American Journal of Infection Control ■■ (2017) ■■-■■

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

American Journal of Infection Control

journal homepage: www.ajicjournal.org

Major Article

Contact patterns during cleaning of vomitus: A simulation study

Yu-Min Su MS [a], Linh Phan MS [a], Osayuwamen Edomwande [a], Rachel Weber BS [a], Susan C. Bleasdale MD [b], Lisa M. Brosseau ScD, CIH [a], Charissa Fritzen-Pedicini MSPH [a], Monica Sikka MD [b], Rachael M. Jones PhD, CIH [a,*] for the CDC Prevention Epicenters Program

[a] School of Public Health, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL
[b] College of Medicine, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL

Key Words:
Environmental service workers
Health care
Contact frequency
Infectious diseases

Background: Environmental service workers cleaning bodily fluids may transfer pathogens through the environment and to themselves through contacts.

Methods: Participants with experience in cleaning of hospital environments were asked to clean simulated vomitus using normal practices in a simulated patient room while being videorecorded. Contacts with environmental surfaces and self were later observed.

Results: In 21 experimental trials with 7 participants, environmental surfaces were contacted 26.8 times per trial, at a frequency of 266 contacts per hour, on average. Self-contact occurred in 9 of 21 trials, and involved 1-18 contacts, mostly to the upper body. The recommended protocol of cleaning bodily fluids was followed by a minority of participants (2 of 7), and was associated with fewer surface contacts, improved cleaning quality, and different tool use. Participants used different cleaning practices, but each employed similar practices each time they performed an experimental trial.

Conclusions: Training in the use of the recommended protocol may standardize cleaning practices and reduce the number of surface contacts.

Many infectious diseases result in the emission of pathogen-containing bodily fluids, such as vomitus and diarrhea, associated with symptomatic norovirus infection.[1,2] During cleanup of pathogen-containing body fluids, environmental service and other health care personnel are exposed to pathogens, and are therefore at risk of acquiring infection. Makison Booth,[3] in a qualitative simulation study, demonstrated that during cleaning of vomitus, a worker may unintentionally contact contaminated hands to the face, and thereby contaminate the face with bodily fluid. Workers' contaminated hands may also transfer pathogens to environmental surfaces and other susceptible people, thereby contributing to indirect or direct contact transmission of the infectious disease.[4]

The objective of this study was to characterize contact patterns during vomitus cleanup. Simulation was used to attain this objective because vomiting is a difficult event to anticipate and observe in health care settings. The study objective was motivated by the ubiquity of norovirus infection in health care settings,[5-7] and the lack of knowledge about how people perform cleanup activities. Surveillance does not routinely tabulate the incidence of norovirus infection among health care workers, but outbreak studies consistently identify infections among health care workers, as well as among patients, and vomitus has been identified as a risk factor for norovirus transmission.[8-11]

The contact transmission route is relevant to many infectious diseases that cause gastroenteritis and colitis, including norovirus and *Clostridium difficile*.[12] The number and types of contacts that workers have while cleaning up pathogen-containing bodily fluids may contribute to the risk of infection. Contact patterns, for example, are key variables in mathematical models of exposure to pathogens in the environment transmitted through the contact route.[13] To our knowledge, contact patterns during cleaning activities have not been studied, although contact patterns have been observed in other health care contexts.[14,15] This research begins to fill the knowledge gap about how pathogens are transmitted through the environment to pose a health risk to environmental service workers, who in turn, may transmit pathogens to others.

* Address correspondence to Rachael M. Jones, PhD, CIH, School of Public Health, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2121 W Taylor St (M/C 922), Chicago, IL 60612.
E-mail address: rjones25@uic.edu (R.M. Jones).

This work was supported by the CDC Prevention Epicenters Program through cooperative agreement U54CK000445 with the UIC Epicenter for Prevention of Healthcare Associated Infections.

Conflicts of interest: None to report.

0196-6553/
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2017.07.005

METHODS

Participants with experience cleaning in health care settings were recruited via e-mail, flyers, and presentations at staff meetings at 2 hospitals in the Chicago area. Participation involved a 2-hour time commitment, and was incentivized with a $40 gift card. The University of Illinois at Chicago Institutional Review Board approved this study (protocol 2015-0990).

Simulations were performed in a room-scale chamber (2.5 m × 4.5 m × 2.4 m high) with sheetrock walls and vinyl tile flooring, equipped with a 7-camera video surveillance system. A gurney was placed at 1 side of the chamber to simulate a patient's bed. The floor was marked into a 12-inch grid to facilitate observation of contamination, and covered with plastic sheeting for ease of cleaning.

Before a participant's arrival, he or she was randomly assigned to clean 200 mL vomitus spilled in 2 of 4 possible ways: low-viscosity vomitus poured on the side of the gurney, high-viscosity vomitus poured on the side of the gurney, low-viscosity vomitus poured on the floor, and high-viscosity vomitus poured on the floor. The 2 locations (gurney and floor) were based on information from University of Illinois Hospital staff that these were the most common locations cleaned by environmental service workers. High (~170 mPa-s) and low (~6 mPa-S) viscosity vomitus were used to reflect variation in vomitus types.[16] The recipe development is described in detail elsewhere.[17] Briefly, the simulated vomitus was a mixture of carboxymethylcellulose powder (0.19 g or 2.51 g) and fluorescein salt (0.5 g) in 500 mL basic buffer.

Upon arrival, participants were provided a cleaning cart stocked with tools used in the protocol at University of Illinois Hospital and consistent with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommendations,[18] including dry and premoistened (with water) 14-inch square microfiber towels, dry and premoistened (with water) Hygen microfiber mop heads (Rubbermaid, Winchester, VA), a mop for use with the mop heads, a bottle of disposable Healthcare Bleach Germicidal Wipes (Clorox, Oakland, CA), and a squirt-top bottle of simulated disinfectant (water). Participants were provided scrubs and shoe covers. Participants were asked to wear, at their discretion, the personal protective equipment (PPE) normally worn to clean vomitus, and they were offered nitrile gloves, BCR 3-layer facemasks with knitted earloops (Berkshire, Great Barrington, MA), N95 filtering facepiece respirators (3M Corp, Minneapolis, MN), and safety glasses.

Participants did not observe the research team introduce the simulated vomitus into the chamber. Participants were asked to clean the simulated vomitus following normal practices. During cleaning, the research team observed the number and type of cleaning products used and the sequence of activities performed by the participant. During 1 visit, each participant performed 1-2 trials with simulated vomitus and 0-1 blank trials (ie, cleaning activity with no vomitus), as time permitted.

Between trials, to prevent cross-contamination, the plastic sheeting on the floor was removed or replaced, and the gurney cleaned by the research team. The absence of cross-contamination was verified by illuminating the chamber with black light to look for visible contamination. In addition, blank trials, in which participants performed cleaning activities without simulated vomitus, verified the absence of fluorescein contamination in the chamber.

Contact patterns and duration of the cleaning activity were observed from digital video recordings. Contacts with the following environmental surfaces were recorded: gurney, cleaning cart, ground, and walls. Contacts with the following surfaces on the participants were recorded: eyes, mouth or nose, head, upper chest and arms, abdomen, lower arms and wrist, and legs. If worn by the participant, contacts were observed with goggles or glasses, and facemask or respirator (ie, facial PPE). Contacts were classified by the nature of the touch: fingers (including rubbing and scratching), hand other than fingers (eg, palm and back of hand, including rubbing), and whole hand.

A crude measure of cleaning quality was defined as the ratio of the spatial extent of contamination after cleaning to the spatial extent of contamination before cleaning. This ratio was then categorized as 0.5, ≥ 0.5-< 1.0, or ≥ 1.0. Category 1, for example, means that after cleaning the extent of contamination was less than one-half the extent of contamination before cleaning, and indicates relatively high quality cleaning. The spatial extent was defined as the area over which contamination was observed, but does not mean that all of that area was contaminated (eg, there were scattered spots of contamination). However, the density of contamination was closely associated with the area of contamination: Trials that fell into category 1 typically involved a few spots of contamination, trials that fell into category 2 typically involved relatively dense spots of contamination over the area, and trials that fell into category 3 involved nearly complete contamination of the area.

Data were initially recorded on paper forms and entered into a database (Microsoft Access 2016; Redmond, WA). All data analysis was performed with the R Project for Statistical Computing (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Two-way and multiway comparisons were made using the Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests, respectively, with statistical significance set to $\alpha = 0.05$. Although the design involves repeated measures for participants, observations were treated as independent in the statistical analyses due to the small number of replicates and participants.

RESULTS

A total of 7 participants were recruited (6 men and 1 woman), and performed 21 trials with simulated vomitus (5 each with the low viscosity on gurney, HG, and low viscosity on floor conditions, and 6 with the high viscosity on gurney condition). Bodily fluid cleaning protocols recommended by the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration involve using an absorbent material to remove the bulk fluid before mopping, and to clean high surfaces before low surfaces.[18,19] Only 2 participants used this approach (Table 1). Cleaning strategies varied among participants, but each participant used the same cleaning strategy each time they performed a trial (Table 1).

The numbers of contacts of different types are shown in Table 1. Contact frequency (contacts per hour) can be calculated by dividing the number of contacts by the hour duration of the trial. On average, the cleaning cart was touched more times, and more frequently, than the gurney (16.3 vs 9.8 contacts, or 171 vs 90 contacts per hour) per trial. Participants were observed to contact their own bodies in only 9 of 21 trials (5 of 7 participants), but the number of self-contacts was highly variable when they occurred (range, 1-18 contacts or 3.3-164 contacts per hour). Most contacts with the body involved the upper body and occurred when participants adjusted their scrubs (worn over their clothing) or PPE. Participants' contacts with their bodies, when they occurred, were more likely to involve the use of fingers, 81% on average, whereas contacts with environmental surfaces involved different parts of the hand more frequently, with 59%, 30%, and 11% involving the fingers, the whole hand, and the hand other than fingers, respectively, on average.

Graphic presentation of the data suggest that participants are relatively consistent from trial to trial in their contact patterns during cleaning of simulated bodily fluids (measured as number of contacts and contact frequency in Fig 1), but there is substantial variability between participants. We verified this intraparticipant consistency from trial 1 to trial 2, and found no evidence to reject the null hypothesis that the mean difference in surface contact