handwashing activities and cleaning for 1 school year</p> <p>Cleaning schedules posted in at least 1 classroom near toilet</p>	<p>Water supply tailored to the school requirements / environment</p> <p>Sanitation facilities provided as needed and designated for boys, girls and students with disabilities</p>	<p>Rain water tank provision affected by rain water supply so change d to tanks with motorized hand pumps or gravity-fed water supply systems</p> <p>Theft and animal consumption of supplies</p>	<p>Unannounced visits every 6-8 weeks for structured observations to measure fidelity and adherence</p> <p>Fidelity Index score (0-20): for hardware provided see Table 1 in paper and protocol</p> <p>Adherence index: Student report of behavioural outcomes index</p>	<p>Fidelity: 30.9% across all schools and visits</p> <p>Adherence: 29.4%</p> <p>Hardware provision: 87.8% of schools</p> <p>School-level adherence: 61.4%</p> <p>Group compound cleaning: 94.8%, toilet use: 75.5%, group toilet cleaning: 68.3%.</p> <p>group handwashing: 48.7%, individual handwashing with soap after toilet use: 23.9%.</p> <p>Further details (Chard 2018)</p>

				Cost per school: US\$13,000-17,500							d soap reduce d supply	score (0-4)	
Ibfelt 2015	Disinfecti on of toys	Daycare nurseries	Reduce transmissio n of pathogens via shared toys in day care environmen t through regular disinfection treatment	Disinfectants: Turbo Oxysan (Ecolab, Valby, Denmark) for washing machines Sirafan M, Ecolab (1- 3% benzalkonium chloride, 1-3% didecylmethylammo nium chloride and 5- 7% alcohol ethoxylates for immersion or wiping	Collection and commercial cleaning of toys from nurseries: - linen and toys suitable for washing machines were washed at 46°C and subsequently disinfected - toys not suitable for washing machines immersed in disinfectant or wiped with microfibre cloth	Commercia l cleaning company: Berendsen A/S, Søborg, Denmark	Cleaning companie s collected the toys and linen and cleaned them off- site then returned them	Daycare nurseries in Denmark Commere cial industrial cleaning facility	2-3 months overall Cleaning every 2 weeks	Staggere d cleaning to ensure children had toys to play with while others being cleaned	None describ ed	None described	None described
Kotch 1994	Hygiene	Caregiver s at child cay-care centres (CDCCs)	Develop feasible, multicompo nent hygienic intervention to reduce infections in children at CDCCs who are at increased risk	Hygiene curriculum for caregivers Availability of soap, running water and disposable towels Waterless disinfectant scrub (Cal Stat™) only used if alternative was not washing at all Handouts posted in CDCC	Delivery of hygiene curriculum to caregivers through initial training session which required demonstration of participants' handwashing and diapering skills Local procedures: Handwashing of children and staff Disinfection of toilet and diapering areas Physical separation of diapering areas from food preparation and serving areas Hygienic diaper disposal Daily washing and disinfection of toys, sinks, kitchen and bathroom floors Daily laundering of blankets, sheets, dress-up clothes Hygienic preparation, serving and clean up of food	Research team delivered training Scrub donated by Calgon Vetal Laboratorie s	Face to face training and follow-up group and individua l	Classroo ms of child day care centres in US	8 months overall 3-hour initial training session Cleaning schedules as described in What On-site follow-up training 1 week and 5 weeks later	Follow- up sessions addressed questions and local adaptatio ns to procedur es As required induction training	During interve ntion research team encour aged directo rs to address physica l barrier to hygien e practic e, such as distanc e betwee n sink and diaperi ng areas and sink access	Follow- up sessions reinforce d training Meeting with directors 5 weekly unobtrusi ve recorded observati on by training staff	Rate of compliance to barrier modification was better in younger centres and these were more likely to have written guidelines

					<p>Separate training of food handlers</p> <p>As required induction training for new staff</p> <p>On-site follow-up training reinforcing adaptations, demonstrations and discussion of hygiene techniques, responding to question and review of handouts</p> <p>Monthly meeting with centre directors to encourage leadership and support</p>						in rooms,		
McConeghy 2017	Multifaceted handwashing and surface cleaning intervention	Nursing homes (NH) and their staff	<p>Reduce exposure to pathogens and person-person transmission in high risk facility of close environment and potentially contaminated surfaces through multifaceted intervention equipping staff to protect residents from infection within the “culture” of care</p>	<p>Education and launch materials</p> <p>Online module for certified nursing assistants about: Infection prevention, product and monitoring</p> <p>‘Essential bundle’ of hygiene products supplied at no cost:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - hand sanitizer gel and foam - antiviral facial tissues - disinfecting spray - hand and face wipes <p>Plus additional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 skin cream and wipe products <p>iPads for compliance audits</p> <p>Newsletters for support during intervention</p>	<p>Pre-intervention: NH Administrators required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identify a ‘Heroes In Prevention’ champion and team - allow all staff participation in education - iPad use for staff in each floor or community - ask staff to incorporate intervention into workflow <p>Delivery of 3 components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) education (ii) cleaning products (iii) compliance audit and feedback <p>Education: Launch event for all staff to publicise program and explain roles</p> <p>Intensive training of ‘hygiene monitors’ for data collection and</p>	<p>Study personnel equipped staff with knowledge and tools and support</p> <p>NH staff, e.g. champion, hygiene monitors, nursing assistants, delivered aspects of interventions after specific training</p>	<p>Face to face interaction with staff for planning and some aspects and delivery of products</p> <p>Some aspects delivered online (e.g. nursing modules, compliance auditing)</p>	<p>Nursing homes in USA</p> <p>Onsite and at unit/team levels</p> <p>Online training</p>	<p>6 months overall: training period: 3 months</p> <p>1-hour launch event</p> <p>1 or 2 hygiene monitors / site</p> <p>1 champion / site</p> <p>1-hour online module for selected nursing assistants</p> <p>iPads for each</p>	<p>Sites could use existing comparable products from another vendor and fill in any gaps with study products</p> <p>New staff provided with education, as needed and came onboard</p> <p>Retraining of sites with low training</p>	<p>2 sites retrained due to low training participation rate</p>	<p>Cloud-based audit and feedback system via secure login to web browsers on NHs’ existing computers or via iPads included weekly product consumption to get measure: Weekly count of product units consumed x no. of hand</p>	<p>Online training participation rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >90% for 3/5 sites, 13% and 23% for 2/5 <p>Administrators demonstrated high-fidelity in reporting measures of handwashing (>80% of time)</p> <p>Handwashing rates reported in Figure 1B in paper reported as “relatively constant” and “not</p>

					<p>compliance audit and feedback tool</p> <p>Training of site champion</p> <p>Training of select group of certified nursing assistants (online module)</p> <p>Audit and feedback activities</p> <p>Ongoing support during intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - newsletter with best practices - teleconferences with each NH - 'onboarding' education of new staff 				<p>community or floor</p> <p>Weekly teleconferences initially decreased in frequency over time</p> <p>Weekly measurement of product consumption</p>	participation rates		hygiene occasions	ideal in the first few months" but improved significantly over time
Sandora 2008	Multifactorial intervention, including alcohol-based hand-sanitizer and surface disinfection	Elementary school and its students	Reduce transmission of infections in school children through improved hand hygiene and environmental disinfection	<p>1 container of disinfecting wipes (Clorox Disinfecting Wipes [The Clorox Company, Oakland, CA]; active ingredient, 0.29% quaternary ammonium chloride compound)</p> <p>Prelabeled 1.7-oz containers of alcohol-based hand sanitizer (AeroFirst non-aerosol alcohol-based foaming hand sanitizer [DEB SBS Inc, Stanley, NC, for The Clorox Company]; active ingredient, 70% ethyl alcohol)</p> <p>Receptacle in classrooms for empty containers</p>	<p>Sanitizer and wipes provided to classroom / teacher with instructions for use</p> <p>Teachers disinfected desks once daily</p> <p>Hand sanitizer to be used: before and after lunch, after use of the restroom (on return to the classroom; hand hygiene with soap and water occurred in the restroom, because sanitizers were not placed there), after any contact with potentially infectious secretions (e.g. after exposure to other ill children or shared toys that had been mouthed)</p>	<p>Research team arranged supply of materials and instructed teachers on use</p> <p>Teachers instructed in use of materials and in collecting empty containers and distributing new product</p>	<p>Products provided to schools</p> <p>Instruction provided face to face to teachers and children</p>	<p>US elementary schools and their classrooms</p>	<p>8-week period</p> <p>Desks disinfected 1/day</p>	<p>Products replenished as needed</p>	<p>None described</p>	<p>Individually labelled containers collected every 3 weeks from the classroom to assess adherence</p>	<p>Product usage: average wipes used / week: 897 (128 wipes / classroom / week)</p> <p>Average bottles of hand sanitizer used per week: 8.75 (1.25 bottles / classroom / week)</p>
White 2001	Alcohol-free	kindergarten through	Effect of alcohol-free, instant	Water-based alcohol-free hand sanitizer containing surfactants,	1-oz bottle fitted with a pump-spray top (for reproducible product	Students self-applied	Application: pump once and	One private and two	One pump (a) immediate	Not described	Not described	Product use was monitored	Minimum adequate product use

	Instant Hand Sanitizer	6th grade students	hand sanitizer as alternative to regular soap and water hand washing on illness absenteeism	allantoin, and active ingredient benzalkonium chloride (SAB). Placebo formulation consisted of solution of nonionic and amphoteric surfactant with allantoin, but without benzalkonium chloride or preservative compounds. All students attended a 22-minute assembly on proper washing technique, coughing and sneezing behaviour, viewed 4-min educational videotape, “The Sneeze: How Germs Are Spread” by Francois Chew (Aimes Multimedia, 1996)	dispensing) distributed in the classrooms. Formulations were distributed in four color-coded groups of 1-oz spritz bottles. The contents and distribution patterns were known only to the researchers and were indecipherable by the school staff or students.	the test products under the supervision of the teachers	spraying into the palm of one hand (approximately 0.25 ml). The hands were then rubbed together using proper hand washing technique : covering the palms, backs of hands, between the fingers, fingertips, and around the nails until dry.	public elementary schools in California with 20-30 students/classroom	ely upon entering the classroom, (b) before and after eating (recess and lunch), and (c) before leaving class at the end of the school day and after any child sneezed or coughed in the classroom			d by collecting and weighing individual bottles at the beginning, midpoint, and at the end of the test period.	standards was defined as at least 3 uses per day. Of the 72 initial classes involved in the study (1,626 student participants), 32 classes (16 active and 16 control; 769 student participants) were retained for analysis. The remainder not analysed because of noncompliance with minimal standards
OTHER (MISCELLANOUS) INTERVENTIONS													
Hartinger 2016	Integrated environmental home-based intervention package (IHIP)	Households and their households including children	Reduce infections and improve child growth in households in rural communities with limited facilities through a multi-	Per household: ‘OPTIMA-improved stove’: improved ventilated solid-fuel stove Kitchen sink with in-kitchen water connection providing piped water Point-of-use water-quality intervention	Community engagement with local and regional stakeholders in design and development Provision of stoves, kitchen sinks and plastic bottles for solar water treatment, and hygiene education Training of mothers/caretakers in:	Health promoters hired local elementary school teachers and implemented and promoted the interventions	Face to face and to individual households; mode of delivery of training as individual or group	Households in rural communities in Peru	Stoves and sinks installed over initial 3 months Monthly reinforcement over 12 months of SODIS,	Tailored to particular household facilities and environments as needed and to local beliefs and	Not described	Weekly spot-check observations of household hygiene and environmental health conditions (e.g. presence	SODIS use: 60% initially and 10% at end of study Self-reported use by mothers: 90% with slight decrease at end

			component low-cost environmental intervention to improve drinking water, sanitation, personal hygiene and household air quality developed in pilot (Hartinger et al. 2011; Hartinger et al. 2012) using a participatory approach that addressed local beliefs and cultural views	applying solar disinfection to drinking water	- solar drinking-water disinfection (SODIS) ¹⁸ according to standard procedures - hand hygiene (washing own and children's hands with soap at critical times ¹⁹) - advice to separate animals and their excreta from the kitchen environment Project-initiated repairs	4 teams of field staff conducted spot-check observations	not described		child and kitchen hygiene Weekly spot checks of compliance Repairs after 9 months Environmental samples test middle and end of 12-month surveillance	cultural customs Repairs to stoves as needed and checked at 9 months		of SODIS bottles on the roof or kitchen) using a checklist Monthly self-report by mothers of stove and sink use	Self-reported stove use: 90% daily Sink use: 66% daily 35% of stoves needed minor repairs, 1% needed major repairs Best-functioning stoves achieved mean 45% and 27% reduction of PM _{2.5} and CO, respectively, in mothers' personal exposure
Huda 2012	Sanitation Hygiene Education and Water Supply in Bangladesh (SHEWA-B)	Villages and their households with a child < 5 years old	Reduce illness in children < 5 years by improving hygiene practices, sanitation and water supply and treatment in their household	Materials for training of community hygiene promoters and promotion activities including flip charts and flash cards with messages alerting participants to presence of unobservable "germs" and practices to minimise germs	Engaging local residents under guidance of local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to develop community action plans addressing: Latrine coverage and usage Access to and use of arsenic-free water Improved hygiene practices, especially handwashing with soap	Community hygiene promoters (local residents with at least 10 years schooling trained for 10 days on behaviour change communication in	Face to face delivery to groups (villages and households) and individuals	Villages and households in districts of Bangladesh Community activities held in villages	18 months overall Expected household visit and courtyard meeting every 2 months	Community action plans developed for and by local residents	Not described	Structured observation of handwashing and child faeces disposal behaviour in households and spot	HW: Food-related: No significant difference from baseline to 18 months; IG vs CG After anus cleaning: 36% vs 27%

¹⁸ SODIS: https://www.sodis.ch/index_EN.html

¹⁹ after defecation, after changing diapers, before food preparation and before eating

				See Box 1 in paper for 11 key messages ²⁰	Recruitment and appointment of community hygiene promoters Household visits, courtyard meetings and social mobilization activities (e.g. water, sanitation and hygiene fairs, village theatre, group discussions in tea stalls, the social meeting point for village men) by community promoters Structured observation in households	water, sanitation and hygiene)		Meetings held in courtyards of groups of households Household visits	Handwashing opportunities: after own or child's defecation, prior to preparing and serving food, prior to eating and feeding a child			checks of type of household water and sanitation facilities	Defecation: 30% vs 23% No access to latrine decreased from 10.3% to 6.8% No significant improvement in access to improved latrines, solid waste disposal, drainage systems, and covered containers for water storage
Najnin 2019 (see also Qadri et al. 2015 for further details)	2 active interventions: A. Combined cholera-vaccine and behaviour-change-communication intervention B. cholera-vaccine-	Low-income households and compounds	Prevent or reduce transmission of respiratory illness based on the Integrated Behavioural Model for Water Sanitation and Hygiene (IBM-WASH) theoretical framework	Following hardware per compound: a. Handwashing hardware: (i) Bucket with a tap (provided free of charge) (ii) Soapy water bottle (mixture of a commercially available sachet of powdered detergent (~US\$ 0.03) with 1.5 L of water in a plastic bottle with a hole punched in the cap) supplied by participating compounds	Provision of handwashing hardware and behaviour-change-communication activities Encouragement of handwashing after defecation, after cleaning child's anus, and before preparing food Encouragement to add chlorine to own water vessels Benefits were again explained	Dushtha Shasthya Kendra (DSK), a non-governmental organization delivered the hardware and behavioural intervention (through community health promoters)	Handwashing and water treatment hardware mostly delivered at the compound level in person Behaviour-change-communication messages	Households and compounds (where several households share a common water source, kitchen, and toilets) in Bangladesh	Behaviour-change-communication messages delivered first (within 3 months of cholera vaccination) Point-of-use water hardware provided	On health promoter follow-up visits, hardware-related problems (breakage/leakage) were addressed	None described	Unannounced home visits by data collectors who observed presence of soap/soapy water and water in most convenient place for handwashing	Presence of soap / soapy water and water: Handwashing group compounds: 45% (1,729 / 3,886); Vaccine-only group compound: 22% (438 / 1,965); Control: 28% (556 / 1,991)

²⁰ 1. Wash both hands with water and soap before eating/ handling food 2. Wash both hands with water and soap/ash after defecation 3. Wash both hands with water and soap/ash after cleaning baby's bottom 4. Use hygienic latrine by all family members including Children 5. Dispose of children's faeces into hygienic latrines 6. Clean and maintain latrine 7. Construct a new latrine if the existing one is full and fill the pit with soil/ash. 8. Safe collection and storage of drinking water 9. Draw drinking water from arsenic safe water point 10. Wash raw fruits and vegetables with safe water before eating and cover food properly 11. Manage menstruation period safely

	alone group		(Dreibelbis et al. 2013; Hulland et al. 2013)	<p>(iii) Bowl to collect rinse water after washing hands (see photo in text or in Najnin 2017 https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyx187)</p> <p>b. Water treatment hardware: Dispenser containing liquid sodium hypochlorite See Figure 2 in (Najnin 2017) for photos of both https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyx187 and more details</p> <p>Participants own water vessels for water treatment</p> <p>Print materials for behaviour change to compounds and households</p>	<p>Follow-up visits by health promoters</p> <p>In addition to provision of cholera-vaccine also provided to cholera vaccine only-group (2 doses at least 14 days apart)</p>	Separate data collectors observed soap availability	were delivered both at compound and household levels		3 months later			<p>(either reserved in a container or available at the tap)</p> <p>Residual chlorine was measured indicating uptake of chlorine dispenser</p>	Residual chlorine present in stored drinking water of 4% (160/3886) of households in the vaccine-plus behaviour-change area and none in the other two areas
Satomura 2005	Gargling	Subjectively healthy individuals, both genders aged 18 to 65 years	Some evidence suggest that frequent gargling with diluted povidone-iodine would reduce the incidence of URTI or influenza and the absenteeism from schools	<p>Gargling with diluted 7% povidone-iodine</p> <p>Gargling with water control</p>	Gargling with povidone-iodine or water. Diary to document frequency of everyday gargling and handwashing.	local administrators composed of Eighteen healthcare professionals	Instructions to gargle with povidone-iodine or water. No change in hand-washing routine, not to change other hygienic and not to take any cold remedies during	community healthcare settings in Japan	GI: gargle with 20 mL of 15 to 30 times three times consecutively and repeat at least 3 times per day. GW: 20 mL of water for 15-sec in the same	Not described	If povidone-iodine caused serious discomfort or was not available subjects were allowed to gargle with water	Local administrators monitored participants' hygienic actions and health condition and encouraged them to keep up their assigned intervention	Participants were generally compliant with their group assignment. Each person gargled with water 3.6, 0.8, and 0.9 times per day in the water gargling, povidone-iodine gargling, and control group,

			or workplaces				the intervention		way above		instead of diluted povidone-iodine	on every week.	respectively (p<0.001), and gargled with povidone-iodine <0.1, 2.9, and 0.2 times per day in each respective group (p<0.001). None of the two gargling groups skipped gargling, while 36 (28%) among the control subjects did not gargle at all.
VIRUCIDAL TISSUES													
Farr 1988 trial 1	2 active interventions in addition to control of no tissues: A. Virucidal nasal tissues B. placebo tissues	Families	Reduce transmission of viruses from hand contamination via hand-to-hand contact or large-particle aerosol through tissues for nose blowing and coughs and sneezes	3-ply tissues with: A. 5.1 mg/inch ² (2.54 cm) ² of the virucidal mixture (58.8% citric acid, 29.4% malic acid, 11.8% sodium lauryl sulphate) B. 3 mg/inch ² (2.54 cm) ² of saccharin uniformly applied uniformly to all 3 plies of the tissue Tissues prepared by Kimberley Clark Corporation, Neenah, Wisconsin	Family visits to distribute tissues Weekly contact of mother Families instructed to use only supplied tissues	Nurse epidemiologist visited families	Face to face visits to families and individuals in families (especially mothers)	Communities in US	6 months overall Monthly family visits Weekly contact with mother	Not described	Not described	Family visits and weekly contact with mother to encourage compliance	Not described
Farr 1988 trial 2	2 active interventions no control	Families	Reduce transmission of viruses from hand contamination	2 two-ply tissues containing: A. 4.0 mg/inch ² (2.54 cm) ² of antiviral mixture (53.3% citric	Family visits to distribute tissues and encourage compliance	Nurse epidemiologist visited families monthly	Face to face visits to families and	Communities in US	6 months overall	None described	None described	Bimonthly study monitor visits to encourage	In 124/222 families, one or more family members

	Virucidal nasal tissues B. placebo tissues		on via hand-to-hand contact or large-particle aerosol through tissues for nose blowing and coughs and sneezes	acid, 26.7% malic acid, 20 % sodium lauryl sulphate) B. 3 mg/inch ² (2.54 cm) ² of succinic acid, malic acid, sodium hydroxide, and polyethylene glycol Tissues prepared by Kimberley Clark Corporation, Neenah, Wisconsin	Weekly contact of mother Families instructed to use only supplied tissues	Study monitor visited bimonthly	individuals in families (especially mothers)		Monthly family visits Weekly contact with mother Bimonthly study monitor visit			compliance as well as monthly and weekly contact by nurse	reported not using the tissues regularly and/or reported having side effects from the tissues
Longini 1988	2 active interventions (no control) A. Virucidal nasal tissues B. Placebo tissues	Households and their families	Prevent intrafamilial transmission of viral agents in a community setting	Treated tissues of 3-ply material identified with no specific identifiers (Kimberly-Clark Corporation) with inside layer containing: A. citric and malic acid plus sodium lauryl sulphate B. succinic acid	Tissues delivered to households with specific instructions on use (all purposes, when blowing nose, coughing or sneezing) and to discard after use and to help young children use tissues if develop a cold	Tissues assigned by study sponsor (Kimberly-Clark Corporation)	Supply of tissues throughout 5-month trial period	Households in USA	5 months overall supply	Resupply of tissues as required	None described	Reported use of tissues “not at all, some of the time, most of the time, or all of the time”	Reported use: “all of the time”: A. vs B. 82% vs 71%

Colour codes: Hand hygiene only (yellow), Both hand and masks (orange), Hand hygiene + surface / materials disinfection (green), Other / Complex (blue) and Virucidal tissues (grey)

Additional references

- Chard AN, Freeman MC. Design, intervention fidelity, and behavioral outcomes of a school-based water, sanitation, and hygiene cluster-randomized trial in Laos. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(4):570.
- Claessen J-P, Bates S, Sherlock K, Seeparsand F, Wright R. Designing interventions to improve tooth brushing. *Int Dent J*. 2008;58(S5):307–20.
- Curtis V, Biran A. Dirt, disgust, and disease: Is hygiene in our genes? *Perspect Biol Med*. 2001;44(1):17-31.
- Dreibelbis R, Winch PJ, Leontsini E, Hulland KR, Ram PK, Unicomb L, et al. The integrated behavioural model for water, sanitation, and hygiene: a systematic review of behavioural models and a framework for designing and evaluating behaviour change interventions in infrastructure restricted settings. *BMC Public Health* 2013;13:1015.
- Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Dutch National Centre for Hygiene and Safety (LCHV). Health risks in a child daycare centre or preschool (0 to 4 year olds) [in Dutch]. Bilthoven: The Institute; 2011 July.
- Ellis M. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus Aureus* (MRSA) Skin and Soft Tissue Infection (SSTI) Prevention in Military Trainees. 2010:NCT01105767. Available from: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT01105767>.
- Erasmus V, Huis A, Oenema A, Van Empelen P, Boog MC, Van Beeck EH, et al. The ACCOMPLISH study. A cluster randomised trial on the cost-effectiveness of a multicomponent intervention to improve hand hygiene compliance and reduce healthcare associated infections. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2011;11:721. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-11-721>
- Glanz K, Rimer BK, Viswanath K, editors. *Health behavior and health education: theory, research, and practice*. 4th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2008.
- 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;32(6):864–73.
- Hartinger SM, Lanata CF, Gil AI, Hattendorf J, Verastegui H, Mäusezahl D. Combining interventions: Improved chimney stoves, kitchen sinks and solar disinfection of drinking water and kitchen clothes to improve home hygiene in rural Peru. *F Actions Sci Rep*. 2012;6(1 SPL). Available from: <http://factsreports.revues.org/1627>
- Hulland KRS, Leontsini E, Dreibelbis R, Unicomb L, Afroz A, Dutta NC, et al. Designing a handwashing station for infrastructure-restricted communities in Bangladesh using the integrated behavioural model for water, sanitation and hygiene interventions (IBM-WASH). *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13(1):877.

Huis A, Schoonhoven L, Grol R, Donders R, Hulscher M, van Achterberg T. Impact of a team and leaders-directed strategy to improve nurses' adherence to hand hygiene guidelines: A cluster randomised trial. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2013;50:464-474.

Kaewchana S, Simmerman M, Somrongthong R, Suntarattiwong P, Lertmaharit S, Chotipitayusunondh T. Effect of intensive hand washing education on hand washing behaviors in Thai households with an influenza-positive child in urban Thailand. *Asia-Pacific J Public Heal*. 2012;24(4):577-85.

Kendrick AS. Training to ensure healthy child day care programs. *Pediatrics*. 1994;94(6 II):1108-110.

Kirscht JP. The Health Belief Model and illness behavior. *Heal Educ Behav*. 1974;2(4):387-408.

Luby SP, Agboatwalla M, Painter J, Altaf A, Billhimer WL, Hoekstra RM. Effect of intensive handwashing promotion on childhood diarrhea in high-risk communities in Pakistan: A randomized controlled trial. *J Am Med Assoc*. 2004;291(21):2547-54.

McKenzie JE, Priest P, Audas R, Poore MR, Brunton CR, Reeves LM. Hand sanitisers for reducing illness absences in primary school children in New Zealand: A cluster randomised controlled trial study protocol. *Trials*. 2010;11:7.

Najnin N, Leder K, Qadri F, Forbes A, Unicomb L, Winch PJ, et al. Impact of adding hand-washing and water disinfection promotion to oral cholera vaccination on diarrhoea-associated hospitalization in Dhaka, Bangladesh: Evidence from a cluster randomized control trial. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46(6):2056-66.

Perkins HW. The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: A handbook for educators, counselors, and clinicians. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2003.

Qadri F, Ali M, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Saha A, Khan IA, et al. Feasibility and effectiveness of oral cholera vaccine in an urban endemic setting in Bangladesh: A cluster randomised open-label trial. *Lancet*. 2015;386(10001):1362-71.

Savolainen-Kopra C, Haapakoski J, Peltola PA, Ziegler T, Korpela T, Anttila P, et al. STOPFLU: Is it possible to reduce the number of days off in office work by improved hand-hygiene? *Trials*. 2010;11:69.

Sidibe M, Shukla N, Rustagi A et al. Inducing the habit of soap usage in an urban community setting. *Proceedings of the 3rd WHO International Conference on Children's Health and the Environment*; Busan, Korea; 2009.

Suess T, Remschmidt C, Schink S, Luchtenberg M, Haas W, Krause G, et al. Facemasks and intensified hand hygiene in a German household trial during the 2009/2010 influenza A(H1N1) pandemic: adherence and tolerability in children and adults. *Epidemiol Infect* 2011;139(12):1895-1901.

World Health Organization (WHO). WHO guidelines on hand hygiene in health care (advanced draft). Geneva: WHO; 2006.

Zomer TP, Erasmus V, Van Beeck EF, Tjon-A-Tsien A, Richardus JH, Voeten HACM. Hand hygiene compliance and environmental determinants in child day care centers: An observational study. *Am J Infect Control*. 2013;41(6):497-502.

Zomer TP, Erasmus V, Van Empelen P, Looman C, Van Beeck EF, Tjon-A-Tsien A, et al. Sociocognitive determinants of observed and self-reported compliance to hand hygiene guidelines in child day care centers. *Am J Infect Control*. 2013;41(10):862-7.

Figure 1: PRISMA Flow Diagram.

Figure 2: Meta-analysis of all trials comparing Hand hygiene vs control: effect on: (a) acute respiratory illness, influenza-like illness and laboratory-confirmed influenza and (b) absenteeism.

Viral illness

*Note: To avoid double-counting of events in combining studies, for each study we used its broadest endpoint (in the order acute respiratory illness, influenza-like illness, influenza).

(b) Absenteeism (school or work)

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

Figure 3

(a): Meta-analysis of trials comparing hand hygiene + masks vs control for influenza-like illness and laboratory-confirmed Influenza.

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

(b): Meta-analysis of trials comparing hand hygiene + masks vs hand hygiene for influenza-like illness and laboratory-confirmed Influenza.

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

Figure 4: Summary of Risk of Bias (RoB) in the Included Studies.