

Interventions to improve hand hygiene in community settings: A systematic review of theories, barriers and enablers, behavior change techniques, and hand hygiene station design features

Authors

Sridevi K. Prasad¹ 0000-0003-0457-9534

Jedidiah S. Snyder² 0000-0002-7688-4450

Erin LaFon²

Lilly A. O'Brien² 0009-0004-1987-3706

Hannah Rogers³ 0000-0002-9515-1439

Oliver Cumming^{4,5} 0000-0002-5074-8709

Joanna Esteves Mills⁵

Bruce Gordon⁵

Marlene Wolfe² 0000-0002-6476-0450

Matthew C. Freeman² 0000-0002-1517-2572

Bethany A. Caruso^{1*} 0000-0001-9738-9857

1 Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA; bcaruso@emory.edu (BAC); sridevi.prasad@emory.edu (SKP)

2 Gangarosa Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA; matthew.freeman@emory.edu (MCF); marlene.wolfe@emory.edu (MW) jedidiah.snyder@emory.edu (JSS); lilly.obrien@emory.edu (LAO); erin.lafon@emory.edu (EL)

3 Woodruff Health Sciences Center Library, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA; hannah.rogers@emory.edu (HR)

4 Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK; oliver.cumming@lshtm.ac.uk (OC)

5 Water, Sanitation, Hygiene and Health Unit, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland; estevesj@who.int (JEM); gordonb@who.int (BG)

*Corresponding author: Bethany A. Caruso bcaruso@emory.edu

Emory University, Rollins School of Public Health, 1518 Clifton Rd, Atlanta, GA 30322

S13 – Hand hygiene station designs

Supplementary File 13:

Hand hygiene station types and designs features reported in included studies (N=223)

Hand hygiene station types and designs features	Total n (%)	Effective** n (%)
Studies reporting any handwashing station types and design features	46 (20.6)	37 (80.4)
Users		
School Populations	24 (52.2)	20 (83.3)
Household Populations	15 (32.6)	12 (80.0)
Community Members	3 (6.5)	2 (66.7)
Migrant Workers	1 (2.2)	1 (100.0)
Workplace Populations	1 (2.2)	1 (100.0)
Not reported	2 (4.4)	1 (50.0)
Total Studies Reporting on Hand Washing Stations	46 (100.0)	37 (80.4)
Raised bucket with tap/outlet	20 (44.4)	15 (75.0)
Sink with tap	7 (15.6)	7 (100.0)
Tippy tap	4 (8.9)	4 (100.0)
Free standing water tank with taps	1 (2.2)	1 (100.0)
Foot pump sink	1 (2.2)	0 (0.0)
Hand pump	1 (2.2)	1 (100.0)
Purpose-built all-in-one system	1 (2.2)	1 (100.0)
Two buckets suspended	1 (2.2)	1 (100.0)
Handwashing Station Type Not reported	10 (22.2)	7 (70.0)
Mobility		
Mobile	13 (28.3)	9 (69.2)
Fixed	12 (26.1)	11 (91.7)
Not reported	21 (45.7)	17 (81.0)
Permanency		
Temporary	15 (32.6)	11 (73.3)
Permanent	11 (23.9)	10 (90.9)
Not reported	20 (43.5)	16 (80.0)
Water supply		
Individual storage tank	13 (28.3)	11 (84.6)
Piped water	5 (10.9)	5 (100.0)
Not reported	28 (60.9)	21 (75.0)
Material		
Plastic	7 (15.2)	7 (100.0)
Not reported	39 (84.8)	30 (76.9)
Location*		
Near baby's room	2 (4.1)	1 (50.0)
Near cooking area	2 (4.1)	0 (0.0)
Near construction sites	1 (2.0)	1 (100.0)

Prasad et al. Interventions to improve hand hygiene in community settings: A systematic review of theories, barriers and enablers, behavior change techniques, and hand hygiene station design features

S13 – Hand hygiene station designs

Near markets	1 (2.0)	1 (100.0)
Near bathroom	1 (2.0)	0 (0.0)
Not reported	42 (85.7)	35 (83.3)
Additional features		
Additional soap provided	5 (10.9)	4 (80.0)
Added cues to action (stickers, painted footpaths)	3 (6.5)	1 (33.3)
Bowl for run-off water provided	3 (6.5)	3 (100.0)
Additional water storage provided	2 (4.4)	1 (50.0)
Mirror	2 (4.4)	2 (100.0)
Aesthetic features	1 (2.2)	1 (100.0)
Addition features not reported	30 (65.2)	25 (83.3)
Studies reporting handwashing station storage capacity (n=13)	Total mean (SD)	Effective mean (SD)
Average storage capacity in L	43.5 (29.8)	46 (31.7)

Note: *Location is multi-select so could have multiple locations per handwashing station study; ** Effectiveness is determined if authors reported that the intervention was effective at improving hand hygiene outcomes