



The method used to dry washed hands affects the number and type of transient and residential bacteria remaining on the skin

R. Mutters^{a,*}, S.L. Warnes^b

^a Institute for Medical Microbiology and Hygiene, Philipps University of Marburg, Marburg, Germany

^b Independent Scientific Writer, Southampton, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 31 August 2018

Accepted 5 December 2018

Available online 8 December 2018

Keywords:

Hand hygiene

Hand drying

Jet air dryer

Transient bacterial flora

Resident bacterial flora



SUMMARY

Background: Widespread antibiotic resistance has led to fears that we are entering a post-antibiotic era and the relatively simple premise of hand washing to reduce transfer of bacteria and viruses has never been more important. Much of the emphasis has been on hand-washing technique, type of soap, and maintaining compliance but effective drying of the hands is just as important.

Aim: To compare the efficacy of drying washed hands with a jet air dryer or paper towels to remove transient bacterial contamination and to determine the effect on residential flora.

Methods: Eighty volunteers were recruited. The entire surfaces of volunteers' hands were artificially contaminated with *Escherichia coli* before being washed and dried; then bacteria remaining on the skin were recovered and enumerated. In the second part of the study the number and types of bacteria comprising the natural flora remaining on washed and dried hands were determined.

Findings: Significantly fewer transient and residential bacteria remained on the skin if hands were dried with a jet air dryer ($P < 0.001$). Drying hands with paper towels increased the number of resident bacteria, including potentially pathogenic species, released from the volunteers' skin, compared to a jet air dryer.

Conclusion: The number and types of bacteria remaining on washed hands were affected by the drying method. Hands dried with a jet air dryer harboured fewer viable bacteria, reducing the risk of infection transmission via touch. This could be especially important for healthcare workers who are constantly in contact with large numbers of vulnerable patients.

© 2018 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of The Healthcare Infection Society. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

The positive effects that good hand hygiene can have in reducing infection transmission have been known since Ignaz Semmelweis faced opposition for introducing hand-washing regimens in the 1840s [1]. Overuse and misuse of our arsenal of antibiotics has led to pandemics of hospital-acquired infections

* Corresponding author. Address: Institute for Medical Microbiology and Hygiene, Hans-Meerwein-Str. 2, D-35043 Marburg, Germany. Tel.: +49 6421 58 64302; fax: +49 6421 58 62309.

E-mail address: mutters@staff.uni-marburg.de (R. Mutters).

(HAIs) and more recently widespread community-associated infections with multidrug-resistant (MDR) organisms [2]. In Germany, although the incidence of HAI caused by methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) has declined, the imported MRSA incidence by colonized patients is significantly associated with high numbers of nosocomial MRSA cases [3,4]. Horizontal gene transfer of antibiotic resistance genes among Enterobacteriaceae has resulted in widespread contamination of our environment and the role of environmental bacterial species in the spread of MDR bacteria cannot be underestimated [5,6].

Contamination of the hands of healthcare workers can have serious consequences for those in their care [7,8]. Bingham *et al.* observed that for almost 30% of patient encounters healthcare workers' hands were contaminated with a pathogen, and the risk is greatly enhanced if the contaminants carry drug resistance [9]. The World Health Organization (WHO) has formulated guidelines to be implemented globally to 'ensure that no patient is unavoidably harmed through lack of compliance with hand hygiene' [10–13]. In 2018 WHO aims to concentrate on reducing the incidence of healthcare-associated sepsis which affects more than 30 million people per year [14].

An efficient hand-washing regimen depends on a multitude of factors including washing technique, types of soap and antibacterial agents as well as other factors including wearing of jewellery and nail length. It is known that the risk of transmitting infection is greater if hands are wet; therefore the method used to dry the hands is an important part of hand hygiene [10]. The commonest methods are paper towels, mechanical hot air or jet air dryers. A model hand-washing technique can be ruined if hands are not sufficiently dry or have become recontaminated during the drying process. There is conflicting evidence regarding hot air and jet air dryers. Concerns about the dispersal of pathogens into the environment have been expressed as well as high energy consumption, noise, and longer hand-drying times [15–18]. However, Snelling *et al.* observed improved performance with a jet air dryer compared to hot air dryer in volunteers who had contaminated their hands by handling raw meat [19].

In this study, washed hands dried with paper towels or with a jet air dryer were compared concerning the removal of transient bacterial flora and the risk of further touch contamination was assessed. The hands of the volunteers had been artificially contaminated with *E. coli*. In the second part of the study the effect of the two drying methods on the residential flora of the volunteers' hands was investigated. In addition, the bacteria of the natural flora were identified as well as enumerated.

Methods

Bacterial strain

Escherichia coli, strain DSMZ 11250, an ancestral K12 strain originally isolated from human faeces, was used as an indicator in experiments to determine efficacy of hand-drying methods to remove transient bacterial contamination from washed hands.

Volunteers

Eighty healthy volunteers were recruited into the study. All the recruits worked at the University of Marburg, Germany, and included clinicians, medical students, healthcare workers, research scientists and technicians. The hands of all volunteers

were examined and only those displaying healthy intact skin without any cuts, abrasions, dermatitis or any other skin conditions on their hands were enrolled in the study. Individuals with any past history of skin disorder or those receiving treatment were excluded. In addition, the nails of the volunteers were cut short and free of nail polish.

Hand-washing and -drying protocols

All volunteers washed their hands for 1 min with 5 mL pure potash soap, pH 10.5 Urkon Fluessigseife (Algin, Neustadt, Germany), as described in the European Standard method EN 1499 [20].

Hands were dried either with paper towels or using a jet air dryer. For hand towels, all volunteers dried their hands the same way using two sheets of paper towel (Torck, Stockholm, Sweden).

The jet air dryer used for the study was a 'hands in' Dyson Airblade dB (Dyson, Malmesbury, UK). Air is drawn into the bottom of the dryer which then passes through a high-efficiency particulate air filter at high velocity which removes >99.95% of particles $\geq 0.3 \mu\text{m}$; since bacteria typically exhibit diameters of $\geq 1\text{--}2 \mu\text{m}$ this is sufficient to remove them. Wet hands are placed in the machine and two jets of filtered air, at room temperature, pass through 0.8 mm apertures where the resulting high-pressure clean air 'scrapes' the water from the hands and avoids lengthy drying protocols and recirculated 'dirty' air previously observed with hot air dryers.

Volunteers drying their hands with a jet air dryer all followed the same protocol by slowly moving their hands down into the basin of the dryer to ensure all areas of the hands were exposed to the air. Total drying time was 1 min.

The same washroom (4 × 7.5 × 3 m) was used throughout this study, which also housed an air conditioner. There was a time interval of one week between each parameter (artificially contaminated or natural contamination on hands dried using paper towels or jet air dryer), therefore the washroom was dedicated to a single drying method each time.

Method to determine the efficacy of drying methods on washed hands to remove transient bacterial contamination

The hands of 70 volunteers were artificially contaminated with a bacterial strain to mimic natural faecal contamination. A suspension of 10^8 colony-forming units (cfu)/mL *E. coli* DSMZ 11250 was prepared in sterile saline within a polypropylene bag, dimensions 30 × 20 cm (Sarstedt, Nümbrecht, Germany) that had previously been sterilized by autoclaving at 121°C, 15 psi. Volunteers placed their hands inside the bag for 5 s. The hands were then withdrawn and held with fingers apart for 3 min during which time the inoculum dried. All volunteers then washed their hands as described. This was performed on three separate occasions where the contaminated hands were either (a) dried with paper towels, (b) dried under a jet air stream or (c) not dried at all. The conventional method to recover bacterial contamination of the hands has been to place the hand in direct contact with agar plates. However, this method introduces bias selecting for those areas touching the agar and may be influenced by other factors, for example, pressure and duration of hand contact and results may be variable. The German Society for Hygiene and

Microbiology (DGHM) recommends the whole hand to be sampled based on the method by Fuls *et al.* [21]. This method is described in detail elsewhere [13]. Briefly, each volunteer's hand was immersed in a sterile polypropylene bag containing 100 mL saline and rigorously washed for 20 s. An aliquot of 100 μ L was removed immediately, serially diluted in saline containing neutralizers (3% Tween 80, 3 g/L; lecithin 3 g/L; L-cystein 1 g/L) and further aliquots plated on to selective media (MacConkey). When the inoculum was dry, plates were inverted and incubated at 36°C for 24 h. Colonies were counted and the recovered *E. coli* enumerated.

Method to determine the efficacy of drying methods on washed hands to remove bacteria comprising the natural skin flora

Eighty volunteers washed their hands as described. The bacterial load was also determined by the whole-hand sampling method from hands that were (i) dried with paper towels, (ii) dried under a jet air stream or (iii) not dried at all. This was done for each volunteer. Aliquots were diluted and plated on to non-selective Columbia blood agar (5% sheep blood) and MacConkey agar selective for coliforms (Beckton Dickinson, Heidelberg, Germany). Plates were incubated aerobically at 36°C for up to 48 h. Bacterial growth was enumerated and the species identified by matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization time-of-flight (MALDI-TOF) mass spectrometry or the Siemens Walkaway System.

Statistical analysis

Graphs were prepared using Sigma Plot Version 14 (Systat Software, Inc., San Jose, CA, USA) and statistical analysis using the Mann–Whitney test where statistical significance was expressed as $P < 0.05$.

Results

Recovery of transient bacterial contamination from washed hands

In the volunteers who had dried their hands using paper towels or a jet air dryer, there was a significant reduction in the number of contaminating transient bacteria remaining on the skin compared to leaving their hands wet ($P < 0.001$) (Figure 1). However, hands dried with the Dyson Airblade hand dryer harboured significantly fewer transient bacterial contaminants ($P < 0.001$) than hands dried with paper towels.

Although all the volunteers using paper towels complied with the study protocol in drying their hands, there was much greater variation (standard deviation (SD): 3.679) in bacteria present on the skin compared to those volunteers using the jet air dryer (SD: 0.93), presumably related to natural human variation compared to uniformity of machines (Table I).

Recovery of bacteria comprising the natural flora on volunteers' washed hands

Similar results were observed in the second part of the study to determine numbers of residential bacteria remaining on the skin after washing and drying (Figure 2). The reduction in




Figure 1. Box plot demonstrating the faecal coliforms recovered from the hands of the volunteers ($N = 70$) after washing and drying either with paper towels, a jet air dryer, or not dried at all. Results are expressed as \log_{10} cfu/mL (total volume 100 mL). The dashed line and numerical value represent the mean of each group.

bacteria recovered was significantly lower on hands dried with a jet air dryer compared to not drying hands at all ($P = 0.005$). However, more bacteria remained on the skin of hands dried with paper towels than if hands were left wet, although the results were not significant ($P = 0.183$).

As in the first part of the study, there was a greater variation in bacterial numbers recovered from volunteers using hand towels (SD: 21.76) compared to other parameters (Table I).

The majority of volunteers harboured normal skin commensals on their washed hands, including *S. epidermidis*, *Micrococcus luteus* and *Corynebacterium* spp. Species that were deemed to be opportunistic or facultative pathogens were also recorded for each volunteer (Table II). Facultative pathogenic bacteria were recovered from more than 15% of volunteers that had used either paper towels or not dried their hands. In contrast, only 5% volunteers using the Dyson Airblade hand dryer harboured potentially pathogenic bacteria on their hands. *Staphylococcus aureus* accounted for ~50% of the 17 individuals using paper towels from which pathogenic species were isolated. Also the number of facultative pathogenic species was greater if hands had been dried using paper towels (Table II). Four volunteers who had used paper towels or had not dried their hands harboured more than one species of potentially problematic bacteria on their skin.

Discussion

In the first part of the study, drying washed hands with a jet air dryer was more efficient than paper towels in removing transient faecal contaminants. The large number of coliforms remaining on the hands of volunteers who had not dried their hands highlights the infection risk as viable micro-organisms could be transferred to others, to surfaces or to clothing if

Table I
Recovery of bacterial contamination from the volunteers' washed hands

Study parameters	Method of hand drying	Mean no. of <i>E. coli</i> recovered (cfu × 10 ³ /mL)	Standard deviation
Hands artificially contaminated with <i>E. coli</i> (transient)	Paper towel	1.89	3.68
	Dyson Airblade	0.85	0.93
	Hands not dried	3.64	4.49
Natural flora of the hands (residential)	Paper towel	9.69	21.18
	Dyson Airblade	3.44	3.37
	Hands not dried	5.44	4.86




Figure 2. Total bacterial counts recovered from the hands of the volunteers after washing and drying either with paper towels, a jet air dryer, or not dried at all. Results are expressed as log₁₀ cfu/mL (total volume 100 mL). The dashed line and numerical value represent the mean of each group.

they are touched before the hands are dry. Studies have shown that office personnel were found to touch their faces on average 15 times every hour and it has also been shown that contaminated fingertips may transfer infectious virus to up to seven clean surfaces [22,23]. The role of surface contamination as well as person-to-person contact is an important and often overlooked aspect of transmission of infective micro-organisms [24]. If the person washing their hands has been nursing a patient with an infectious disease, then the risk of infecting themselves, others or their environment with hands, although washed but remaining wet, is greatly increased.

Although drying hands with paper towels was found to be better than leaving hands wet at reducing numbers of bacterial contaminants remaining on the skin, there was a large variation in the volunteer cohort. However, drying the hands with a jet air dryer was the most efficacious way to remove transient bacterial contaminants and dried hands in a reproducible and consistent manner which would be an asset in a busy, high-pressure environment which exists in healthcare facilities.

In the second part of the study the jet air dryer was also found to be the most superior method to dry hands and reduce the risk of transfer of viable bacteria by touch. Drying hands with paper towels or leaving hands wet after washing

significantly increased the numbers of potentially problematic bacteria on the skin surface which could present a risk of infection to others, either by direct contact or indirect via fomites. The increased numbers of bacteria found on the skin of volunteers who had used paper towels, which was greater than if they had not dried their hands at all, may be due to the rubbing, exfoliating action required to dry the hands by this method removing skin squamae and releasing bacteria from deeper layers of the skin.

However, increasing the proportion of recycled fibres in paper manufacture is associated with an increase in microbial load [25]. Unused paper towels made from recycled paper may harbour more micro-organisms, especially *Bacillus* and *Clostridium* species, compared to towels made with virgin wood

Table II

Facultative pathogenic bacteria recovered from washed hands which had been dried with paper towels, jet air dryer, or not dried

Hand-drying method	Species (no. of volunteers)	No. of positive samples in cohort of 80 volunteers
Paper towel	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (7)	14 (17.5%)
	MRSA (1)	
	<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> (2)	
	<i>Corynebacterium amycolatum</i> (1)	
	<i>Pseudomonas alcaliphila</i> (1)	
	<i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. (1)	
	<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i> (2)	
	<i>Enterococcus</i> spp. (1)	
	(2 volunteers harboured >1 species)	
Dyson Airblade	<i>Staphylococcus haemolyticus</i> (1)	4 (5%)
	<i>Klebsiella</i> spp. (1)	
	<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> (1)	
Hands not dried	<i>Enterococcus</i> spp. (1)	18 ^a (22.8%)
	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (6)	
	<i>Staphylococcus haemolyticus</i> (3)	
	MRSA (2)	
	<i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. (3)	
	<i>Pseudomonas alcaliphila</i> (1)	
	<i>Enterococcus</i> spp. (5)	
(2 volunteers harboured >1 species)		

MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*.

^a N = 79.

pulp, which were found to transfer to gloved hands after drying hands washed with sterile water [26]. These bacterial species produce spores which may be resistant to skin cleansers and alcohol rubs. Sasahara *et al.* observed frequent contamination of healthcare workers' hands with *Bacillus* and *Clostridium* spores attributed to inadequate hand hygiene [27]. The significance of this requires further investigation.

The prevention of infection from touch contamination cannot rely solely on any hand-washing and -drying method and has to be part of overall regimes of stringent cleaning, pre-hospital admission screening, biocidal products, and measures to maintain compliance [13]. This study has focused on the bacteria remaining on the skin of washed and dried hands and the possible infection risk associated with this. The study limitations include the standardized method used by the volunteers to wash and dry their hands, which may not reflect the real-world scenario. In the study the volunteers' hands were dried for 1 min in the jet air dryer, which may be longer than usual in busy healthcare facilities. Likewise, two paper towels were used by volunteers, which may not always be the norm. The potential contamination of the environment from the jet air dryer, unused or soiled paper towels, and the possible risk of infection transmission associated with this, were beyond the scope of the current study. However, the air of the washroom was sampled at the beginning and end of the experiments with an RCS sampler and bacterial burden was <100 cfu/m³ regardless of whether a jet air dryer or paper towels had been in use (results not shown).

Concerns have been expressed about the aerosolization of waterborne pathogens using mechanical dryers [28,29]. A recent study by Best *et al.* observed increased contamination of hospital washroom environments when jet air dryers were employed [17]. As in any real-world study there were a very large number of variables and not all values were statistically significant, but it raises serious concerns requiring further investigation. It was interesting that the authors observed reduced environmental contamination overall in the Italian washroom compared to those in the UK and France, with a reduction in aerobic bacteria isolated from the air, door plates, and dust when a jet air dryer was used. There could be other factors contributing here such as higher ambient temperature, more effective cleaning regimes, model of jet air dryer, and the users themselves. Harrison *et al.* reported cross-contamination of paper towel dispensers in dirty and clean hands of volunteers, highlighting the need for continuous and effective room disinfection measures [30].

Further research is needed to determine the optimal locations for positioning jet air dryers, which is beyond the scope of this study. However, within hospitals in Germany and other countries, patients' hand-washing facilities are usually located in separate rooms that often contain a toilet and shower. This is primarily to reduce the infection risk from waterborne pathogens from the hand-washing basins. Therefore, good locations for air dryers could be in the patients' bathrooms and all public restrooms. The increase in community-associated MDR infections means that efficient drying of hands is just as important in other communal areas of our society such as public transport, schools, food-handling areas, as well as healthcare facilities.

The results from this study suggest that the latest generation of jet air dryers is effective at rapidly drying hands to remove the risk of bacterial pathogen transfer by touch. Jet air dryers may also be beneficial where hands are continually

washed and dried, as in the case of HCWs to prevent skin excoriation. Gram-negative bacteria are more susceptible to environmental stress and further research could determine the effect of rapid jet air drying on the bacterial cell and efficacy against virus contamination of the hands, especially those with low infectious dose such as norovirus, plus respiratory viruses and pathogenic fungi.

This study suggests that a jet air dryer alongside a rigorous hand-washing technique is a superior way to dry hands compared to paper towels. Leaving hands wet posed a serious risk of further infection transmission by touch. Drying hands in filtered air removed more transient contaminants and residual bacteria, including potentially problematic bacterial species, than using paper towels. To be fully effective, as for any hand hygiene measures, there must be accompanying stringent, effective, and regular environmental cleaning regimes and equipment maintenance.

A recent study suggested that jet air dryers should not be used in healthcare facilities [17]. However, before significant investments and healthcare policy changes are made, further studies are needed on the efficacy of the latest designs of jet air dryers, which have very rapid drying times (<20 s), features to reduce splashing and reduced noise output, as well as the potential microbial hazards present in recycled paper towels. Then a balance can be made to achieve the most efficient and effective method to dry hands to reduce cross-contamination combined with the need to reduce the cost to the environment.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank H. Bykow for her excellent technical assistance.

Conflict of interest statement

None declared.

Funding sources

This was an independent study funded by Dyson Technology Ltd, Malmesbury, UK, but the company was not involved in the design, execution, and analysis of the results.

References

- [1] Best M, Neuhauser D. Ignaz Semmelweis and the birth of infection control. *Qual Saf Heal Care* 2004;13:233–4.
- [2] World Health Organization. Global action plan on antimicrobial resistance. Geneva: WHO; 2015. Available at: <https://www.who.int/antimicrobial-resistance/global-action-plan/en/> [last accessed December 2018].
- [3] Meyer E, Schröder C, Gastmeier P, Geffers C. The reduction of nosocomial MRSA infection in Germany: an analysis of data from the Hospital Infection Surveillance System (KISS) between 2007 and 2012. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2014;111:331–6.
- [4] Schweickert B, Geffers C, Farragher T, Gastmeier P, Behnke M, Eckmanns T, et al. The MRSA-import in ICUs is an important predictor for the occurrence of nosocomial MRSA cases. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2011;17:901–6.
- [5] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; Health and Medicine Division; Board on Global Health. Forum on Microbial Threats. Combating antimicrobial resistance: a one health approach to a global threat: proceedings of a workshop. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2017.

- [6] Westphal-Settele K, Konradi S, Balzer F, Schönfeld J, Schmithausen R. The environment as a reservoir for antimicrobial resistance: a growing problem for public health? *Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforsch Gesundheitsschutz* 2018;61:533.
- [7] Moolenaar RL, Crutcher JM, Joaquin VHS, Sewell LV, Hutwagner LC, Carson LA, et al. A prolonged outbreak of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in a neonatal intensive care unit did staff fingernails play a role in disease transmission? *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2000;21:80–5.
- [8] Loftus RW, Muffly MK, Brown JR, Beach ML, Koff MD, Corwin HL, et al. Hand contamination of anesthesia providers is an important risk factor for intraoperative bacterial transmission. *Anesth Analg* 2011;112:98–105.
- [9] Bingham J, Abell G, Kienast LA, Lerner L, Matuschek B, Mullins W, et al. Health care worker hand contamination at critical moments in outpatient care settings. *Am J Infect Control* 2016;44:1198–202.
- [10] World Health Organization. WHO guidelines on hand hygiene in health care: first global patient safety challenge. Clean care is safer care. Geneva: WHO; 2009.
- [11] Larson E. A causal link between handwashing and risk of infection? Examination of the evidence. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1988;9:28–36.
- [12] Larson E. Skin hygiene and infection prevention: more of the same or different approaches? *Clin Infect Dis* 1999;29:1287–94.
- [13] Günther F, Rudolph K, Frank U, Mutters NT. Improvement of hand hygiene quality and compliance using bioburden measurement and online feedback in Germany. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2017;38:119–22.
- [14] Saito H, Allegranzi B, Pittet D. 2018 WHO hand hygiene campaign: preventing sepsis in health care and the path to universal health coverage. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2018;18:490–2.
- [15] Alharbi SA, Salmen SH, Chinnathambi A, Alharbi NS, Zayed ME, Al-Johny BO, et al. Assessment of the bacterial contamination of hand air dryer in washrooms. *Saudi J Biol Sci* 2016;23:268–71.
- [16] Huesca-Espitia L del C, Aslanzadeh J, Feinn R, Joseph G, Murray TS, Setlow P. Deposition of bacteria and bacterial spores by bathroom hot-air hand dryers. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2018;84.
- [17] Best E, Parnell P, Couturier J, Barbut F, Le Bozec A, Arnoldo L, et al. Environmental contamination by bacteria in hospital washrooms according to hand-drying method: a multi-centre study. *J Hosp Infect* 2018;100:469–75.
- [18] Yamamoto Y, Ugai K, Takahashi Y. Efficiency of hand drying for removing bacteria from washed hands: comparison of paper towel drying with warm air drying. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2005;26:316–20.
- [19] Snelling AM, Saville T, Stevens D, Beggs CB. Comparative evaluation of the hygienic efficacy of an ultra-rapid hand dryer vs conventional warm air hand dryers. *J Appl Microbiol* 2011;110:19–26.
- [20] Standards E. CSN EN 1499 Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics – Hygienic handwash – Test method and requirements (phase 2/step 2) [not dated].
- [21] Fuls JL, Rodgers ND, Fischler GE, Howard JM, Patel M, Weidner PL, et al. Alternative hand contamination technique to compare the activities of antimicrobial and nonantimicrobial soaps under different test conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2008;74:3739–44.
- [22] Nicas M, Best D. A study quantifying the hand-to-face contact rate and its potential application to predicting respiratory tract infection. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2008;5:347–52.
- [23] Barker J, Vipond IB, Bloomfield SF. Effects of cleaning and disinfection in reducing the spread of Norovirus contamination via environmental surfaces. *J Hosp Infect* 2004;58:42–9.
- [24] Suleyman G, Alangaden GBA. The role of environmental contamination in the transmission of nosocomial pathogens and healthcare-associated infections. *Curr Infect Dis Rep* 2018;20:12.
- [25] Hladíková Z, Kejlová K, Sosnovcová J, Jírová D, Vavrouš A, Janoušek A, et al. Microbial contamination of paper-based food contact materials with different contents of recycled fiber. *Czech J Food Sci* 2015;33:308–12.
- [26] Gendron LM, Trudel L, Moineau S, Duchaine C. Evaluation of bacterial contaminants found on unused paper towels and possible postcontamination after handwashing: a pilot study. *Am J Infect Control* 2012;40:e5–9.
- [27] Sasahara T, Ae R, Watanabe M, Kimura Y, Yonekawa C, Hayashi S, et al. Contamination of healthcare workers' hands with bacterial spores. *J Infect Chemother* 2016;22:521–5.
- [28] Huang C, Ma W, Stack S. The hygienic efficacy of different hand-drying methods: a review of the evidence. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2012;87:791–8.
- [29] Margas E, Maguire E, Berland CR, Welander F, Holah JT. Assessment of the environmental microbiological cross contamination following hand drying with paper hand towels or an air blade dryer. *J Appl Microbiol* 2013;115:572–82.
- [30] Harrison WA, Griffith CJ, Ayers T, Michaels B. Bacterial transfer and cross-contamination potential associated with paper-towel dispensing. *Am J Infect Control* 2003;31:387–91.