Effectiveness of handwashing with soap for preventing acute respiratory infections in low-income and middle income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Presented by resident family doctor Houri Amira

04.10.2023

Introduction:

- Acute respiratory infection (ARI) is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality globally, with 83% of ARI mortality occurring in LMICs before the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 2.5 million deaths in 2019 were attributable to ARIs.
- Very young and very old people are at particularly high risk, with an estimated 740000 deaths of children younger than 5 years attributable to ARIs in 2019.
- Handwashing practices at key moments are less prevalent in LMICs compared with high-income countries (HICs) for many reasons, including reduced access to water supply on premises or to handwashing facilities with soap and water.
- The aim of this presentation: to estimate the effect of interventions promoting handwashing with soap in domestic, school, and childcare settings on ARI in LMICs.

Reminder:

	lower respiratory infections	upper respiratory infections		
the infection's primary location	below the larynx	above it		
global disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs)	3.8%	0.3%		
e.g	pneumonia and bronchiolitis	the sinuses and throat		
symptoms	difficulty breathing and rapid respiratory rate	runny nose (coryza) and a sore throat (pharyngitis)		
Pathogens:	can be bacterial or viral.	predominantly viral		

 ARI-causing pathogens can be transmitted via airborne, surface, or person-to-person contact routes. Handwashing with soap can prevent many ARIs by mechanically removing pathogens from hands, and by rupturing many bacteria and viruses.

Methodology :

- databases searched : MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science, Scopus,
 - Cochrane Library, Global Health, and Global Index Medicus
- Period of the research : from inception to May 25, 2021.
- Design of the studies searched : prospective observational studies
- primary and secondary endpoints :
- The primary outcome was all-cause ARI morbidity
- secondary outcomes: lower respiratory infection morbidity, upper

respiratory infection morbidity, influenza confirmed by diagnostic test,

COVID-19 confirmed by diagnostic test, and all-cause mortality

Results :

- Number of studys : 26 studies : 13 studies in Asia, 9 in Africa, and 3 in Latin America
- Total Number of participants : 161 659 participants
- Places: domestic settings, primary school, childcare settings.
- Risk of biais: moderate



	Years	of	Country	Milieu Study desi	gn	Interventi	on study						
				Randomisation and	d Follow-u	ıp HWWS wi	thin Intervention co	ntent study design (n	nonths) intervention				
Studies in dom	<u>nestic setti</u>	ngs (n=18	9										
Arnold et al (2009	9) ⁴¹						2007	GuatemalaRural	Non-randomised (P	SM) 3	Majority, HWWS ≥50%	Handwashing promo	tion, alongside household water treatment
Ashraf et al (2020)	³¹ 2013–1	5 Banglad	esh Rural	Randomised (cRCT)	24	Majority,	HWWS onlyHandwa	shing promotion with	h soap and HWF provisio	on			
Chase and Do (20	12) ⁴² 2009–1	1 Viet Nam I	Rural Rando	mised (cRCT) 18 Major	rity, HWW	S only Hand	washing promotion	Galiani et al (2015); ³³	³ 2008–11 Peru Mixed R	andomised (cRCT) 36	Majority, HWWS only Handwash	ning promotion domestic	
Galiani et al (2015	5); ³³ 2008–11	Peru Mixed	Randomise	d (cRCT) 36 Majority, H	HWWS onl	ly Handwash	ing promotion dom	estic and schools					
					н	artinger et a	l (2016) ⁴³	2008–10 Peru	Rural Randomised	d (cRCT) 12	Minority Hygiene promotion i	ncluding handwashing, al	ongside cookstove, sink, water connection, SODIS
Huda et al (2012) ⁴	4 2007–0)9 Banglad	esh Rural	Non-randomised (matched cohort)	24	Minority	Hygiene prom promo	notion including hand otion of sanitation an	lwashing, alongside d safe collection and sto	rage of drinking wate	er		
Humphrey et al (2)	019) ³⁹ 2012–1	.5 Zimbabı	we Rural	Randomised (cRCT)	18	Minority	Handwashing p alongs house	romotion with soap a ide promotion of foo hold water treatmen	and HWF provision, od hygiene, sanitation, a t	nd			
Hussam et al (201	.9) ⁴⁰ *	2015–17	India	Rural Randomise	ed (cRCT)	8	Majority, HWWS o	nly Handwashing pro	motion with soap provis	ion Luby et al (2005) [:]	¹⁵ 2002–03 Pakistan Urban	Randomised (cRCT)	12 Majority, HWWS only Handwashing
Manaseki-Holland	et al 2015–1	7 Gamhia	Rural	Randomised (cRCT)	32	Maiority	HWWS >50%Handw	ashing promotion wi	th soan provision along	side			
(2021) ²⁶	2015	., Gambia	Kurui	handomised (ener)	52	wajoney,	food hy	giene promotion	th soup provision, along	5140			
Morse et al (2020)	²⁹ 2017–1	L8 Malawi	Rural	Non-randomised (sit	e- 18	Minority	Hygiene prom	notion including hand	lwashing, alongside				
			/	randomised)			promotion	of sanitation and ho	usebold water				
				randomisedy			promotion		usenoiu water	m	anagement		
Nainin et al (2019)	45 2011-1	.3 Banglad	esh Urban	Randomised (cRCT)	24	Minority	Hygiene pr	omotion including ha	andwashing and HWF				
							provis	ion, alongside housel	hold water treatment ar	nd cholera vaccine			
Studies in prin	nary schoo	<u>l settings</u>	<u>(n=8)</u>										
Bowen et al (2007) ²⁴ 2004–0	5 China	Mixed	Randomised (cRCT)	5	Majority,	HWWS onlyHandwa	shing promotion with	h soap provision				
Chard et al (2019) ⁴	⁴⁹ 2014–1	.7 Laos	Rural	Randomised (cRCT)	24	Minority	Hygiene prom provis	notion including hand ion of HWF, sanitatio	lwashing, alongside n, and water supply and	treatment			
Galiani et al (2015	5); ³³ 2008–11	Peru Mixed	Randomise	d (cRCT) 36 Majority, H	HWWS onl	ly Handwash	ing promotion dom	estic and schools					
Mangklakeree et a	al (2014) ³⁶	2011	Thailand	l RuralNon-ra	andomised	d (CBA)4	etique	tte, masking, and sel	Minority f-isolation	Hygiene promotio	n including handwashing and co	ugh	
Patel et al (2012) ³	38			2007–09	Kenya	Rural	Non-randomised	12 Majori	ity, HWWS ≥50%	Handwashing pror tre	motion with soap and HWF provi eatment	ision, (controlled cohort)	alongside promotion and provision of drinking w
Pickering et al (202	13)50 2010	Kenya	Urban	Randomised (cRCT)	2	Majority,	HWWS onlyHandwa	shing promotion with	h soap and HWF provisio	on			
Ta <mark>laat et al (2011)</mark>	23 2008	Egypt	Urban	Randomised (cRCT)	3	Majority,	HWWS onlyHandwa	shing promotion					
Trinies et al (2016)) ⁵¹ 2013–1	4 Mali	Mixed	Non-randomised	14	Minority	Handwashing p	romotion with soap a	and HWF provision,				
	NN	((matched cohort)			alongside	provision of sanitatio	on and water				
Studies in child	dcare setti	ngs (n=2)											
Ban et al (2015) ³⁷	2010–1	.1 China	Urban	Randomised (cRCT)	12	Majority,	HWWS ≥50%Handw provis	ashing promotion wition, alongside surface	th soap and sanitiser e cleaning				
Liu et al (2019) ³⁰	2015	China	Urban	Randomised (cRCT)	6	Majority,	HWWS onlyHandwa	shing promotion with	h soap provision				



Figure 3: Forest plot of included comparisons for any acute respiratory infection, for which handwashing comprised the majority of intervention content Weights are from random-effects model. DL=DerSimonian and Laird. RR=relative risk.

	Number of comparisons	Effect size (95% CI)	²	p value for heterogeneity
Any acute respiratory infection	27	0·83 (0·76–0·90)	88%	<0:0001
Lower respiratory infection	12	0.78 (0.64-0.94)	64%	0.0010
Upper respiratory infection	1	0·74 (0·59–0·93)	91%	<0·0001
Influenza confirmed by diagnostic test	3	0.94 (0.42-2.11)	90%	<0.0001

Table 2: Pooled estimates of the effect of interventions to promote handwashing versus control for all outcomes

Discussion:

- Interventions promoting handwashing with soap reduced ARI morbidity by about 17%.

- Such interventions are therefore an important means of preventing ARIs in LMICs.
- this study is the **first meta-analysis** of the effect of handwashing with soap interventions on any ARI **since the 2008** study by Aiello and colleagues.

- A further strength is in **distinguishing between lower and upper respiratory infections**, which previous handwashing meta-analyses have not done

Limitation of the study :

- First, masking of participants in handwashing interventions is impossible.
- Second, symptoms included in the primary outcome were typically caregiver-reported or selfreported.
 - Reporting bias could therefore lead to effects being overstated.

- For effective uptake of handwashing with soap, **complementary investments are required** in water supply and handwashing facilities, which **can be costly** to households and governments. Hand hygiene is best facilitated by a water supply on premises, but 27% of the LMIC population (1.8 billion people) do not have such a service. Furthermore, nearly a third of the global population, almost exclusively in LMICs, does not have a handwashing facility with soap and water at home.

Conclusion:

- As in previous outbreaks influenza, most governments have promoted handwashing with soap during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- However, in comparison with the attention given to handwashing during these epidemics of respiratory disease, handwashing campaigns in normal times are rare.
- This review suggests that the scarcity of such campaigns might be a missed opportunity, and promoting handwashing with soap more broadly could reduce the large endemic burden of respiratory disease