

Factors affecting healthcare workers' compliance with social and behavioural infection control measures during emerging infectious disease outbreaks: Rapid evidence review.

Dr Samantha K. Brooks PhD¹, Professor Neil Greenberg FRCPsych¹, Professor Sir Simon Wessely FMedSci¹, Dr G. James Rubin PhD¹

¹King's College London, Department of Psychological Medicine, Cutcombe Road, London SE5 9RJ, United Kingdom

Contact details:

Samantha.k.brooks@kcl.ac.uk, neil.greenberg@kcl.ac.uk, simon.wessely@kcl.ac.uk,

Corresponding author: Dr G. James Rubin, King's College London, Department of Psychological Medicine, Cutcombe Road, London SE5 9RJ, United Kingdom. Email: gideon.rubin@kcl.ac.uk

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets supporting the conclusions of this article are included within the manuscript and its additional files.

Competing interests

None reported.

Funding

The research was funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's College London in partnership with Public Health England (PHE), in collaboration with the University of East Anglia. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily

those of the NHS, the NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care, or Public Health England.

Authors' contributions

SKB carried out the searches, screening, data extraction and data analysis; any queries were discussed with GJR, NG and SW. SKB wrote the first draft of the manuscript. SW, NG and GJR contributed significantly to editing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Abstract

The 2019-2020 outbreak of novel coronavirus has raised concerns about nosocomial transmission; that is, transmission within healthcare settings. Research from previous outbreaks of emerging infectious diseases suggests a major cause of nosocomial transmission is healthcare professionals' poor compliance with recommended personal protective behaviours. This rapid evidence review explored existing literature on emerging infectious disease outbreaks to identify factors associated with compliance with social and behavioural infection control measures among healthcare staff. 56 papers were reviewed and several positive associations were found: Staff working in emergency or intensive care settings appeared more likely to comply with recommendations than those in other settings, and there was some evidence that contact with confirmed cases could improve compliance. There was some evidence that staff with higher levels of anxiety and higher concern about the risk of infection were more likely to comply with recommended behaviour, and that monitoring from superiors could improve compliance. Several negative associations were also found. Observed non-compliance of colleagues could hinder compliance. Staff identified many barriers to compliance related to personal protective equipment, including availability; perceived difficulty and effectiveness; inconvenience; discomfort; and a negative impact on patient care. There appeared to be many issues regarding the communication and ease of understanding of infection control guidance. Based on the results of this review we recommend provision of training and education tailored for different occupational roles within the healthcare setting; managerial staff 'leading by example'; ensuring adequate resources for infection control; and timely provision of practical evidence-based infection control guidelines.

Keywords: Compliance, coronavirus, COVID-19, emerging infectious diseases, healthcare workers, protective behaviour

Background

Recent years have seen frequent outbreaks of emerging infectious diseases [1]. Examples include severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in 2003, avian influenza (H5N1) in 2004, swine flu (H1N1) in 2009, Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) in 2015 and most recently coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 originating in 2019. Previous outbreaks saw high levels of nosocomial transmission (hospital-acquired infections) [2].

A major cause of nosocomial transmission is poor compliance with personal protective behaviours among healthcare staff [3,4]. Early reports from the COVID-19 frontline have noted poor compliance of healthcare workers with recommended behaviours: in one hospital in China, many had their masks hung from one ear or pulled downwards, while more than half had inadequate hand hygiene [5].

Compliance with infection control behaviours can be difficult. Previous literature has reported on difficulties in the general population with adhering to protective behaviours such as facemask-wearing [6], using hand sanitising gel [7] and quarantine [8] during infectious disease outbreaks. The main facilitators of compliance in the general population appear to be perceived susceptibility, perceived severity of being afflicted and perceived benefits of compliance as well as accurate knowledge about the disease and the recommended behaviours, while major barriers include discomfort, embarrassment and practical issues [6,8]. A review [9] of healthcare workers' perceptions of barriers and facilitators to compliance with guidelines during respiratory outbreaks suggested that protective practices are influenced by understanding of guidelines, support received from managers, communication about guidelines, sufficient resources, perceived value of following guidance, comfort of personal protective equipment (PPE), perceived impact of PPE on patients, and workplace culture. However, this review focused only on qualitative literature, the majority of which related to tuberculosis.

We systematically reviewed existing literature on compliance with social and behavioural protective behaviours among staff involved in healthcare, specifically during outbreaks of emerging infectious diseases and encompassing quantitative and qualitative research.

Method

This rapid evidence review was carried out according to World Health Organization guidelines [10]: the basic principles of a systematic literature review were followed, with certain aspects simplified in order to produce evidence rapidly at a time when urgent evidence synthesis is required. Searching of grey literature and quality appraisal of included studies were not carried out.

Search strategy

The search strategy consisted of four search strings (adherence terms; protective behaviour terms; emerging infectious disease terms; and healthcare worker terms). The full search strategy can be seen in Appendix I. Five databases were searched from date of inception to May 4th, 2020: MEDLINE®, PsycINFO®, Embase, Global Health, and Web of Science.

Selection criteria

To be included, studies had to: i) contain primary data; ii) be published in peer-reviewed journals in English; iii) include participants who worked in healthcare; iv) include data on factors predicting adherence to social or behavioural infection control practices during emerging infectious disease pandemics. For the latter criterion, quantitative data needed to report statistics on factors associated with compliance, while the qualitative component of the review considered studies reporting on participants' beliefs about facilitators and barriers to compliance as well as any reported difficulties in complying with protective behaviours.

Screening

One author (SKB) ran the searches on all databases on May 4th, 2020. Resulting citations were downloaded to EndNote© version X9 (Thomson Reuters, New York, USA). The same author evaluated titles for relevance, then used the inclusion criteria to screen abstracts and then full texts of remaining citations and exclude any which were irrelevant. Reference lists of all remaining papers were hand-searched for additional relevant studies.

Data extraction and synthesis

SKB extracted the following data from papers: authors, publication year, country of study, design, participants (including n , demographic information and profession), disease outbreak, protective behaviours measured, measures used, and key results. We used thematic analysis [11] to synthesise the data and group results into themes.

Results

The initial search strategy yielded 1900 papers, of which 744 duplicates were removed and 1090 were excluded based on title or abstract. An additional twelve papers were found via hand-searching the reference lists of included papers. After full-text screening, 56 papers remained for inclusion. A PRISMA flow diagram of the process can be seen in Appendix II.

Countries represented in the literature included Canada (n=13), Saudi Arabia (n=7), Singapore (n=7), China (n=5), South Korea (n=5), USA (n=5), Netherlands (n=2), Australia (n=1), Greece (n=1), India (n=1), Iran (n=1), Taiwan (n=1), Turkey (n=1), UK (n=1) and Vietnam (n=1). A further five papers included participants from multiple countries. Papers discussed H1N1 (n=22), SARS (n=20), MERS (n=11), avian influenza (n=2) and COVID-19 (n=2). The participants represented in the literature were from a wide range of roles and departments in the healthcare profession, and a wide range of protective behaviours were considered. A full overview of study characteristics is presented in Supplementary Table I.

Eight main themes were identified. These were socio-demographics and personal characteristics; occupational role; training and knowledge; work-related factors; personal protective behaviour-related factors; guidance; distress and risk perception; and attitudes and behaviours of others. A number of other potential predictors of compliance were considered but only appeared in one paper each; these are presented in Supplementary Tables I and III but not covered in the text. Supplementary Table II provides a summary of themes and sub-themes and identifies for each theme which papers showed a significant association with protective behaviours, which papers found no significant association, and which papers supplemented these findings by reporting on the theme but without statistical analysis (e.g. qualitative papers and papers with descriptive statistics only). Supplementary Table III summarises the evidence extracted from the literature for each theme.

Socio-demographics and personal characteristics

Overall, there appeared to be no significant association between age [12,13,14,15,16,17,18] or gender [12,13,14,17,19,20,21] and protective behaviour. Only one study [20] found that older age was significantly associated with protective behaviours, while two found that female staff were significantly more likely to comply with protective behaviours [16,22].

One study examined nationality as a predictor [12] and found that Saudi staff were significantly more likely to comply with protective behaviours than non-Saudi staff working in the same city. Mixed findings were reported in the studies comparing behaviours across countries. Staff in Hong Kong and Singapore were more likely to comply than UK staff [23], whereas staff in Singapore vs Indonesia [24] or Hong Kong vs Canada [25] were more likely to comply with some recommendations but not others (see Supplementary Table III for details). Particular attention should be given to a worldwide study [26] that found no significant differences between countries in terms of taking protective measures.

There was no evidence of association between compliance and religion [20] or marital status [18,19]. One paper found that staff in ‘high or middle’ socioeconomic status were more likely to comply than those of lower socioeconomic status [22], and one found a significant association between compliance and qualification [12] (see Table III for details); these were offset by four studies finding that level of education was not associated with compliance [13,18,20,21]. One study found that H1N1 influenza vaccination was significantly associated with high compliance [27]. Having a chronic illness, being pregnant, or having a pregnant spouse, elderly person or school-aged child at home were not associated with compliance, but staff with babies at home were more likely to comply with protective behaviours [19].

Occupational role

Many studies which examined role as a predictor of compliance found a significant relationship [12,19,23,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36]; however, due to the variety of different roles compared across studies, it was not possible to identify a consistent pattern (see Supplementary Table III for details). Five studies found no significant association between role and compliance [13,16,17,37,38].

Length of time in role was not significantly associated with compliance in five studies [12,16,17,18,30], while two studies suggested that longer experience of working in healthcare was associated with greater compliance [31,33] and one suggested that less than ten years’ experience was associated with significantly higher compliance than more experience [36].

Training and knowledge

There was mixed evidence on the effectiveness of outbreak-specific training and education: one study [21] found no significant association between protective behaviours and having received education; another [17] found a non-significant increase in protective practices post-training; and a third [30] found that recent infection control training was a significant predictor of compliance with recommended behaviours. Jeong et al. [22] found that staff who sought information about the outbreak and infection control were more likely to comply with recommended behaviours. Qualitative evidence suggested that staff felt their prior training and education were not useful in dealing with the rapidly-changing nature of emerging infectious disease outbreaks [39,40]. Participants believed that inadequate training was a barrier to compliance [28] and that infection control training with annual refresher courses would benefit them [41].

Sources of knowledge about the outbreak and protective behaviours were not associated with protective behaviours in two studies [20,21] while knowledge from textbooks and attending Continuing Medical Education activities were significantly associated with higher levels of protective practice in one study [12]. Kim and Choi [20] found that receiving outbreak-specific training was not significantly associated with compliance, but higher outbreak-related knowledge did result in significantly higher compliance. Another study examining knowledge of the outbreak itself [28] found the majority of participants believed lack of knowledge about mode of transmission contributed to poor compliance. Knowledge of current recommendations was associated with compliance in three studies [4,16,27], associated with compliance in one hospital but not three other hospitals in another study [14] and was not associated with compliance in one further study [12]. Hsu et al. [42] found that a minority of participants believed that lack of education explained lack of compliance.

Work-related factors

Unsurprisingly, compliance was better in higher acuity settings such as emergency, intensive care or inpatient departments [14,35,38,43,44]. Wong et al. [45] found that staff in high-infection districts were more likely to wear gowns, wash hands and use disinfectants but less likely to comply with quarantine measures. But even then, two studies found no significant association between setting and compliance [19,21].

Having contact with confirmed cases was associated with higher compliance in four studies [14,18,35,43] whereas one study found no association [19]. Wong et al. [45] found that

SARS-exposed staff were more likely than non-SARS-exposed staff to comply with mask guidance, but less likely to quarantine themselves.

There was reasonably consistent evidence that high workload may be a barrier to compliance with recommended personal protective behaviours [23,30,35,39,41,46], with only one study reporting the opposite – namely higher workload (in terms of working overtime) was associated with increased compliance in terms of giving patients appropriate infection control advice [36].

Two studies suggested that monitoring of compliance by superiors or public health authorities encouraged compliance [27,47], while a small minority of participants in Hsu et al.'s [42] study reported that better policing by infection control staff was the most important strategy for improving compliance.

Two studies suggested compliance was associated with characteristics of the patient encounter. Many of De Perio et al.'s [14] participants reported not using recommended PPE if they did not know the patient had H1N1 or an influenza-like illness, if they did not think it was needed for the particular activity they were doing, if they only entered the patient's room for a brief time, if they did not touch the patient or if they did not come within six feet of the patient. Meanwhile, Shigayeva et al.'s [35] participants were less likely to comply with recommended behaviours when providing care for patients with more severe illness (which the authors suggest may be due to the time required to don barrier equipment leading staff to put patient safety above self-protection) and if they were only observing procedures, rather than performing or assisting with them.

Personal protective behaviour-related factors

Many studies, although mostly without statistical analysis, reported issues in performing personal protective behaviours, most notably due to lack of availability of appropriate PPE, perceived difficulty of protective behaviours, logistic issues, perceived effectiveness, perceived importance, convenience, comfort, and the impact on patient care.

Concerns about lack of PPE, largely due to insufficient resources, were very common [14,39,40,41,42,48,49,50,51,52,53]. Shortage of PPE created difficulties such as having to wear the wrong size PPE [40,41,51]. One study showed that availability of PPE was

significantly associated with higher compliance [27], while another found that staff were significantly more compliant with PPE use when eyewear and gloves were readily available at the point of care, but availability did not increase compliance of N95 respirators, surgical masks or gowns [33]. Logistic issues were also reported, such as lack of space in the hospital, making it difficult to use PPE appropriately [51,54,55].

There may also be issues regarding the perceived difficulty of protective behaviours. Kang et al.'s [54] participants reported difficulties with the complexity of using several PPE items together, and only 35% of Van Dijk et al.'s [53] participants thought the recommended measures were feasible.

Perceived PPE effectiveness significantly predicted higher compliance in three studies [27,33,34]. In one qualitative study, staff expressed doubts about the quality and effectiveness of PPE [54]. Beliefs in the effectiveness of infection control procedures, as modified by previous experiences, were identified by participants as having a positive impact on compliance [46].

Hsu et al. [42] reported that failure to recognise the importance of hand hygiene prevented compliance, while Vinck et al. [36] found that the main reason for not complying with the recommendation to consult with a specialist unit for centralised assessment of symptomatic patients was associated with finding it 'unnecessary'.

Many qualitative study participants reported not using PPE due to perceived inconvenience and its effect on their ability to do their job [14,27,39,40,41,42,54,56,57] – in particular, it appeared that participants found it too time-consuming to change in and out of protective clothing as it slowed them down substantially.

Many of Khalid et al.'s [49] participants reported that having to use PPE was 'stressful'. Many qualitative studies found that discomfort of PPE was a barrier to compliance [39,40,41,46,52,56,57,58]. In several studies, participants reported discomfort and/or symptom due to PPE, including dehydration and skin peeling [41], difficulty breathing [40,52,58,59], sweating and dizziness [58], headaches [40,52,60] and skin rashes [40,52]. Comfort of PPE was a predictor of compliance in one quantitative study [33], with staff who reported always or often feeling comfortable wearing protective eyewear and N95 respirators

significantly more likely to wear them; however, no significant association was found in compliance between staff who reported always or often feeling short of breath, claustrophobic or dizzy when wearing protective eyewear or N95 respirators and those who rarely experienced these symptoms.

Qualitative data confirmed that many healthcare professionals believe that PPE use has an impact on patient care, making it difficult to communicate with patients due to muffled speech [40,41,52,56,57,59], being unable to establish non-verbal cues with patients [60] and making them less ‘visible’ to their patients [61]. Masks were reported as being frightening to psychiatric patients [52], whilst PPE created anxiety in some patients who assumed the staff were wearing it because they had been exposed to the virus already [40]. One quantitative study found that the perception that PPE use would interfere with patient care was significantly associated with poor compliance [27].

Guidance

Many study participants reported a lack of guidance on the protocols for caring for infected patients and protecting themselves [28,30,39,40,41,46,50,51,53,54,55,56,58,61,62,63,64,65]. There was a consistent message about inadequate guidelines. These were often too long, providing staff with ‘information overload’ [30,50,63]. The recommended protocols changed too frequently for staff to keep up [39,41,54,55,58,56,61,63,64] and staff received conflicting messages from different sources [39,41,50,51,62,63,64]. Other issues included inconsistent advice about what to do when patients are deemed non-infectious [41], difficulty working out what should be prioritised [50] and external guidance with little relevance to specific locations [39]. The manner of communication of guidance also created problems. New guidelines were sent to them by email, which they did not check before work [39]; information was filtered down from other sources rather than given to them first-hand was frustrating [64]; and finally communication about changes to protocols was too slow [63].

Distress and risk perception

High levels of distress were associated with higher compliance in two studies: Chia et al. [43] found that higher distress was associated with higher use of respiratory protection while Wong et al. [45] found that staff who were highly anxious were more likely to comply with recommended protective behaviours. However, when the protective measure involved

quarantine, some staff felt such high stress that it tempted them to break guidelines, although it is unclear if any actually did [47].

Risk perception was consistently associated with compliance. Four studies found that compliance was significantly more likely in staff who perceived the disease to be a serious risk [20,22,34,66] and another found that perceived seriousness of the outbreak was significantly associated with compliance in Hong Kong but not in Singapore or the UK [23]. Three qualitative papers also suggested that participants themselves believed staff complied with recommended behaviours when they perceived the risk to be severe [39,47,51]. However, one study [21] showed a significant negative correlation between protective behaviours and fear of infection.

Attitudes and behaviours of others

Qualitative data confirmed that many participants had observed non-compliance in colleagues or managers [27,39], which could lead to non-compliance in the participants themselves [30,42]. DiGiovanni et al.'s [47] participants suggested that managers had modified the recommended quarantine guidelines to allow their staff to return to duty in response to critical staff shortages. Yassi et al.'s [46] participants believed that compliance of other occupational groups within the healthcare setting had an impact on compliance, while more than half of Hsu et al.'s [42] participants believed that senior staff 'leading by example' and complying with recommended behaviours was the single most important strategy in improving staff compliance.

Attitudes of family members were also deemed important in two qualitative studies [39,46] with healthcare staff reporting they were encouraged to comply by anxious family members who were afraid of getting infected.

Discussion

Overall the studies reviewed provided mixed and sometimes contradictory results. Nonetheless, some risk factors stood out as being promising either for identifying specific groups at-risk for poor compliance or for targeting in interventions. These included: working outside of emergency or intensive care settings; not working with confirmed infection cases; lack of concern about risk of infection; lack of monitoring by superiors; observed non-

compliance of colleagues; lack of PPE; perceived difficulty using PPE; perceived lack of effectiveness or lack of importance of PPE; perceived inconvenience and discomfort of PPE; perceived negative impact of PPE on patient care; lack of infection control guidance; and inconsistent or unclear guidance. Organisations faced with nosocomial transmission would be wise, as part of their mitigation efforts, to look to these areas in an effort to help staff adhere to protective behaviours.

There was little evidence for an association between compliance with protective behaviours and socio-demographic or personal characteristics. There was inconsistent evidence that compliance levels differ across countries: it is not clear whether this is due to between-country differences in the communication of guidance, different risk perceptions due to different countries' media coverage of the outbreak, different levels of training received, or possible cultural differences in the participants themselves.

This review suggests that compliance may differ between different roles and different settings. Targeted interventions for specific occupational groups with different levels of patient contact, hierarchies and cultures, may be helpful. Whilst it was unclear which occupational groups might need more attention, it seems that those not in emergency departments or intensive care units and not working directly with infected patients could benefit from additional focus.

We found little evidence that training and education significantly improved compliance. This initially seems surprising as previous trials of training courses to improve knowledge of infection control practices and encourage compliance with them have suggested positive results [67,68,69]. However, taken together with the evidence that compliance differs between occupational groups, it may be that staff in different roles require different levels and methods of training. We also found mixed evidence of the impact of knowledge about infection control on compliance with the recommended measures: this may be associated with what is actually covered in training, or even that wanting more knowledge/training was the driver behind better compliance, and not simply the knowledge itself. In addition, because the perceived importance of PPE was also related to compliance, it may be that training that covers the 'why' rather than the 'how' of PPE is particularly useful. Overall, though, training itself is no panacea. Many of the factors identified by our review, and discussed below, are not amenable to better training.

A small amount of evidence suggested that observed non-compliance by others – including colleagues - could affect healthcare workers’ own levels of compliance. This is likely to be particularly problematic where managers and supervisors fail to ‘lead by example’ and ensure that they comply with the recommended policies and procedures. ‘Role modelling’ by superiors could be useful, with supervisors setting the standards for infection control practices and reinforcing them.

The availability, ease of use, perceived effectiveness, convenience, comfort, and impact on patients of PPE may be other key modifiable factors. This review highlights the frequency of negative experiences of PPE, with participants reporting lack of appropriate resources, the inconvenience of having to change in and out of PPE repeatedly, physical discomfort, and a negative impact on their ability to communicate with patients. It is useful to know about these concerns about PPE as this can be a target to change.

Reviewed studies suggest difficulties understanding and keeping up with rapidly changing recommendations. This may be unavoidable during an outbreak of an emerging infectious disease, as new evidence becomes available. Staff should therefore be prepared for the likelihood of changes in advance, both to help maintain trust and to ensure that they monitor for updates. This is particularly important if it is proposed to reduce the measures - the belief, whether rightly or wrongly, that recommended procedures have been downgraded not because of better evidence, but in order to coerce people back to duty, should be directly addressed and not ignored.

There was some evidence that higher levels of anxiety and risk perception were associated with higher compliance. This may suggest that, whilst it is important not to create unhealthy anxiety, desensitisation to risk or genuine reductions in risk may lead to a reduction in PPE use. Indeed, away from pandemics, staff in industrial settings experience complacency in terms of protective behaviours, as a result of habituation (repeated exposures which do not result in anything bad, lessening fearful responding) and low levels of positive reinforcement for safe behaviour [70]. Particular care may be needed to maintain PPE use as risk changes, or is perceived to change, over the course of an outbreak.

Limitations

We are aware that many papers (particularly on SARS and MERS) have been published in other (predominantly Asian) languages, but due to the rapid nature of this review we limited inclusion to English-language papers only. Future reviews should consider translating and analysing the many relevant foreign-language papers. Also due to the rapid nature of the review, quality appraisal of individual papers was not carried out as this is not always deemed necessary when urgent evidence synthesis is required [71].

Conclusions

Overall this review identified many potential facilitators and barriers to adhering with recommended personal protective behaviours. Although much of the evidence was inconsistent, some recommendations can be made. Interventions that may be helpful for improving healthcare workers' compliance include role-specific or setting-specific training; emphasising the importance of protective behaviours and the risk of infection if behaviours are not performed; monitoring of staff behaviours by supervisors and positive reinforcement for correct behaviours; managerial staff leading by example; training focused on the importance and effectiveness of PPE; and better communication of clear, and most probably concise, guidelines. We also suggest that the following interventions would likely *not* be useful: training aimed at specific age or gender groups; training focused on increasing knowledge about the outbreak itself; or training on how to use PPE without also emphasising *why* it is necessary.

List of abbreviations

COVID-19 – coronavirus disease 2019

MERS – Middle East respiratory syndrome

PPE – personal protective equipment

SARS – severe acute respiratory syndrome

SARS-CoV-2 – severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

SKB – lead author

UK – United Kingdom

USA – United States of America

References

1. World Health Organization, Regional Office for South-East Asia. (2014). A brief guide to emerging infectious diseases and zoonoses. WHO Regional Office for South-East Asia. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/204722>. Cited 9 May 2020.
2. Feng D, de Vlas SJ, Fang L-Q, Han X-N, Zhao W-J, Sheng S, et al. The SARS epidemic in mainland China: bringing together all epidemiological data. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2009;14(Suppl 1):4-13.
3. Gamage B, Moore D, Copes R, Yassi A, Bryce E, members of The BC Interdisciplinary Respiratory Protection Study Group Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Protecting health care workers from SARS and other respiratory pathogens: A review of the infection control literature. *Am J Infect Control*. 2005;33(2):114-21.
4. Yap J, Lee VJ, Yau TY, Ng TP, Tor PC. Knowledge, attitudes and practices towards pandemic influenza among cases, close contacts, and healthcare workers in tropical Singapore: a cross-sectional survey. *BMC Public Health*. 2010;10:442.
5. Xu C, Jin J, Song J, Yang Y, Yao M, Zhang Y, et al. (2020). Application of refined management in prevention and control of the coronavirus disease 2019 epidemic in non-isolated areas of a general hospital. *Int J Nurs Sci*. 2020;<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2020.04.003>
6. Sim SW, Moey KSP, Tan NC. The use of facemasks to prevent respiratory infection: a literature review in the context of the Health Belief Model. *Singapore Med J*. 2014;55(3):160-7.
7. Rubin GJ, Potts HWW, Michie S. The impact of communications about swine flu (influenza A H1N1v) on public responses to the outbreak: results from 36 national telephone surveys in the UK. *Health Technol Assess*. 2010;14(34):183-266.
8. Webster RK, Brooks SK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Rubin GJ. How to improve adherence with quarantine: rapid review of the evidence. *Public Health*. 2020;182:163-9.

9. Houghton C, Meskell P, Delaney H, Smalle M, Glenton C, Booth A, et al. Barriers and facilitators to healthcare workers' adherence with infection prevention and control (IPC) guidelines for respiratory infectious diseases: a rapid qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2020;4.
10. World Health Organization. (2017). Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: a practical guide. Available from: <https://www.who.int/alliance-hpsr/resources/publications/rapid-review-guide/en/>. Cited 4 May 2020.
11. Braun V, Clarke V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol* 2006;3(2):77-101.
12. Al-Amri S, Bharti R, Alsaleem SA, Al-Musa HM, Chaudhary S, Al-Shaikh AA. Knowledge and practices of primary health care physicians regarding updated guidelines of MERS-CoV infection in Abha city. *J Family Med Prim Care.* 2019;8(2):455-61.
13. Datta SS, Kuppuraman D, Boratne AV, Abraham SB, Singh Z. Knowledge, attitude and practices regarding swine flu among para-medical workers in a tertiary care hospital in Pondicherry. *J Commun Dis.* 2011;43(1):1-9.
14. de Perio MA, Brueck SE, Mueller CA, Milne CK, Rubin MA, Gundlapalli AV, et al. Evaluation of 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1) exposures and illness among physicians in training. *Am J Infect Control.* 2012;40(7):617-21.
15. Manabe T, Pham Thi Phuong T, Kudo K, Vu Thi Tuong V, Takasaki J, Nguyen Dang T, et al. Impact of Education and Network for Avian Influenza H5N1 in Human: Knowledge, Clinical Practice, and Motivation on Medical Providers in Vietnam. *Plos One.* 2012;7(1).
16. Nour MO, Babalghith AO, Natto HA, Al-Amin FO, Alawneh SM. Knowledge, attitude and practices of healthcare providers towards MERS-CoV infection at Makkah hospitals, KSA. *Int J Med Med Sci.* 2015;3(4):103-12.

17. Nour MO, Babalghith AO, Natto HA, Alawneh SM, Elamin FO. Raising awareness of health care providers about MERS-CoV infection in public hospitals in Mecca, Saudi Arabia. *East Mediterr Health J.* 2017;23(8):534-42.
18. Pratt M, Kerr M, Wong C. The impact of ERI, burnout, and caring for SARS patients on hospital nurses' self-reported compliance with infection control. *CJIC.* 2009;24(3):167-74.
19. Evirgen O, Savas N, Koksaldi Motor V, Onlen Y, Yengil E. An evaluation of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of employees of a university hospital in an H1N1 influenza pandemic. *J Infect Dev Countr.* 2014;8(5):561-9.
20. Kim JS, Choi JS. Middle East respiratory syndrome-related knowledge, preventive behaviours and risk perception among nursing students during outbreak. *J Clin Nurs.* 2016;25(17-18):2542-9.
21. Taghrir MH, Borazjani R, Shiraly R. COVID-19 and Iranian Medical Students; A Survey on Their Related-Knowledge, Preventive Behaviors and Risk Perception. *Arch Iran Med.* 2020;23(4):249-54.
22. Jeong HS, Lee DW, Youn CH, Lee MK, Lee SJ, Suh YS, et al. Perception and Performance of Preventive Behaviors for the Pandemic Influenza in Hospital Employees and Outpatients. *Yonsei Med J.* 2011;52(1):181-7.
23. Chor JSY, Pada SK, Stephenson I, Goggins WB, Tambyah PA, Medina M, et al. Differences in the compliance with hospital infection control practices during the 2009 influenza H1N1 pandemic in three countries. *J Hosp Infect.* 2012;81(2):98-103.
24. Koh GC-H, Abikusno N, Kwing CS, Yee WT, Kusumaratna R, Sundram M, et al. Avian influenza and South Jakarta primary healthcare workers: a controlled mixed-method study. *Trop Med Int Health.* 2009;14(7):817-29.
25. Wong SYS, Wong W, Jaakkimainen L, Bondy S, Tsang KK, Lee A. Primary care physicians in Hong Kong and Canada – how did their practices differ during the SARS epidemic? *Fam Pract.* 2005;22(4):361-6.

26. Kamate SK, Sharma S, Thakar S, Srivastava D, Sengupta K, Hadi AJ, et al. Assessing knowledge, attitudes and practices of dental practitioners regarding the covid-19 pandemic: A multinational study. *Dent Med Probl.* 2020;57(1):11-7.
27. Hu X, Zhang Z, Li N, Liu D, He W, Zhang W, et al. Self-Reported Use of Personal Protective Equipment among Chinese Critical Care Clinicians during 2009 H1N1 Influenza Pandemic. *PLoS ONE.* 2012;7(9).
28. Alsahafi AJ, Cheng AC. Knowledge, attitudes and behaviours of healthcare workers in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to MERS coronavirus and other emerging infectious diseases. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2016;13:1214.
29. Alsubaie S, Hani Tamsah M, Al-Eyadhy AA, Gossady I, Hasan GM, Al-Rabiaah A, et al. Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus epidemic impact on healthcare workers' risk perceptions, work and personal lives. *J Infect Dev Countr.* 2019;13(10):920-6.
30. Chau JP, Thompson DR, Twinn S, Lee DT, Lopez V, Ho LS. An evaluation of SARS and droplet infection control practices in acute and rehabilitation hospitals in Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Med J.* 2008;14 Suppl 4:44-7.
31. Koh D, Lim MK, Chia SE, Ko SM, Qian F, Ng V, et al. Risk perception and impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) on work and personal lives of healthcare workers in Singapore: What can we learn? *Med Care.* 2005;43(7):676-82.
32. May L, Katz R, Johnston L, Sanza M, Petinaux B. Assessing physicians' in training attitudes and behaviors during the 2009 H1N1 influenza season: a cross-sectional survey of medical students and residents in an urban academic setting. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses.* 2010;4(5):267-75.
33. Mitchell R, Ogunremi T, Astrakianakis G, Bryce E, Gervais R, Gravel D, et al. Impact of the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic on Canadian health care workers: A survey on vaccination, illness, absenteeism, and personal protective equipment. *Am J Infection Control.* 2012;40(7):611-6.

34. Parker MJ, Goldman RD. Paediatric emergency department staff perceptions of infection control measures against severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Emerg Med.* 2006;23(5):349-53.
35. Shigayeva A, Green K, Raboud JM, Henry B, Simor AE, Vearncombe M, et al. Factors associated with critical-care healthcare workers' adherence to recommended barrier precautions during the Toronto severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2007;28(11):1275-83.
36. Vinck L, Isken L, Hooiveld M, Trompenaars M, Ijzermans J, Timen A. Impact of the 2009 influenza A(H1N1) pandemic on public health workers in the Netherlands. *Euro Surveill.* 2011;16(7).
37. Alshammari M, Reynolds KA, Verhougstraete M, O'Rourke MK. Comparison of Perceived and Observed Hand Hygiene Compliance in Healthcare Workers in MERS-CoV Endemic Regions. *Healthcare.* 2018;6(4).
38. Jaeger JL, Patel M, Dharan N, Hancock K, Meites E, Mattson C, et al. Transmission of 2009 Pandemic Influenza A (H1N1) Virus among Healthcare Personnel-Southern California, 2009. *Infect Control Hospital Epidemiol.* 2011;32(12):1149-57.
39. Moore DM, Gilbert M, Saunders S, Bryce E, Yassi A. Occupational health and infection control practices related to severe acute respiratory syndrome: health care worker perceptions. *AAOHN.* 2005;53(6):257-66.
40. Tan NC, Goh LG, Lee SS. Family physicians' experiences, behaviour, and use of personal protection equipment during the SARS outbreak in Singapore: Do they fit the Becker Health Belief Model? *Asia-Pac J Public Health.* 2006;18(3):49-56.
41. Corley A, Hammond NE, Fraser JF. The experiences of health care workers employed in an Australian intensive care unit during the H1N1 influenza pandemic of 2009: A phenomenological study. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2010;47(5):577-85.

42. Hsu LY, Jin J, Ang BS, Kurup A, Tambyah PA. Hand hygiene and infection control survey pre- and peri-H1N1-2009 pandemic: knowledge and perceptions of final year medical students in Singapore. *Singapore Med J.* 2011;52(7):486-90.

43. Chia SE, Koh D, Fones C, Qian F, Ng V, Tan BH, et al. Appropriate use of personal protective equipment among healthcare workers in public sector hospitals and primary healthcare polyclinics during the SARS outbreak in Singapore. *Occup Environ Med.* 2005;62(7):473-7.

44. Ki HK, Han SK, Son JS, Park SO. Risk of transmission via medical employees and importance of routine infection-prevention policy in a nosocomial outbreak of Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS): a descriptive analysis from a tertiary care hospital in South Korea. *BMC Pulm Med.* 2019;19(1).

45. Wong WCW, Lee A, Tsang KK, Wong SYS. How did general practitioners protect themselves, their family, and staff during the SARS epidemic in Hong Kong? *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2004;58(3):180-5.

46. Yassi A, Moore D, Fitzgerald JM, Bigelow P, Hon CY, Bryce E, et al. Research gaps in protecting healthcare workers from SARS and other respiratory pathogens: an interdisciplinary, multi-stakeholder, evidence-based approach. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2005;47(1):41-50.

47. DiGiovanni C, Conley J, Chiu D, Zaborski J. Factors influencing compliance with quarantine in Toronto during the 2003 SARS outbreak. *Biosecur Bioterror.* 2004;2(4):265-72.

48. Edeghere O, Fowler T, Wilson F, Caspa R, Raichand S, Kara E, et al. Knowledge, attitudes, experience and behaviour of frontline health care workers during the early phase of 2009 influenza A(H1N1) pandemic, Birmingham, UK. *J Health Serv Res Pol.* 2015;20(1):26-30.

49. Khalid I, Khalid TJ, Qabajah MR, Barnard AG, Qushmaq IA. Healthcare Workers Emotions, Perceived Stressors and Coping Strategies During a MERS-CoV Outbreak. *Clin Med Res.* 2016;14(1):7-14.

50. Locatelli SM, LaVela SL, Hogan TP, Kerr AN, Weaver FM. Communication and information sharing at VA facilities during the 2009 novel H1N1 influenza pandemic. *Am J Infect Control*. 2012;40(7):622-6.
51. Rebmann T, Wagner W. Infection preventionists' experience during the first months of the 2009 novel H1N1 influenza A pandemic. *Am J Infect Control*. 2009;37(10):e5-e16.
52. Rowlands A. Medical social work practice and SARS in Singapore. *Soc Work Health Care*. 2007;45(3):57-83.
53. van Dijk CE, Hooiveld M, Jentink A, Isken LD, Timen A, Yzermans CJ. Experiences of General Practitioners and Practice Assistants during the Influenza A (H1N1) Pandemic in the Netherlands: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *Plos One*. 2015;10(8).
54. Kang J, Kim EJ, Choi JH, Hong HK, Han S-H, Choi IS, et al. Difficulties in using personal protective equipment: Training experiences with the 2015 outbreak of Middle East respiratory syndrome in Korea. *Am J Infect Control*. 2018;46(2):235-7.
55. Wong ELY, Wong SYS, Lee N, Cheung A, Griffiths S. Healthcare workers' duty concerns of working in the isolation ward during the novel H1N1 pandemic. *J Clin Nurs*. 2012;21(9-10):1466-75.
56. Lam KK, Hung SYM. Perceptions of emergency nurses during the human swine influenza outbreak: A qualitative study. *Int Emerg Nurs*. 2013;21(4):240-6.
57. Nickell LA, Crighton EJ, Tracy CS, Al-Enazy H, Bolaji Y, Hanjrah S, et al. Psychosocial effects of SARS on hospital staff: survey of a large tertiary care institution. *Can Med Assoc J*. 2004;170(5):793-8.
58. Kang HS, Son YD, Chae S-M, Corte C. Working experiences of nurses during the Middle East respiratory syndrome outbreak. *Int J Nurs Pract*. 2018;24(5):e12664.

59. Khoo KL, Leng PH, Ibrahim IB, Lim TK. The changing face of healthcare worker perceptions on powered air-purifying respirators during the SARS outbreak. *Respirology*. 2005;10(1):107-10.
60. Straus SE, Wilson K, Rambaldini G, Rath D, Lin Y, Gold WL, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome and its impact on professionalism: qualitative study of physicians' behaviour during an emerging healthcare crisis. 2004. *BMJ*;329(7457):83.
61. Tolomiczenko GS, Kahan M, Ricci M, Strathern L, Jeney C, Patterson K, et al. SARS: Coping with the impact at a community hospital. *J Adv Nurs*. 2005;50(1):101-10.
62. Hsu CC, Chen T, Chang M, Chang YK. Confidence in controlling a SARS outbreak: Experiences of public health nurses in managing home quarantine measures in Taiwan. *Am J Infect Control*. 2006;34(4):176-81.
63. Nhan C, Laprise R, Douville-Fradet M, Macdonald ME, Quach C. Coordination and resource-related difficulties encountered by Quebec's public health specialists and infectious diseases/medical microbiologists in the management of A(H1N1) – a mixed-method, exploratory survey. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12:115.
64. Rambaldini G, Wilson K, Rath D, Lin Y, Gold WL, Kapral MK, et al. The impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome on medical house staff: A qualitative study. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2005;20(5):381-385.
65. Robertson E, Hershenfield K, Grace SL, Stewart DE. The psychosocial effects of being quarantined following exposure to SARS: A qualitative study of Toronto health care workers. *Can J Psychiat*. 2004;49(6):403-7.
66. Goulia P, Mantas C, Dimitroula D, Mantis D, Hyphantis T. General hospital staff worries, perceived sufficiency of information and associated psychological distress during the A/H1N1 influenza pandemic. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2010;10.

67. Carrico RM, Coty MB, Goss LK, LaJoie AS. Changing health care worker behavior in relation to respiratory disease transmission with a novel training approach that uses biosimulation. *Am J Infect Control*. 2007;35(1):14-9.
68. Hon C-Y, Gamage B, Bryce EA, LoChang J, Yassi A, Maultsaid D, et al. Personal protective equipment in health care: Can online infection control courses transfer knowledge and improve proper selection and use? *Am J Infect Control*. 2008;36(10):E33-7.
69. May L, Lung D, Harter K. An intervention to improve compliance with transmission precautions for influenza in the emergency department: Successes and challenges. *J Emerg Med*. 2012;42(1):79-85.
70. Hyten C, Ludwig TD. Complacency in process safety: A behaviour analysis toward prevention strategies. *JOBM*. 2017;37(3-4):240-60.
71. Haby MM, Chapman E, Clark R, Barreto J, Reveiz L, Lavis JN. What are the best methodologies for rapid reviews of the research evidence for evidence-informed decision making in health policy and practice: a rapid review. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2016;14(1):83.