



Journal Homepage: [-www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/19688
DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/19688>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

KNOWLEDGE AND BEHAVIOR OF HATTA HOSPITAL HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS REGARDING COVID- 19 INFECTION PREVENTION AND CONTROL

Naglaa Mohamed Abdelhamied, MD, Eric S. Weinstein, MD MSc DM, Afzal Hussein Yusufali, MD;
M Med; FRCP and Rasha M. Farghaly, MD.

Emergency Medicine Department, Hatta Hospital, Dubai health.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 19 August 2024

Final Accepted: 22 September 2024

Published: October 2024

Key words:-

Knowledge, Behavior, COVID-19,
Infection, Prevention, Control

Abstract

Healthcare-associated infection represents a public health problem in all countries. COVID-19 patients can rapidly overwhelm the capacities of healthcare systems. As more patients are hospitalized, healthcare workers (HCW) at the frontline of care are at the greatest risk of infection. This study aimed to assess the knowledge and self-reported behavior of healthcare professionals in Hatta Hospital regarding COVID-19 infection prevention and control (IPC) during this emerging infectious disease pandemic. A descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted in Hatta hospital, United Arab Emirates (UAE) among one hundred HCWs using a self-administered questionnaire based on UAE National and World Health Organization (WHO) IPC guidelines. Of the study participants, 66% received COVID-19 IPC training inside Hatta hospital. The mean knowledge and behavior scores were $75.7\% \pm 9.4$ and $87.6\% \pm 5.9$, respectively. Knowledge score and behavior score were not related to gender ($p = 0.232, 0.091$, respectively) and to work position ($p = 0.882, 0.994$, respectively), however, they were related to the previous contact with COVID-19 patients ($p = 0.001, 0.011$, respectively). Nonetheless, gaps in IPC knowledge and behavior have been identified and need improvement. This includes donning and doffing of PPE and optimal use of protective measures especially respirators (N95 or FFP2).

Copyright, IJAR, 2024. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

On 30 January 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak a Public Health Emergency of International Concern [1]. The COVID-19 pandemic, caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), had become a global challenge [2]. COVID-19 had spread worldwide especially with the aid of commercial air travel [3]. The spread of COVID-19 was explained by the phenomenon of 'superspreading', whereby a COVID-19 patient may have transmitted the disease to up to eight contacts [4]. Any delay in the recognition of the disease and the application of effective control measure areas increased the probability of the spread of the virus. The increasing numbers of COVID-19 patients could rapidly overwhelm the capacities of healthcare systems. As

more patients were hospitalized, healthcare workers at the frontline of care were at the greatest risk of infection [5]. Infection control encompassed all the policies, procedures, and measures used to prevent or minimize the risk of transmission of infectious disease in healthcare facilities [6]. Appropriate hospital infection control measures have been recently shown to prevent nosocomial transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [5]. If infection control measures were not widely followed, healthcare facilities may dramatically speed up the spread of the virus amongst staff [7]. In Italy, 2020 infection rates of healthcare workers were five times that of the general population [7]. By the end of the last Ebola epidemic in West Africa in 2016, the rate of infection among healthcare workers was 21 to 32 times that of the general population [7]. Left unchecked, the current pandemic could attain comparable levels and lead to the failure of healthcare systems [7].

A positive correlation was found between knowledge regarding COVID-19 among HCWs and appropriate clinical practices [8]. The contact with confirmed and suspected COVID-19 patients did not promote self-reported IPC behaviors in low-risk areas, but in high-risk departments, IPC behaviors have significantly improved after the COVID-19 outbreak [9].

Very few studies report on the Knowledge and behavior of COVID 19 IPC. A national survey of UK medical students and interim foundation doctors in 2020 during the COVID-19 pandemic showed that the levels of self-reported PPE and IPC training were sub-optimal [10]. In UAE a study in Al Ain, (2020) indicated that there was a significant gap in knowledge and perception about COVID-19 [11]. However, in UAE and the Middle East, no study has been done regarding COVID 19 IPC knowledge and behavior in the HCW.

International health regulations have dictated five public health measures to manage an outbreak: prevention, detection, response, enabling function, and operational readiness [2]. The best approach to control a pandemic was through the simultaneous application of preventive measures and sensitive diagnoses [12]. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the knowledge and self-reported behavior of healthcare professionals in Hatta Hospital regarding COVID-19 IPC and to identify any gaps that might increase the risk of infection.

Materials and Methods:-

Research questions

1. Did healthcare professionals (HCP) in Hatta Hospital have up-to-date knowledge about COVID-19 IPC?
2. Did this knowledge affect their behavior regarding COVID-19 IPC measures?

Research Methods:-

This is a cross-sectional descriptive study. Comprised of a convenient sample of healthcare professionals working at Hatta Hospital who were willing to participate in the study.

Questionnaire

A semi-structured paper-based questionnaire was created by the author after reviewing the United Arab Emirates (UAE) national guidelines course materials on emerging respiratory viruses, including COVID-19 [13] and WHO IPC guidelines [14, 15, 16, 17] as well as WHO commonly asked questions that cover all parts related to COVID-19 IPC [18].

Two infection control experts (qualified infection control consultants at Suez Canal University) who also have access to the materials used for developing the questionnaire have validated the questionnaire.

Following the validation process, five physicians and ten nurses from Hatta Hospital tested the pilot questionnaire throughout the 3rd week of May 2021 to institute clarity, ease of comprehension, and content of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was then revised according to the raised concerns throughout the 4th week of May 2021.

The first page of the questionnaire (appendix 1) encompassed a consent form along with an explanation of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was comprised of three sections:

First: Demographic data (e.g., age, gender, years of experience).

Second: Knowledge regarding COVID-19 IPC (e.g., routes of transmission, incubation period, fatality rate, and types of protective measures in different situations). There were thirteen multiple-choice and rearrangement questions with 1 point to correct answer and zero point to incorrect answer with a total score of 31.

Third: Behavior about COVID-19 IPC practice (e.g., frequency of following respiratory hygiene practices, educating patient and relatives about cough and sneeze etiquette, designating staff who will be responsible for caring for suspected or known COVID-19 patients). It included 31 questions with answers ranging from (never, not at all) to (always, excellent).

Response to each item recorded on the 4-point Likert scale as follows: always or excellent (4-points), most of the time or above average (3-points), average or occasionally (2-points), below average or rarely (1-points), and not at all or never with a total score of 124. A score above 80% was considered as good behavior [19,20].

The definition according to the WHO checklist and adapted by us was that: Always or excellent means more than 95% of the time. Most of the time or above-average means 50% to under 95% of the time. Occasionally or average means 20% to less than 50% of the time and rarely or below-average means less than 20% of the time [14].

Data collection;

The final paper-based questionnaire was given to the participants in person and administered by the respondents themselves (self-administered throughout the 1st week of June 2021).

Participants' inclusion criteria: Health care professionals at Hatta Hospital, including doctors, nurses, technicians, and pharmacists. Hatta Hospital staffing at the time of the study: 112 doctors, 239 nurses, 99 technicians, and 10 pharmacists. The sample size was at least 80 participants according to the following equation [21].

$$n = \left[\frac{Z_{\alpha/2} \cdot \sigma}{E} \right]^2$$

Where

n = sample size

$Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$ (The critical value that divides the central 95% of the Z distribution from the 5% in the tail)

σ = the estimate of the standard deviation = 1.3

E = the margin of error (= width of confidence interval) = 0.5

Exclusion criteria:

Other hospital staff and uncompleted questionnaire.

Ethical considerations

The first page of the questionnaire consisted of an explanation of the aim, objectives, and methods of the study as well as an informed consent to be agreed by the participants before they can advance to the questionnaire.

The participants' identities were kept anonymous, and the collected data was saved in a secure file, and was strictly confidential and used for this research purpose only. Participants were aware that this study required voluntary participation, and their participation had no bearing on their primary work position.

The participants had the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Ethics approval:

The study was performed following the deliberation of the Dubai Scientific Research Ethics Committee (DSREC) and ethical approval reference number: USRRC-GL-2021-04-03.

Data Analysis:-

Analysis was by frequencies and percent for qualitative data and mean \pm standard deviation for quantitative data (such as age and years of experience). The significance of the relationship between quantitative variables would be tested by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent sample t-test for parametric quantitative data.

Correlation Coefficient was used to assess the strength and direction of the relationships between variables as years of experience and knowledge scores. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were conducted using the SPSS for Windows statistical package 9 (version 22).

Results:-

One hundred sixty-three health care professionals from Hatta hospital participated in this study. However, only one hundred submitted complete questionnaires and were included in this study. The description of their demographic profile is shown in Table 1. The mean age was 37.9 ± 6.12 years and 57% were female. Twenty-eight percent were from the Emergency Medicine department, 13% from Family Medicine, 11% from ICU, 9% from Radiology department, 7% Surgery and 6% Obstetrics and Gynecology departments, and (2%) were from the Anesthesia department. The majority (58%) were Nurses and 27% were doctors. Regarding the main source of information, 42% use social media, circular hospital announcements, and scientific journals as main sources of information. Table 1 also contains training and COVID 19 contact.

Table 1:- Description of the demographic profile of study participants (n=100).

Characteristics	Values	
Age (years)	Mean \pm SD	37.9 \pm 6.12
	Range	30–59
Gender	Male	43%
	Female	57%
Work position	Doctor	27%
	Nurse	58%
	Pharmacist	4%
	Technician	11%
Years of experience	Mean \pm SD	13.5 \pm 5.1
	Range	6–35
Sources of information regarding COVID-19 infection	Social media	68%
	Circular hospital announcement	66%
	Scientific journal	55%

Table 2:- Shows the percent of correct knowledge of all participants. The mean percentage of correct knowledge was 75.7 ± 9.4 .

	Workshop	27%
	Other	13%
Previous direct care contact with COVID-19 patient	No	9%
	Yes	91%
Training for COVID-19 infection prevention and control	Hatta hospital training	65%
	Self-study	44%
	National training	10%
	Training in another hospital	6%
	Other	4%
	None	10%

Regarding the incubation period and fatality rate of COVID-19, 89 (89%) of participants knew that the incubation period was 1-14 days; and 53 (53%) knew that the fatality rate of COVID-19 was 3%. Only 45 (45%) knew about the three most common routes of COVID-19 transmission, which were through the droplet, direct contact transmission, and aerosol transmission, while 51 (51%) of the participants had misunderstandings regarding water transmission.

As regards the aerosol-generating procedure, 54 participants (54%) had known the three most aerosol-generating procedures i.e the tracheal intubation procedure, nebulizer treatment, and open airway suction. Sixty six (56%) of participants had misconception regarding the collection of sputum as aerosol-generating procedure.

Assessing the knowledge about protective measures required during triage of suspected COVID-19 patients revealed that 59 participants (59%) knew that medical masks should be used. Besides, 80 participants (80%) have a misconception about using respirators (N95 or FFP2).

Regarding the knowledge about protective measures required during transporting of a suspected/confirmed case of COVID-19 including direct patient care, 48% knew the four recommended protective measures, single-use gloves, goggles, and medical masks. Nevertheless, 84 participants (84%) had a misunderstanding of the utilization of respirators as a protective measure. (Table 2)

Table 2 also presents participants' knowledge about types of PPEs required during collecting a respiratory specimen. Only forty-one participants (41%) knew the four recommended protective measures, the gowns, goggles, single-use gloves, and medical masks. Eighty-seven of the participants (87%) misunderstood the utilization of respirators as being required during collecting the respiratory specimen. Among the total participants, 89 (89%) knew about the four most protective measures required during aerosol-generating procedures, which include single-use gloves, respirators, gowns, and goggles.

Regarding knowledge about the approaches that help to prevent transmission of COVID-19, 66 (66%) knew all four approaches that help to prevent transmission of COVID-19, hand hygiene, staying home, covering nose and mouth while coughing, and rapid assessment. All 100 participants (100%) believed that hand hygiene was the very essential approach that could help prevent transmission of COVID-19. (Table 2)

Regarding correct steps of donning and doffing PPEs, fifty-nine participants (59%) knew and followed the correct donning steps of PPEs. In addition, 58 participants (58%) knew the correct doffing steps of PPEs. Concerning knowledge about actions needed in case of concerns regarding a breach of PPE during patient care, only 37 participants (37%) knew the three actions that should be taken. These actions include removing and changing PPE away from the patient in 71 participants (71%), leaving the patient care area when safe to do so in 64 participants (64%), reporting it to the direct line manager and infection control unit in 56 participants (56%). (Table 2)

Table 2:- Knowledge about COVID-19 IPC in study participants (n=100).

Description	Correct results
Incubation period	89%
Fatality rate	53%
Knowledge about most likely routes of COVID-19 transmission	43%
Types of aerosol-generating procedures	54%
Types of protective measures required during triage of a non-suspected COVID-19 patient	56%
Types of protective measures required during triage of a suspected COVID-19 Patient	59%
Types of protective measures required during transporting of a suspected/confirmed case of COVID-19 including direct patient care	48%
Types of protective measures required during collecting a respiratory specimen	41%
Types of protective measures required during aerosol-generating procedures on COVID-19 patient	89%
Knowledge about approaches that help to prevent transmission of COVID-19	66%
Knowing the correct steps of PPE donning techniques.	59%
Knowing the correct steps of PPE doffing techniques.	58%
Participants' knowledge about actions that should be taken in case of concerns regarding a breach of PPE during patient care.	37%

Mean±SDofKnowledgescore	75.7±9.4
-------------------------	----------

Table 3 shows self-reported behaviors on the frequency of using PPEs in study participants during a healthcare interaction with a COVID-19 patient. Ninety-two participants (92%) stated that they always use single-use gloves. About the utilization of surgical masks, the majority of the participants always have good behavior in using the surgical mask, which is equivalent to 90 participants (90%), while 53 (53%) had good behavior when using or regarding eye goggles. Seventy-three participants (73%) had always utilized gowns. Generally, these results showed that the majority of the participants have good behavior in using the mentioned PPEs during their interaction with a COVID-19 patient.

Table 4 presented self-reported participants' behavior on the frequency of using PPEs during an aerosol-generating procedure on a COVID. For single-use gloves, 87 participants (87%) reported that they always use gloves. While 76 participants (76%) always utilized the N95 mask. 69 participants (69%) always used goggles. 60 participants (60%) always utilized gowns, whereas, 59 participants (59%) used the apron always. Overall, the majority of the participants have good behavior towards the use of PPEs during an aerosol-generating procedure on COVID-19 patients.

During a health care interaction with the COVID-19 patient, the self-reported behavior on the frequency of performing hand hygiene before touching the patient was performed always in 74 participants (74%). Seventy-eight of them (78%) responded that they always performed hand hygiene after touching the patient. While, hand hygiene was being performed always before or after any cleaning or aseptic procedure as perceived by 83 participants (83%), hand hygiene after body fluid exposure was always performed by 75 participants (75%). On the other hand, hand hygiene after touching the patient's surroundings was always performed in 71 participants (71%). These results showed good behavior among the studied participants were in a majority often performed hand hygiene during their interaction with COVID-19 patients (Table 5).

Regarding the self-reported rate of training about infection prevention and control regarding the COVID-19 outbreak during the previous 6 months. As regards infection control policies and procedures training, 41 participants (41%) rated above average and excellent training for 38 participants (38%). For hand washing techniques, 42 participants (42%) rated it both excellent and above average respectively. About N95 mask-wearing techniques, 46 participants (46%) rated it excellent and above average for 33 participants (33%). On wearing gloves, 46 participants (46%) rated it excellent and above average for 43 participants (43%). Concerning wearing goggles or face shields rated excellent by 47 participants (47%) and above average in 40 participants (40%). Regarding the removal and disposal of PPEs, 40 participants (40%) rated it excellent and above average for 44 participants (44%). The results show that the majority of the participants have good behavior regarding training about the COVID-19 outbreak during the last 6 months. (Table 6)

Table 7 shows the rate of different preventive actions performed to prevent COVID-19. Removing and replacing PPEs according to protocols was always performed in 62 participants (62%). 57 participants (57%) always observed following respiratory hygiene. While on triage patients for respiratory symptoms, fifty-five participants (55%) always performed it. Keeping a one-meter distance between the patients was always followed by 58 participants (58%). Besides, offering a medical mask for a suspected COVID-19 patient was always performed by 67 participants (67%). Educating patients and relatives about cough and sneeze etiquette was always performed by 65 participants (65%). Avoiding touching eyes, mouth, or nose was always performed by 76 participants (76%). 56 participants (56%) always report limit movements suspected/confirmed patients with COVID-19 patients inside of the facility. Placing suspected/confirmed patients with COVID-19 in an isolation room was always followed in 71 participants (71%). Furthermore, 67 participants (67%) always performed environmental disinfection after each patient. Reporting to a superior/higher up was always applied in 68 participants (68%).

Table 3:- Self-reported behaviors on the frequency of using PPEs during a healthcare interaction with a COVID-19 patient.

Description	Values
Most of the time	8%

Single-usegloves	Always	92%
	Mostoftime	7%
Surgicalmask	Always	90%
	Mostoftime	28%
Goggles	Always	53%
	Mostoftime	15%
Gowns	Always	73%

Table4:-Self-reported behaviorsonthe frequencyof usingPPEsduringanaerosol-generating procedureona COVID-19 patient.

Description		
Single-usegloves	Mostoftime	6%
	Always	87%
N95mask	Mostoftime	11%
	Always	76%
Goggles	Mostoftime	13%
	Always	69%
Gowns	Mostoftime	26%
	Always	60%
Apron	Mostoftime	22%
	Always	59%

Table5:-Self-reportedbehaviorsonthe frequencyof performinghandhygieneduringahealthcare interactionwitha COVID-19patient.

Description		Values
Performhandhygienebeforetouchingthepatient	Mostoftime	24%
	Always	74%
Performhandhygieneaftertouchingthepatient	Mostoftime	17%
	Always	78%
Performhandhygienebeforeorafteranycleaningorasepticprocedure	Mostoftime	13%
	Always	83%
Performhandhygieneafterbodyfluidexposure	Mostoftime	20%
	Always	75%
Performhandhygieneaftertouchingthepatient'ssurroundings	Mostoftime	18%
	Always	71%

Table6:-Self-reported rateofparticipants'trainingregardingthe COVID-19outbreakduringtheprevious6months.

Description		Values
Infectioncontrolpoliciesand procedures	Aboveaverage	41%
	Excellent	38%
Handwashingtechniques	Aboveaverage	42%
	Excellent	42%
N95mask-wearingtechniques	Aboveaverage	33%
	Excellent	46%
Wearinggloves	Aboveaverage	43%
	Excellent	46%
Wearinggogglesorafaceshield	Aboveaverage	40%
	Excellent	47%
Removaland disposaloffPPEs	Aboveaverage	40%
	Excellent	44%

Table7:-Self-reported Participants'rateofperformingpreventiveactionsrelatedto COVID-19.

Description	Mostoftime	Always
Removeand replacePPEsaccordingtoprotocol	35%	62%

Follow respiratory hygiene practice	35%	57%
Triage patients for respiratory symptoms	27%	55%
Keep a one-meter distance between the patients	36%	58%
Offer medical mask for a suspected COVID-19 patient	23%	67%
Educate patient and relatives about cough hands sneeze etiquette	30%	65%
Avoid touching your eyes, mouth, or nose	18%	76%
Limit suspected/confirmed patients with COVID-19 patients inside of the facility	40%	56%
Place suspected/confirmed patients with COVID-19 in an isolation room	21%	71%
Ensure environmental disinfection after each patient	25%	67%
Report to superior/higher up	27%	68%

Table 8 shows the Knowledge and Behavior scores. The mean knowledge score was 23.5 ± 2.9 (75.7±9.4%), and the mean Behavior score was 108.6 ± 7.3 (87.6±5.9%). The highest achievable Knowledge score possible is 31 and the Behavior score is 123

Table 8:- Knowledge and behavior scores in study participants (n=100).

Description		Achieved Value	Best possible value	Percentage achieved
Knowledge score	Mean±SD	23.5±2.9	31	75.7±9.4
	Range	16 – 31		51.6–100
	Median	23		74.2
Behavior score	Mean±SD	108.6± 7.3	124	87.6±5.9
	Range	89–123		71.8–99.2
	Median	110		88.7

Table 9 shows the relationship between different categories of healthcare professionals and their Knowledge and Behavior regarding COVID-19 Infection Prevention and Control. There was no statistical significance difference between different work positions regarding their knowledge and behavior about the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on the knowledge mean score and percentage of the total score achieved, it was 23.6 ± 2.2 (76.0±7.1%) for doctors, 23.3 ± 2.9 (75.5±9.5%) for nurses, 24.3 ± 3.5 (78.3±11.3%) for pharmacists, and 23.3 ± 4.1 (75.1±13.4%) for technician; where (p= 0.882). Similarly, for behavior, it was 108.9 ± 5.7 (87.8±4.6%) for doctors, 109.1 ± 9.3 (87.6±6.5%) for nurse, 106.5 ± 9.1 (85.9±7.4%) in pharmacist, and 108.8 ± 6.6 (87.7±5.3%) for technician (p-value=0.938).

Table 9:- Relation between work position and knowledge and behavior scores.

Description	Work position				Kruskal-Wallis	p-value
	Doctor (N=27)	Nurse (N=58)	Pharmacist (N=4)	Technician (N=11)		
Knowledge score	23.6±2.2	23.3±2.9	24.3±3.5	23.3±4.1	0.66	0.882NS
	76.0±7.1%	75.5±9.5%	78.3±11.3%	75.1±13.4%	0.66	0.362NS
Behavior score Mean±SD	108.9±5.7	109.1±9.3	106.5±9.1	108.8±6.6	0.41	0.938NS
	87.8±4.6%	87.6±6.5%	85.9±7.4%	87.7±5.3%	0.362	0.948NS

As shown in Table 10, the knowledge and behavior scores compared to each other and experience and age. There was no statistical significance (p = 0.331) and correlation (r = 0.098) between knowledge and behavior score, no statistical significance (p=0.283) and correlation (r=- 0.1) between knowledge score and years of experience. In addition, between behavior scores and years of experience, there was no statistical significance (p = 0.925) and correlation (r = -0.01). At the same time, there was no statistical significance (p = 0.921) and correlation (r=-0.01) between knowledge score and age, and similarly, there was no statistical significance (p = 0.590) and correlation (r = -0.05) between behavior scores vs age.

Table10:-Correlationbetweenyearsofexperience, ageandknowledge,andbehaviorscores.

Variables	(r)	p-value
KnowledgescorevsBehaviorscore	0.098	0.331NS
KnowledgescorevsyearsofExperience	-0.1	0.283NS
Behaviorscorevsyears ofExperience	-0.01	0.925NS
Knowledgescorevs.age	-0.01	0.921NS
Behaviorscorevs.age	-0.05	0.590NS

(r): Pearsoncorrelationcoefficient.NS:statisticallyinsignificant

Table 11 presents the relation between the percent of correct knowledge and the different basic data of the study participants. There was no statistical significant relationship between knowledge and gender or work position. On the other hand, there was a statistical significant difference (p = 0.001), between knowledge and contact with COVID-19 cases., The percent of correct knowledge was higher in individuals in contact with COVID-19 cases (76.6±9.01%) than individuals without contact with COVID-19 cases (65.9±7.4%)

Table 11:- Relationship between knowledge score and gender, work position, and COVID-19 contact.

Description	Variables	No	correct knowledge score	Correct Knowledge e%	Test	P-value
Gender	Male	43%	23.9± 2.9	77±9.5	T=1.2	0.232NS
	Female	57%	23.2±2.8	74.7±9.2		
Work Position	Doctor	27%	23.6±2.2	75.9±7.1	KW=0.66	0.882NS
	Nurse	58%	23.3±2.9	75.5±9.5		
	Pharmacist	4%	24.3±3.5	78.3±11.3		
	Technician	11%	23.3±4.1	75.1± 13.4		
COVID contact	No	9%	20.4±2.3	65.9±7.4	MW =141	0.001S
	Yes	91%	23.8±2.8	76.6±9.01		

T:IndependentsampleTtest.

NS: p-value > 0.05 is considered non-significant.KW:Kruskal–Wallistest
 NS: p-value > 0.05 is considered non-significant.MW:Mann-Whitneytest
 S:p-value<0.05isconsideredsignificant.

In table 12, the relationship between the percent of good behavior and different basic data of the study participants. The results showed that there was no statistical significant difference (p=0.091), between the percent of good behavior and the gender of the participants (where; male=88.7±5.01 and female=86.7±6.3). There was also no statistical significance (p=0.944), between percent of good behaviors and work position of the participants (where; doctor=87.8±4.6, nurse= 87.6 ± 6.4, pharmacist = 85.9 ± 7.3, and technician = 87.7 ± 5.2). While there is a statistical significance (p = 0.011) in the percent of good behavior in that HCP in contact with COVID-19 cases compared to those not in contact (88.04±5.4% vs 82.8± 8.5 respectively).

Table12:-Relationshipbetweenbehaviorscore andgender,work position,andCOVID-19contact.

Description	Variables	P	Behaviorscore	Behaviorscore%	Test	P-value
Gender	Male	43%	110.7±8.2	88.7±5.01	T =1.7	0.091 NS
	Female	57%	107.5±7.8	86.7±6.3		
Work Position	Doctor	27%	108.9±5.7	87.8±4.6	F =0.12	0.944 NS
	Nurse	58%	109.1±9.3	87.6±6.4		

	Pharmacist	4%	106.5±9.2	85.9±7.3		
	Technician	11%	108.8± 6.6	87.7±5.2		
COVIDcontact	No	9%	102.8±10.6	82.8±8.5	T=2.6	0.011 S
	Yes	91%	109.5± 7.6	88.04±5.4		

T: IndependentsampleTtest.

F: FvalueofANOVAtest.

NS: p-value >0.05isconsiderednon-significant.

S:p-value<0.05isconsideredsignificant.

Discussion:-

Health care workers, in particular those in contact with COVID-19 patients, are at higher risk of being infected with COVID-19 than the general population. Despite the healthworkers representing less than 3% of the population in the large majority of countries and less than 2% in almost all low-and middle-income countries, about 14% of COVID-19 cases reported to WHO are among healthworkers [22]. The proportion can be as high as 35% in some countries [23]. WHO estimates that in the period between January 2020 to May 2021, between 80000 and 180000 health and care workers could have died from COVID-19 [24].

The first confirmed case in the United Arab Emirates was announced on 29 January 2020. It was the first country in the Middle East to report a confirmed case [25]. According to the UAE National Emergency Crisis and Disaster Management Authority's latest report about coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in November 2021, the total number of COVID-19 patients was 741433, and the death rate was 21.678 per million [26]. No published statistics regarding the infection rate among HCW in UAE are available. An early survey on HCWs in Al Ain, UAE in 2020 indicated that there was a significant gap in knowledge and perception about the COVID-19 virus [11].

Available scientific evidence suggests that appropriate personal protective equipment use, hand hygiene best practices, implementation of universal masking policies in healthcare facilities, and adequate infection prevention and control (IPC) training and education are associated with decreased risk of COVID-19 among health care workers [22].

Mitigating and reducing the risk of infection in the HCW is essential to protecting their well-being and reducing the spread of COVID-19 [22]. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the knowledge and self-reported behavior of healthcare professionals in Hatta Hospital regarding COVID-19 IPC and to identify any gaps that might increase the risk of infection.

This is a cross-sectional descriptive study that used a semi-structured self-administered paper-based questionnaire involving a convenient sample of healthcare professionals (HCP) working at Hatta Hospital who were willing to participate in the study during the first week of June 2021.

Hatta hospital HCP depends on different sources of information to build up their knowledge regarding COVID-19 infection and prevention control. The majority (68%) was from social media, hospital circular announcements (66%), and scientific journals (55%). There was the use of multiple sources of information (42%) not relying on social media only most probably reflected on their knowledge score. A similar study showed that the most often mentioned source of information about COVID-19 was the ministry of health website or WHO official websites and social media with only a small percent reporting course or training as their source of information [20]. This was unlike other studies where social media was the main source [27, 28].

Regarding COVID-19 IPC training, ninety percent of participants were involved in various training approaches, sixty-five percent acquired most of their training inside Hatta hospital, (44%) reported self-study, and (10%) received

national training, and (4%) learned from another training facility program and all these approaches affected their knowledge and behavior. This was unlike the national survey conducted on the United Kingdom (UK) medical students and interim foundation doctors during the COVID-19 pandemic, which showed sub-optimal self-reported PPE (43%) and IPC training (56%) in medical students from 33 medical schools in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic during March 2020 [10].

In the current study, the knowledge level of HCP about COVID-19 IPC was high. The mean correct answer rate was $75.7 \pm 9.4\%$. However, the knowledge level was still less than other studies conducted in Egypt (80.4%), China (90%), and Pakistan (93.2%) [20, 27, 28]. On the other hand, in a study from the United Arab Emirates, poor knowledge about the disease transmission (61%), and the symptom (63.6%) was found in a significant proportion of HCWs [11], this may be due to the current study, concentrated on COVID-19 IPC measures while the previous study discussed COVID-19 as a disease in general.

This study showed that 89% of participants knew about the COVID-19 incubation period (1-14 days). A similar study showed that approximately 96.19% of HCWs indicated that the incubation period of the virus is 1-14 days. This time was very important in preventing disease spread, and suspected individuals must quarantine for 14 days until symptom appearance or arrival of laboratory reports [29].

Based on the responses of the participants, only 45% knew about the three most common routes of COVID-19 transmission. Individually, however, 85% chose droplet transmission, 69% direct contact transmission, and 51% aerosol transmission as routes of transmission. However, 51% had a misconception that it was transmissible through the water. In a study from Jeddah city, Saudi Arabia (2020), the majority of HCWs displayed sufficient awareness of virus transmission mode, droplets emitted during coughing (97.46%), physical contact with infected individuals (96.38%), and sharing clothing/towels (84.07%). However, 54.25% thought of water as a source of COVID-19 transmission [29].

Only 54% in the study knew all the three most aerosol-generating procedures, the tracheal intubation procedure, nebulizer treatment, and open airway suctioning. This is a large knowledge gap, as aerosol-generating procedures have been associated with an increased risk of transmission of COVID-19 [17]. Moreover, additional airborne precautions are needed when performing aerosol-generating procedures other than contact and Droplet precautions [17]. However, 56% of participants had misconceptions regarding the collection of sputum as an aerosol-generating procedure. This may explain the overuse of respirators during sputum collection.

The current study showed above-average knowledge about protective measures required during dealing with suspected COVID-19 patients in different situations especially using the medical mask. These results support the previous literature that facemasks are the most essential preventive measures in PPE for healthcare professionals [30]. In contrast, Kumaret al. [31] found HCWs' knowledge regarding the role of facemasks in the prevention of the disease to be moderate to poor. On the other hand, Olum et al., [32] found about 17% of HCWs believed that wearing general medical masks was not protective against COVID-19.

One of the findings in the study was the overuse of respirators (N95 or FFP2) that were recorded and reported from 80 to 87% in different situations. This may be due to fear of being infected or transmitting the infection to their families followed by their belief that the disease is highly transmissible [20].

This study showed good knowledge about approaches that help to prevent transmission of COVID-19 score. Sixty-six percent of study participants knew all four approaches that help to prevent transmission of COVID-19, hand hygiene, staying home, covering nose and mouth while coughing, and rapid assessment. All 100 participants (100%) believed that hand hygiene was the very essential approach that could help prevent transmission of COVID-19. Hand hygiene is recognized globally as a leading measure of IPC, which is effective in decreasing the transmission of common respiratory viruses, including human coronaviruses and it had been used in responding to SARS, and Ebola [9].

Another area of knowledge gap which needs improvement, was the correct steps of donning and doffing PPEs as only 59% knew and followed the correct donning steps of PPEs. In addition, only 58% knew the correct doffing steps of PPEs. A similar finding showed from a national survey of UK medical students, as the sufficiency of PPE information was significantly worse than that of IPC training. Furthermore, the same UK study stated that it might be desirable to examine the proficiency of IPC measures and include 'donning and doffing' as a skill required for medical graduation [10].

As regards to self-reported behavior of the participants on COVID-19 IPC measures in the current study, the participants have shown a good overall behavior score of 87.6% (SD=5.9), similar to Suleiman et al. study showed that: adherence to safety measures was 80.4% [19]. Also, Al-Hanawi et al. reported that optimistic attitudes of (94.1%) among study participants [33].

There was no statistical significance difference between different work positions, age, gender, work position, and years of experience regarding their knowledge and behavior about the COVID-19 pandemic. Olumetal. in Uganda reported no significant difference in the level of knowledge about COVID among HCWs irrespective of their professions or qualifications [32]. In other studies, physicians had a significantly higher level of knowledge followed by pharmacists and nurses [34, 35]. Similarly, Wahed et al. in Egypt stated that the level of knowledge about COVID-19 was significantly associated with younger age groups especially 20–30 years, and with superior education levels [20]. In this study, there was no statistical significance ($p = 0.331$) and negative correlation ($r = 0.098$) between knowledge and behavior scores despite good recording scores in both sections. This was unlike other studies that found a good knowledge in HCW was significantly associated with this positive attitude [20, 28, 34]. Even the studies that included the general population showed that a higher knowledge level was associated with a positive attitude [35, 36]. According to Wahed et al., [20] knowledge of HCWs is a very important prerequisite for prevention beliefs, positive attitudes, and promoting positive practices. It also affects their coping strategies to some level. This may be related to the gap shown in the current study knowledge and high self-reported behavior.

On the other hand, there was a statistical significant difference between knowledge and contact with COVID-19 patients, the percent of correct knowledge was higher in individuals in contact with COVID-19 cases ($76.6 \pm 9.01\%$) than individuals without COVID-19 contact ($65.9 \pm 7.4\%$). The Egyptian study similarly found being in direct contact with COVID-19 patients significantly increases the knowledge level as direct dealing with patients makes HCWs more motivated to know about the disease and to search for scientific materials and guidelines [20].

The current study reported that there was a statistical significance in the percent of behavior in that HCP in contact with COVID-19 cases compared to those not in contact ($88.04 \pm 5.4\%$ vs 82.8 ± 8.5 respectively). Remarkably, a study on healthcare workers in China showed the self-reported IPC behaviors of HCWs significantly improved after the COVID-19 outbreak. HCWs who were in the affected area and high-risk departments reported better IPC behavior [8]. This was opposite to Lai et al., also from China who reported that the contact with confirmed and suspected COVID-19 patients did not promote self-reported IPC behaviors, which may result from the higher workload and lack of resources such as gowns [9].

Limitation:-

The limitation of this study was that out of 163 participants only 100 (61%) completed the questionnaire and were included in our study. This study was from one hospital only and cannot be generalized to other Dubai health authorities (DHA) hospitals or UAE hospitals. Moreover, IPC's self-reported behavior score of HCWs may be overestimated, because HCWs may respond to interview questions in a way that they believe is socially acceptable rather than being completely accurate.

Strength

This study concentrated mainly on COVID-19 IPC measures unlike other studies focused on the virus itself.

Conclusions:-

This study revealed that: Hattah hospital used varieties of COVID-19 IPC training techniques and approaches to prevent and control the transmission of the virus among HCP. There was a high level of overall COVID-19 IPC

knowledge and behavior. Nevertheless, many gaps in knowledge and behavior have been identified. This includes donning and doffing of PPE and optimal use of protective measures especially respirators (N95 or FFP2), which can be corrected to further enhance the protection against COVID-19 among the HCP.

Recommendations:-

Based on the results on knowledge and behavior of the studied participants about COVID-19 IPC, some of the commendations that need to consider are:

Strengthening the COVID-19 IPC knowledge awareness through various training, workshop-seminar, and IPC programs to improve the level of healthcare workers especially in terms of PPE donning and doffing steps and types of protective measures indicated in different patient approaches and included in annual HCP mandatory education.

Furthermore, direct observation study to evaluate actual IPC behavior.

Acknowledgments:-

I express my deep and sincere gratitude to my research supervisors for giving me guidance, motivation and vision that had always set me on the right track. I am grateful to all the participants who filled the questionnaire; providing their valuable time and contribution to this work. I am grateful to Maitha Almansoori, head of the Health Informatics unit of Hattah hospital, for facilitating research conduction and ethical approval.

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References:-

1. WHO. Novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) situation report 11. 31 Jan, 2020. <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/2020>
2. Kandel, N., Chungong, S., Omaar, A., & Xing, J. (2020). Health security capacities in the context of COVID-19 outbreak: an analysis of International Health Regulations annual report data from 182 countries. *The Lancet*, 395(10229), 1047-1053. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30553-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30553-5)
3. Lee, A. (2020). Wuhan novel coronavirus (COVID-19): why global control is challenging?. *Public Health*, 179, .. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.02.001>
4. Kucharski, A. J., & Althaus, C. L. (2015). The role of superspreading in Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) transmission. *Eurosurveillance*, 20(25), 21167. <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES2015.20.25.21167>
5. Cheng, V. C., Wong, S. C., Chen, J. H., Yip, C. C., Chuang, V. W., Tsang, O. T., ... & Yuen, K. Y. (2020). Escalating infection control response to the rapidly evolving epidemiology of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) due to SARS-CoV-2 in Hong Kong. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*, 41(5), 493-498. Press: 05 March 2020, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2020.58>.
6. Gulilat, K., & Tiruneh, G. (2014). Assessment of knowledge, attitude, and practice of health care workers on infection prevention in health institution Bahir Dar city administration. *Sci J Public Health*, 2(5), 384-3. DOI: 10.11648/j.sjph.20140205.13
7. Bedoya, G., & Dolinger, A. (2020). Supporting Vulnerable Health Systems Improve Infection Prevention and Control to Fight the COVID-19 Pandemic. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/33481> License: CCBY 3.0 IGO."
8. Limbu, D. K., Piryani, R. M., & Sunny, A. K. (2020). Healthcare workers' knowledge, attitude, and practices during the COVID-19 pandemic response in a tertiary care hospital of Nepal. *PloS one*, 15(11), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-020-00746-1> e0242126. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal>
9. Lai, X., Wang, X., Yang, Q., Xu, X., Tang, Y., Liu, C., & Chen, H. (2020). Will healthcare workers improve infection prevention and control behaviors as COVID-19 risk emerges and increases, in China?. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control*, 9(1), 1-9
10. Norton, E. J., Georgiou, I., Fung, A., Nazari, A., Bandyopadhyay, S., & Saunders, K. E. (2021). Personal protective equipm

- entandinfectionpreventionandcontrol:anationalsurveyofUKmedicalstudents andinterimfoundationdoctorsduringthe COVID-19pandemic. *JournalofPublicHealth*,43(1),67-75.(1-HTTPhtp://doi:10.1093/PubMed/fdaa187
11. Bhagavathula, A. S., Aldhaleei, W. A., Rahmani, J., Mahabadi, M. A., & Bandari, D. K. (2020). Novel coronavirus (COVID-19) knowledge and perceptions: a survey on healthcare workers. *MedRxiv*.<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.09.20033381>doi
 12. CDC.DifferentCOVID-19Vaccines.Dec20,2020.<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/differentvaccines.html>
 13. National Clinical Committee for COVID-19 Management. (2020). National Guidelines for Clinical Management and Treatment of COVID-19 1st June 2020 Prepared and Reviewed by National Clinical Committee for COVID-19 Management Approved by Technical team for Pandemic Control National Guidelines for Clinical Management.
 14. World Health Organization. (2020). Health worker exposure risk assessment and management in the context of COVID-19 virus: interim guidance, 4 March 2020 (No. WHO/2019-Nov/HCW_riskassessment/2020.1). World Health Organization.
 15. World Health Organization. (2020). Mask use in the context of COVID-19: interim guidance, 1 December 2020 (No. WHO/2019-Nov/IPC_Masks/2020.5). World Health Organization.
 16. WHO. (2020). The COVID-19 risk communication package for healthcare facilities
 17. World Health Organization. (2019). Infection prevention and control during health care for probable or confirmed cases of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) infection: interim guidance: updated October 2019 (No. WHO/MERS/IPC/15.1 Rev.1). World Health Organization.
 18. The World Health Organization Q&A on coronaviruses (COVID-19) (2020). Retrieved April 20, 2020 from <https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/q-a-coronavirusesp>
 19. Suleiman, A., Bsisu, I., Guzu, H., Santarisi, A., Alsatari, M., Abbad, A., & Almustafa, M. (2020). Preparedness of frontline doctors in Jordan healthcare facilities to COVID-19 outbreak. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(9), 3181. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17093181>
 20. Wahed, W. Y. A., Hefzy, E. M., Ahmed, M. I., & Hamed, N. S. (2020). Assessment of knowledge, attitudes, and perception of health care workers regarding COVID-19, a cross-sectional study from Egypt. *Journal of community health*, 45(6), 1242-1251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-020-00882-0>
 21. Kaur, G., & Naing, N. N. (2003). Prevalence and ethnic distribution of *Helicobacter pylori* infection among endoscopy patients in North-Eastern Peninsular Malaysia. *The Malaysian journal of medical sciences: MJMS*, 10(2), 66. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1995-7645\(11\)60037-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1995-7645(11)60037-0)
 22. World Health Organization. (2020). Prevention, identification and management of health worker infection in the context of COVID-19: interim guidance, 30 October 2020.
 23. World Health Organization. (2020). Keep health workers safe to keep patients safe: WHO. Geneva: WHO.
 24. World Health Organization. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on health and care workers: a closer look at deaths (No. WHO/HWF/Working Paper/2021.1). World Health Organization.
 25. Nandkeolyar, K. (2020). Coronavirus in UAE: Four of a family infected, *Gulf News*. Archived from the original on, 29. <https://covid19.ncema.gov.ae/en>
 26. <https://covid19.ncema.gov.ae/en>
 27. Huynh, G., Nguyen, T. N. H., Vo, K. N., & Pham, L. A. (2020). Knowledge and attitude toward COVID-19 among healthcare workers at District 2 Hospital, Ho Chi Minh City. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Medicine*, 13(6), 260. <https://doi.org/10.4103/1995-7645.280396>.
 28. Saqlain, M., Munir, M. M., Rehman, S. U., Gulzar, A., Naz, S., Ahmed, Z., & Mashhood, M. (2020). Knowledge, attitude, practice and perceived barriers among healthcare workers regarding COVID-19: a cross-sectional survey from Pakistan. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 105(3), 419-423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.05.007>.
 29. Qadah, T. (2020). Knowledge and attitude among healthcare workers towards COVID-19: a cross-sectional study from Jeddah city, Saudi Arabia. *The Journal of Infection in Developing Countries*, 14(10), 1090-1097. <https://doi.org/10.3855/jidc.13083>
 30. Roy, D., Tripathy, S., Kar, S. K., Sharma, N., Verma, S. K., & Kaushal, V. (2020). Study of knowledge, attitude, anxiety & perceived mental health care need in Indian population during COVID-19 pandemic. *Asian journal of psychiatry*, 51, 102083. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102083>

31. Kumar, J., Katto, M. S., Siddiqui, A. A., Sahito, B., Jamil, M., Rasheed, N., & Ali, M. (2020). Knowledge, attitude, and practices of healthcare workers regarding the use of face mask to limit the spread of the new coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *Cureus*, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.7737>.
32. Olum, R., Chekwech, G., Wekha, G., Nassozi, D. R., & Bongomin, F. (2020). Coronavirus disease-2019: knowledge, attitude, and practices of healthcare workers at Makerere University Teaching Hospitals, Uganda. *Frontiers in public health*, 8, 181. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00181>
33. Al-Hanawi, M. K., Angawi, K., Alshareef, N., Qattan, A., Helmy, H. Z., Abudawood, Y., & Alsharqi, O. (2020). Knowledge, attitude and practice toward COVID-19 among the public in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: a cross-sectional study. *Frontiers in public health*, 8, 217. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00217>.
34. Zhang, M., Zhou, M., Tang, F., Wang, Y., Nie, H., Zhang, L., & You, G. (2020). Knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 among healthcare workers in Henan, China. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 105(2), 183-187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.04.012>
35. Abdelhafiz, A. S., Mohammed, Z., Ibrahim, M. E., Ziady, H. H., Alorabi, M., Ayyad, M., & Sultan, E. (2020). Knowledge, perceptions, and attitude of Egyptians towards the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *Journal of community health*, 45(5), 881-890. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-020-00827-7>.
36. Zhong, B. L., Luo, W., Li, H. M., Zhang, Q. Q., Liu, X. G., Li, W. T., & Li, Y. (2020). Knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards COVID-19 among Chinese residents during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak: a quick online cross-sectional survey. *International journal of biological sciences*, 16(10), 1745. [doi:10.7150/ijbs.45221](https://doi.org/10.7150/ijbs.45221).