Hand hygiene compliance monitoring in anaesthetics: Feasibility and validity

Journal of Infection Prevention
2018, Vol. 19(3) 116–122
© The Author(s) 2018
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1757177418755306
jip.sagepub.com

A Jeanes¹, J Dick², P Coen¹, N Drey³ and DJ Gould⁴

Abstract

Background: Hand hygiene compliance scores in the anaesthetic department of an acute NHS hospital were persistently low.

Aims: To determine the feasibility and validity of regular accurate measurement of HHC in anaesthetics and understand the context of care delivery, barriers and opportunities to improve compliance.

Methods: The hand hygiene compliance of one anaesthetist was observed and noted by a senior infection control practitioner (ICP). This was compared to the World Health Organization five moments of hand hygiene and the organisation hand hygiene tool.

Findings: In one sequence of 55 min, there were approximately 58 hand hygiene opportunities. The hand hygiene compliance rate was 16%. The frequency and speed of actions in certain periods of care delivery made compliance measurement difficult and potentially unreliable. During several activities, taking time to apply alcohol gel or wash hands would have put the patients at significant risk.

Discussion: We concluded that hand hygiene compliance monitoring by direct observation was invalid and unreliable in this specialty. It is important that hand hygiene compliance is optimal in anaesthetics particularly before patient contact. Interventions which reduce environmental and patient contamination, such as cleaning the patient and environment, could ensure anaesthetists encounter fewer micro-organisms in this specialty.

Keywords

Audit, hand hygiene, quality assurance

Date received: 23 March 2017; accepted: 10 December 2017

Background

Optimal hand hygiene compliance (HHC) by healthcare workers contributes to the reduction and acquisition of healthcare-associated infection (Pittet et al., 2000). Monitoring HHC is an established method of providing assurance of compliance with infection control practice (NICE, 2011). Tools such as the World Health Organization (WHO) five moments of hand hygiene (Sax et al., 2009) have been used widely to measure HHC and produce a score based on observed compliance (WHO, 2009). This method is generally accepted to be the ‘gold standard’ (Boyce and Pittet, 2002) of HHC monitoring and the results obtained are used for assurance and comparison.

The use of observation to measure HHC has been criticised as it may provide an inaccurate reflection of practice (Eckmanns et al., 2006; Gould et al., 2011). In addition,

auditors may produce inconsistent results depending on many factors, including training and experience (Gwet, 2014).

It has been recognised that consistently attaining 100% HHC may not be feasible and could interfere with care (McArdle et al., 2006; Steed et al., 2011; Voss and Widmer,

¹Infection Control Department, University College London Hospitals, London, UK

²University College Hospital, London, UK

³City University London, London, UK

⁴Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

Corresponding author:

A Jeanes, Infection Control Department, University College London Hospitals, 3rd floor East 250 Euston Road, London NW1 2PG, UK.
Emails: Annette.jeanes@uclh.nhs.uk

1997), while achieving low levels of HHC may be viewed as failure and persistent non-compliance may be considered deviant (Goldmann, 2006; Pittet and Boyce, 2001).

The HHC of anaesthetists has been researched previously (Biddle and Shah, 2012; El Mikatti et al., 1999; Krediet et al., 2011; Loftus et al., 2011; Magee et al., 1995; Pittet et al., 2003; Scheithauer et al., 2013). The delivery of anaesthesia frequently requires invasive procedures and contact with body substances including blood (Chakravarthy, 2010). There is a significant risk of transmission of infection in this specialty (Loftus et al., 2012; Scheithauer et al., 2013). Several pathogens have been identified in the anaesthetic environment and on equipment handled by anaesthetic staff including phones, laryngoscope handles and stopcocks (Brady et al., 2007; Call et al., 2009; El Mikatti et al., 1999; Hall, 1994; Jeske et al., 2007; Loftus et al., 2012). The hands of anaesthetists have been found to be a significant vector of micro-organisms (Loftus et al., 2011; Magee et al. 1995). However, a key finding in studies of hand hygiene in anaesthetics has been a low level of HHC (El Mikatti et al., 1999; Krediet et al., 2011; Pittet et al., 2003), which increases the potential risk of transmission of infection at a critical point in patient care.

Several interventions have been proposed to improve HHC in anaesthetics. These include education (Bellaard-Smith and Gillespie, 2012), coaching and feedback of performance (Martin et al., 2013), cleaning of the environment (Munoz-Price et al., 2012, 2013; Rowlands et al., 2014), decolonisation or cleaning of patients before surgery (Loftus et al., 2015) and improved work flow (Pittet et al., 2003).

A key barrier to improving compliance is the rapid actions or 'task density' (Biddle and Shah, 2012; Scheithauer et al., 2013) and the 'intensity of patient care' (Pittet et al., 2003) required in anaesthetics. This impedes achieving high levels of HHC in this specialty. There is an expectation in some organisations that the HHC of anaesthetists is comparable to other healthcare workers and is monitored with a standard observation-based tool which may not reflect the rapidity and complexity of the work undertaken.

In our organisation, anaesthetics were persistent outliers in HHC reporting performance with reported monthly scores in the range of 60–100% (Jeanes et al., 2015). The policy of the organisation was to undertake an investigation to improve performance whenever a score fell below 75%. The staff conducting the audits attributed the results to poor practice, but anaesthetic staff recognised that the measurement method did not take into account the type of work undertaken. A review of the hand hygiene practice of anaesthetists was requested by managers and anaesthetists.

The aims were:

- to determine the feasibility and validity of regular accurate measurement of HHC in anaesthetics using the organisation hand hygiene tool;

- to understand the context of care delivery, potential barriers and opportunities to improve compliance.

This paper describes the observed clinical work and hand hygiene practice of one anaesthetist in an acute hospital in London. It discusses the feasibility of achieving standard expectations of HHC in this rapid and complex specialty and the reliability of compliance measurements based on observation.

Methods

A quality improvement methodology was used (Pronovost et al., 2009) to review the current monitoring process in theatres in the context of the workplace. Managers and staff of the anaesthetic department met with a senior infection prevention and control practitioner (ICP). It was agreed that the ICP would undertake an extended session of the regular observation of HHC undertaken in theatres for compliance monitoring assurance. This was to concentrate specifically on anaesthetic practice to also understand the context and complexity of the work undertaken in the specialty. In addition, the feasibility of the observation and measurement of HHC of anaesthetics would be assessed and results fed back to the group. One consultant anaesthetist agreed to be observed and liaise with colleagues about the results.

A 'typical' example of the work undertaken by a consultant anaesthetist during a morning operating list was overtly observed by the ICP. The primary focus of the observation was the manual activity including hand hygiene of the anaesthetist. The sequence of work undertaken by the anaesthetist was manually noted.

The anaesthetist was observed for approximately 3 h 30 min on one morning. The reason for the presence of the ICP was explained to the staff working in the area. There were some brief interruptions in the work undertaken primarily for the anaesthetist to provide assistance and support in other areas. Only the actions of the anaesthetist were recorded.

These recorded actions were retrospectively correlated with the WHO five moments of hand hygiene (Sax et al., 2007) and the standard organisation hand hygiene tool which was based on the Lewisham HH tool (Rao et al., 2002).

The observations and compliance measurements were fed back to the observed clinician on the same day. A report and feedback were subsequently provided to managers and anaesthetic staff.

Subsequently, a typed copy of the main sequence of observed actions was sent to ten experienced hand hygiene monitoring staff for review to identify when they would expect hand hygiene to occur in the sequence. The consistency of the auditors was calculated by means of the Fleiss's kappa coefficient statistic using unweighted inter-rater agreement with STATA 12 (StataCorp. 2011. Stata

Statistical Software: Release 12. College Station, TX, USA: StataCorp LP).

This was part of the continuous quality improvement (CQI) work (Mc Laughlin and Kaluzny 1999) undertaken in the organisation. HHC monitoring is an established part of many healthcare workers' roles. The Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership (HQIP) guidelines for CQI research (Dixon, 2009) were utilized to assess for the presence of significant ethical issues in this work. It was concluded that there was no requirement for ethical approval as regular HHC monitoring of healthcare workers has been established for more than a decade (Storr, 2005) and consent is not required. In addition, the data collection process did not fringe on patients' rights, did not involve a departure from usual clinical care and no data were collected from patients or about patients.

The anaesthetist volunteered for this work (and is an author) and the organisation agreed to the publication of this work.

Results

The anaesthetist was observed for approximately 3 h 30 min on one morning. There were some brief interruptions in the work undertaken primarily for the anaesthetist to provide assistance and support in other areas. The hand hygiene and actions of other staff in the environment were not recorded.

During the observation, there was minimal hand hygiene in the presence of many actions which are classified as hand hygiene opportunities (HHOs) in the initial stages of the reception of the patient and during anaesthetic delivery. The anaesthetist wore non-sterile disposable gloves and changed them rather than gel or wash hands during some stages of care delivery. Once the patient was in theatre and stabilised, there were fewer actions and proportionally more hand hygiene activity.

Paradoxically, the frequency of hand hygiene increased as the risks of transmission decreased. After the initial rapid activity of induction and movement of the patient from the anaesthetic room to the theatre, the use of gloves decreased and the use of alcohol hand gel increased as the patient was stabilised.

The longest unbroken sequence of direct patient care was for approximately 55 min, during which time the anaesthetist sequentially anaesthetised and cared for two patients. An extract from this sequence is in Table 1. During this time the anaesthetist performed 76 observed actions, ≥ 58 of which are classified as HHOs using the WHO criteria, and the anaesthetist cleaned his hands six times (i.e. six hand hygiene events) resulting in $< 10.3\%$ HH compliance.

By contrast, the organisation tool classified ≥ 56 actions as HHO as it requires hand hygiene before and after glove use but merges some actions into sequences. This includes

intubation, nasogastric (NG) tube insertion, suction of NG tube and securing of tubes to the patient's head, as these would be done in quick succession as one complex operation. Examples are actions 11, 12 and 13 (Table 1).

The HHC rate for the 55-min sequence using the two methods ranged from $< 10.3\%$ to $< 10.7\%$ depending on the auditing tool and the interpretation of the tool by the auditor (Table 1). However, the frequent use of disposable gloves for sequences of activities made this calculation more complex. If the use of gloves is assumed to be appropriate in the presence of body substances and the changing of gloves is assumed to be a surrogate for hand hygiene, then approximately 20 actions could be removed from this HHO calculation. The HHC score then ranged between < 15.7 and $< 16.6\%$ (Table 2). There was little difference between the results of the two tools, both suggesting unacceptably low scores, although the ICP assessed the actions observed were appropriate within the context of the care delivered and risks encountered.

The anaesthetist was assisted at times, particularly at induction and intubation, but often worked alone. He had to gather and manage his own equipment, which included going from the theatre to the anaesthetic room to get drugs. A personal mobile telephone was used which enabled him to remain in communication with his colleagues in other theatres.

The working environment of the anaesthetic room was tight and the equipment required was near to hand. The environment was visibly clean but there were many items such as pre-filled syringes, infusions and intubation kit, ready to use on surfaces which could become contaminated before use. The environmental surfaces frequently touched by the anaesthetist in the anaesthetic room and theatre included the anaesthetic trolley, the anaesthetic machine, doors and door handles, flat surfaces used for drug preparation and storage, and the moveable sides of the patient trolley. During the same period, the anaesthetist touched the head, neck, arms, intravenous and ventilator devices, auscultated chests and assisted with the movement of the patient onto and off the operating table. The only surfaces regularly cleaned during the observation were the anaesthetic machine and some flat surfaces.

Whole sequences of care rather than periods of time were observed but the frequency and speed of actions in certain periods of care delivery meant that even for an experienced ICP it was difficult to identify when hand hygiene should and could take place, particularly during certain sequences of care associated with induction and intubation. Consequently, scoring HHOs was done retrospectively and was potentially subjective. It was unclear if different observers would produce consistent scores for the same observed actions. As real-time validation of the scoring was not possible, it was agreed that infection control nurses with > 1 years' experience of HHC monitoring would be asked to score part of the documented

Table 1. Extract from observation of anaesthetist.

	Observed action/Activity of anaesthetist	Wearing gloves	WHO 5 moments HHO	Organisation tool hand hygiene required	Rationale for hand hygiene
1	Putting up and drawing up antibiotics and drugs		2	Yes	Before clean or aseptic procedure
2	Hand wash at sink before patient entering room		1	Yes	After clean or aseptic procedure Before patient contact
	(Patient walks into room and gets on trolley)				
3	Puts on disposable gloves			No	Previous hand wash covers requirement to clean hands before donning gloves
4	Connecting IV bag to giving set		2	Yes	Before clean or aseptic procedure
5	Insert cannula into patient forearm		2/1/4	Yes	Before clean or aseptic procedure After patient contact
6	Gives (IV) antibiotic		2	Yes	Not before as cannula insertion and drug delivery part of same process but Yes after giving IV antibiotic
7	Checks and draws up controlled drug		2	Yes	Before clean procedure
8	Gives IV drugs		2	Yes	Before patient contact and aseptic procedure
9	Gives IV anaesthetic and attaches IV bag		2/5	Yes	After aseptic procedure and contact with equipment
10	Hand ventilating with bag – gloved hand on face and neck		1/3/4	Yes	Before and after patient contact and potential contact with body fluids
11	Intubation including nasogastric (NG) tube insertion		1/2/3/4	Yes	Before and after clean procedure and contact with equipment and potential body fluids
12	Suctions of NG tube		3	Yes	Before and after contact with equipment and body substances
13	Securing tubing to head		1/4	Yes	Before and after patient contact
14	Takes off gloves and replaces with new ones			Yes	Following removal of gloves and before putting on new ones
15	IV-line insertion in other arm		1/2/4	Yes	Before and after aseptic procedure plus patient contact
16	Puts on IV dressing		2	No	This would be part of IV-line insertion and included in above
17	Adjust IV fluids to transfer to second cannula and first cannula bunged off		2	Yes	Before and after aseptic/clean procedure plus patient contact
18	Takes off leads from chest		1/4	Yes	Before and after patient contact
19	Takes off gloves			Yes	Following removal of gloves
20	Discontinues ventilation on anaesthetic room machine		5	Yes	Following contact with patient equipment

Table 2. Comparison of HHC scores.

	Hand hygiene events	Hand hygiene opportunities (HHO)	HHC (%)	Gloves used as surrogates for hand hygiene	HHC (gloves) (%)
WHO tool	6	≥ 58	< 10.3	≥ 38	< 15.7
Organisation tool	6	≥ 56	< 10.7	≥ 56	< 16.6

Figure 1. Results of the concurrent classification of actions as HHO (black round marker present) and non-HHO (marker absent) by five different auditors (numbered 1 to 5 on the vertical axis). The number of HHOs for the five auditors were 65, 35, 14, 8 and 35, respectively.

observation. Ten people, including staff working in other acute units, were invited to participate and were asked to indicate which of the actions identified should be accompanied by hand hygiene.

Five of the ten hand hygiene monitors invited completed the review of the 55-min sequence, a section of which is shown in Table 1. This revealed a general lack of consistency in the decisions made by the auditors (Figure 1; Kappa = 0.012). This is in spite of at least three auditors at one time in agreement within each action (not always the same three auditors across all actions). There was agreement that no hand hygiene was required for three actions and that hand hygiene was required for action 14. The number of HHOs identified was in the range of 8–65 (Figure 1). This illustrated a lack of consistency in expectations in this sequence.

Discussion

The measured HHC was low, reflecting other published studies (El Mikatti et al., 1999; Krediet et al., 2011; Pittet et al., 2003). In this instance, it was assessed to be appropriate but there is considerable scope for improving HHC and infection prevention which will benefit patients.

Compliance results obtained by observation in this specialty may be unreliable, particularly when measuring different stages of the anaesthetic process. The potential lack of consistency in expectations of observers further undermines the results obtained. Observer bias (O'Leary et al.,

1975), the experience and training of the monitor, and the Hawthorne effect (Eckmanns et al., 2006), may also be significant.

HHC measurement in this specialty could be onerous using the WHO and other HHC monitoring tools which are dependent on manually recording observations in practice. It was particularly difficult to calculate compliance when disposable gloves were in use.

Anaesthetics is not comparable to work undertaken by staff on most general hospital wards. It was often not feasible or desirable to stop to wash or gel hands during critical stages of the anaesthetic process; such as after administration of the initial intravenous anaesthetic and before maintaining the airway. The speed and skill of delivering the anaesthetic and caring for the anaesthetised patient is crucial to the patient outcome and disruption of this safe process could be detrimental. It may be more rational to ensure the anaesthetist encounters fewer micro-organisms from the environment and patient rather than seek unachievable expectations of compliance based on little evidence of benefit.

The process of anaesthesia risks introducing infection to the patient (Loftus et al., 2008; Scheithauer et al., 2013), though this is primarily associated with aseptic technique and the use of invasive devices (Bennett et al., 1995). These actions are more likely to occur at the beginning of the anaesthetic process where the contamination originates from the hands of the anaesthetist (Loftus et al., 2011), the previous patient (Rowlands et al., 2014) and the current patient's flora (Ayliffe, 1991). In addition, intravenous devices, anaesthetic equipment and the immediate intraoperative patient environment (Loftus et al., 2011) have been found to be significant reservoirs of micro-organisms in this environment (Loftus et al., 2012).

Good design of the environment and equipment, careful cleaning and preparation of the environment (Dancer et al., 2009; Wilson et al., 2011) and the patient, particularly head, arms and chest before the anaesthetic could reduce contamination and transmission risks. These combined with an emphasis on scrupulous hand cleaning by the anaesthetic team before each initial patient contact, together with careful aseptic practice, could be a possible strategy. This could form the basis of a compliance assessment. This is not the first time a novel approach (Biddle and Shah, 2012) or system change (Pittet, 2003) for HHC in anaesthetics has been suggested.

This short observation of a single anaesthetist may not be representative or generalisable, although similar

findings have been reported in more extensive studies (Pittet, 2003; Rowlands et al., 2014; Biddle and Shah, 2012). In addition, the effect of overt observation may have affected the results obtained (Eckmanns et al., 2006) or simply reflected the habits of one anaesthetist. However, the purpose of this work was to understand the context and determine the feasibility of measurement of HHC using an observational methodology in anaesthetics.

It was concluded that the compliance scores obtained using observation were unlikely to provide accurate assurance. This method of measurement ceased to be used in this specialty and instead the focus shifted to removing ambiguity about expectations of compliance and removing barriers to compliance. A quality improvement measurement tool which monitors barriers and opportunities for improvement taking into account the local context and risks is now used to monitor infection prevention and control performance in the organisation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the help of Jackie Portsmouth, Anna Whitehead, Leila Hail and members of the infection control team for reviewing the hand hygiene compliance scoring.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared the following potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: AJ and JD conceived the review of monitoring; AJ researched the literature; AJ, ND and DJG discussed study design; PC analysed the data with input from AJ, ND and DJG; AJ wrote the first draft of the manuscript with contributions from ND and DJG. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: this research was funded by the University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust.

Peer review statement

Not commissioned; blind peer-reviewed.

References

- Ayliffe GAJ. (1991) Role of the environment of the operating suite in surgical wound infection. *Review of Infectious Diseases* 13 (Supplement 10): S800–S804.
- Bellaard-Smith ER and Gillespie EE. (2012) Implementing hand hygiene strategies in the operating suite. *Healthcare Infection* 17: 33–37.
- Bennett SN, McNeil MM, Bland LA, Arduino MJ, Villarino ME, Perrotta DM, Burwen DR, Welbel SF, Pegues DA, Stroud L and Zeitz PS. (1995) Postoperative infections traced to contamination of an intravenous anesthetic, propofol. *New England Journal of Medicine* 333: 147–154.
- Biddle C and Shah J. (2012) Quantification of anesthesia providers' hand hygiene in a busy metropolitan operating room: What would Semmelweis think? *American Journal of Infection Control* 40: 756–759.
- Boyce JM and Pittet D. (2002) Guideline for hand hygiene in health-care settings Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America/ Association for Professionals in Infection Control/Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 51: 1–45.
- Brady RR, Fraser SF, Dunlop MG, Paterson-Brown S and Gibb AP. (2007) Bacterial contamination of mobile communication devices in the operative environment. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 66: 397–398.
- Call TR, Auerbach FJ, Riddell SW, Kiska DL, Thongrod SC, Tham SW and Nussmeier NA. (2009) Nosocomial contamination of laryngoscope handles: challenging current guidelines. *Anesthesia and Analgesia* 109: 479–483.
- Chakravarthy M. (2010) Enhanced risk of needlestick injuries and exposure to blood and body fluids to cardiac anesthesiologists: Need for serious introspection. *Annals of cardiac anaesthesia* 13: 1–2.
- Dancer SJ, White LF, Lamb J, Girvan EK and Robertson C. (2009). Measuring the effect of enhanced cleaning in a UK hospital: a prospective cross-over study. *BMC Medicine* 7: 28.
- Dixon N. (2009) *Review of ethics issues related to clinical audit and quality improvement activities*. London: Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership.
- Eckmanns T, Bessert J, Behnke M, Gastmeier P and Rüden H. (2006). Compliance with antiseptic hand rub use in intensive care units the Hawthorne effect. *Infection Control* 27: 931–934.
- El Mikatti N, Dillon P and Healy TE J. (1999). Hygienic practices of consultant anaesthetists: a survey in the North-West region of the UK. *Anaesthesia* 54: 13–18.
- Goldmann D. (2006). System failure versus personal accountability—the case for clean hands. *New England Journal of Medicine* 355: 121–123.
- Gould DJ, Drey NS and Creedon S. (2011) Routine hand hygiene audit by direct observation: has nemesis arrived? *Journal of Hospital Infection* 77: 290–293.
- Gwet KL. (2014) *Handbook of inter-rater reliability: The definitive guide to measuring the extent of agreement among raters*. Gaithersburg: Advanced Analytics, LLC.
- Hall JR. (1994). Blood contamination of anesthesia equipment and monitoring equipment. *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 78: 1136–1139.
- Jeanes A, Coen PG, Wilson AP, Drey NS and Gould DJ. (2015). Collecting the data but missing the point: validity of hand hygiene audit data. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 90: 156–162.
- Jeske HC, Tiefenthaler W, Hohlrieder M, Hinterberger G and Benzer A. (2007). Bacterial contamination of anaesthetists' hands by personal mobile phone and fixed phone use in the operating theatre. *Anaesthesia* 62: 904–906.
- Krediet AC, Kalkman CJ, Bonten MJ, Gigengack AC and Barach P. (2011) Hand-hygiene practices in the operating theatre: an observational study. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 107: 553–558.
- Loftus RW, Brown JR, Koff MD, Reddy S, Heard SO, Patel HM, Fernandez PG, Beach ML, Corwin HL, Jensen JT and Kispert D. (2012) Multiple reservoirs contribute to intraoperative bacterial transmission. *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 114: 1236–1248.
- Loftus RW, Koff MD, Brown JR, Patel HM, Jensen JT, Reddy S, Ruoff KL, Heard SO, Yeager MP and Dodds TM. (2015) The epidemiology of *Staphylococcus aureus* transmission in the anesthesia work area. *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 120: 807–818.
- Loftus R, Koff M, Burchman C, Schwartzman J, Thorum V, Read M, Wood T and Beach M. (2008) Transmission of pathogenic bacterial organisms in the anesthesia work area. *Anesthesiology* 109: 399–407.
- Loftus RW, Muffly MK, Brown JR, Beach ML, Koff MD, Corwin HL, Surgenor SD, Kirkland KB and Yeager MP. (2011) Hand contamination of anesthesia providers is an important risk factor for intraoperative bacterial transmission. *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 112: 98–105.

- Magee L, Godsiff L, Matthews I, Farrington M and Park GR. (1995) Anaesthetic drugs and bacterial contamination. *European Journal of Anaesthesiology Supplement* 12: 41–43.
- Martin LD, Rampersad SE, Geiduschek JM, Zerr DM, Weiss GK and Martin LD. (2013) Modification of anesthesia practice reduces catheter-associated bloodstream infections: a quality improvement initiative. *Pediatric Anesthesia* 23: 588–596.
- McArdle FI, Lee RJ, Gibb AP and Walsh TS. (2006) How much time is needed for hand hygiene in intensive care? A prospective trained observer study of rates of contact between healthcare workers and intensive care patients. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 62: 304–310.
- McLaughlin CP and Kaluzny AD. (1999) *Continuous quality improvement in healthcare, theory implementation and application*. 2nd ed. Burlington, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Munoz-Price LS, Birnbach DJ, Lubarsky DA, Arheart KL, Fajardo-Aquino Y, Rosalsky M, Cleary T, DePascale D, Coro G, Namias N and Carling P. (2012) Decreasing operating room environmental pathogen contamination through improved cleaning practice. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* 33: 897–904.
- Munoz-Price LS, Lubarsky DA, Arheart KL, Prado G, Cleary T, Fajardo-Aquino Y, DePascale D, Eber S, Carling P and Birnbach DJ. (2013). Interactions between anesthesiologists and the environment while providing anesthesia care in the operating room. *American Journal of Infection Control* 41: 922–924.
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. (2011) *Prevention and control of healthcare-associated infections. NICE public health guidance PH36*. London: NICE.
- O’Leary KD, Kent RN and Kanowitz J. (1975) Shaping data collection congruent with experimental hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 8: 43–51.
- Pittet D and Boyce JM. (2001) Hand hygiene and patient care: pursuing the Semmelweis legacy. *Lancet Infectious Diseases* 1: 9–20.
- Pittet D, Hugonnet S, Harbarth S, Mourouga P, Sauvan V, Touveneau S and Perneger TV. (2000) Effectiveness of a hospital-wide programme to improve compliance with hand hygiene. Infection Control Programme. *Lancet* 356: 1307–1312. Erratum in: *Lancet* (2000) 356: 2196.
- Pittet D, Stephan F, Hugonnet S, Akakpo C, Souweine B and Clergue F. (2003). Hand-cleansing during postanesthesia care. *Anesthesiology* 99: 530–535.
- Pronovost PJ, Goeschel CA, Marsteller JA, Sexton JB, Pham JC and Berenholtz SM. (2009) Framework for patient safety research and improvement. *Circulation* 119: 330–337.
- Rao GG, Jeanes A, Osman M, Aylott C and Green J. (2002). Marketing hand hygiene in hospitals—a case study. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 50: 42–47.
- Rowlands J, Yeager MP, Beach M, Patel HM, Huysman BC and Loftus RW. (2014) Video observation to map hand contact and bacterial transmission in operating rooms. *American Journal of Infection Control* 42: 698–701.
- Sax H, Allegranzi B, Chraiti M, Boyce J, Larson E and Pittet D. (2009) The World Health Organization hand hygiene observation method. *American Journal of Infection Control* 37: 827–834.
- Sax H, Allegranzi B, Uckay I, Larson E, Boyce J and Pittet D. (2007). ‘My five moments for hand hygiene’: a user-centred design approach to understand, train, monitor and report hand hygiene. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 67: 9–21.
- Scheithauer S, Rosarius A, Rex S, Post P, Heisel H, Krizanovic V, Schulze-Röbbecke R, Rossaint R and Lemmen SW. (2013) Improving hand hygiene compliance in the anesthesia working room work area: more than just more hand rubs. *American Journal of Infection Control* 41: 1001–1006.
- Steed C, Kelly JW, Blackhurst D, Boeker S, Diller T, Alper P and Larson E. (2011) Hospital hand hygiene opportunities: where and when (HOW2)? The HOW2 Benchmark Study. *American Journal of Infection Control* 39: 19–26.
- Storr J. (2005) The effectiveness of the national cleanyourhands campaign. *Nursing Times* Feb 22–28; 101: 50–51.
- Voss A and Widmer AF. (1997) No time for handwashing!? Handwashing versus alcoholic rub: can we afford 100% compliance? *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology* 18: 205–208.
- Wilson AP, Smyth D, Moore G, Singleton J, Jackson R, Gant V, Jeanes A, Shaw S, James E, Cooper B, Kafatos G, Cookson B, Singer M and Bellingan G. (2011) The impact of enhanced cleaning within the intensive care unit on contamination of the near-patient environment with hospital pathogens: a randomized crossover study in critical care units in two hospitals. *Critical Care Medicine* 39: 651–658.
- World Health Organization. (2009) *WHO Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care*. Geneva: WHO.