Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 14, No. 3 , 2024 (pp. 892-906)

RESEARCH ARTICLE WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Infection Prevention and Control in Solid Organ Transplant Units: Healthcare Workers' Knowledge, Compliance, and Determinants

Noha Hesham El-Awady, Amel Elwan Mohammed , Amira Abdelsalam, Wafaa Atwa Elnemr

Public Health and Community Medicine Department, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University

Corresponding author: Noha Hesham El-Awady

Abstract

***Background*:** Solid organ transplant (SOT) recipients are among the most vulnerable patient populations to healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) due to lifelong immunosuppression, frequent healthcare exposure, and the complexity of care delivered in transplant units. HAIs in SOT settings are associated with substantial morbidity, mortality, prolonged hospitalization, graft loss, and increased healthcare costs. Infection prevention and control (IPC) measures are therefore a cornerstone of patient safety in transplant units. Despite the availability of international guidelines and evidence-based recommendations, suboptimal adherence to IPC practices remains a persistent challenge. Healthcare workers' (HCWs') knowledge and compliance play a central role in the effective implementation of IPC measures, yet wide variations in practice have been reported across settings.

Aim: This review aims to synthesize current evidence on infection prevention and control in solid organ transplant units, with a particular focus on healthcare workers' knowledge, compliance with IPC measures, and the determinants influencing adherence. The review adopts a public health and patient safety perspective to identify gaps, challenges, and opportunities for improvement in transplant-specific IPC practices.

Methods and Key Findings: The review integrates evidence from international guidelines, systematic reviews, observational studies, and interventional research addressing IPC in SOT settings. Findings indicate that inadequate knowledge of IPC guidelines, limited training, workload pressures, resource constraints, and organizational factors are key contributors to poor compliance among HCWs. Variability in adherence has been documented for standard precautions, hand hygiene, use of personal protective equipment, device-associated infection prevention bundles, and vaccination practices. Education-based interventions grounded in knowledge–attitude–practice frameworks have demonstrated improvements in IPC compliance and reductions in HAIs; however, sustained adherence requires supportive institutional policies, leadership commitment, and continuous monitoring.

Conclusion: Effective infection prevention and control in solid organ transplant units depends not only on evidence-based guidelines but also on healthcare workers' knowledge, attitudes, and compliance within supportive health system environments. Addressing individual, organizational, and system-level determinants of IPC adherence is essential to reducing HAIs and improving transplant outcomes. Strengthening education, surveillance, vaccination strategies, and institutional accountability represents a critical pathway toward safer, higher-quality care for solid organ transplant recipients.

Keywords: Infection Prevention, Solid Organ Transplant Units, Knowledge, Compliance, and Determinants

INTRODUCTION

Solid organ transplantation (SOT) has become a life-saving therapeutic option for patients with end-stage organ failure, with significant improvements in graft survival and patient outcomes over recent decades. These advances have been driven by progress in surgical techniques, immunosuppressive therapy, and post-transplant care. However, the success of transplantation remains critically threatened by infectious complications, which continue to be a leading cause of morbidity, mortality, graft dysfunction, and prolonged hospitalization among SOT recipients [1].

Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) represent a particularly serious challenge in solid organ transplant units. Lifelong immunosuppression, frequent invasive procedures, prolonged hospital stays, and repeated contact with healthcare environments place transplant recipients at exceptionally high risk of infection. International data indicate that HAIs occur more frequently and with greater severity in transplant populations than in the general hospitalized population, often involving multidrug-resistant organisms and leading to substantial clinical and economic burden [2].

Infection prevention and control (IPC) measures are therefore central to patient safety in solid organ transplant units. Standard precautions, transmission-based precautions, hand hygiene, appropriate use of personal protective equipment, environmental cleaning, vaccination, and adherence to device-associated infection prevention bundles are all evidence-based strategies designed to interrupt the transmission of infectious agents in healthcare settings. International organizations such as the World Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have issued comprehensive IPC guidelines; however, the effectiveness of these measures depends largely on their consistent and correct application by healthcare workers [3].

Healthcare workers' knowledge and compliance are widely recognized as key determinants of IPC effectiveness. In transplant units, where patients are uniquely vulnerable, even minor lapses in adherence can result in severe consequences. Evidence suggests that gaps in knowledge of IPC guidelines, misconceptions about infection risks, workload pressures, limited resources, and organizational culture contribute to suboptimal compliance among healthcare workers across different professional groups [4].

From a public health and community medicine perspective, IPC compliance should not be viewed solely as an individual responsibility but as a product of complex interactions between knowledge, attitudes, training, organizational support, and health system infrastructure. Understanding these determinants within the specific context of solid organ transplant units is essential for designing effective, sustainable interventions that reduce HAIs and improve patient safety [5].

Accordingly, this review examines infection prevention and control in solid organ transplant units with a focus on healthcare workers' knowledge, compliance with IPC measures, and the determinants influencing adherence. By synthesizing evidence from guidelines, observational studies, and educational interventions, the review aims to identify gaps and inform strategies to strengthen IPC practices in this high-risk clinical setting [6].

Solid Organ Transplant Units and Infection Risk: Epidemiology and Burden

Solid organ transplant units represent high-risk healthcare environments due to the convergence of severely immunocompromised patients, intensive medical and surgical interventions, and frequent use of invasive devices. The epidemiology of infections in these units differs markedly from that of general hospital wards, with higher incidence rates, greater severity, and more complex microbiological profiles. Early post-transplant periods are particularly critical, as patients are exposed to maximal immunosuppression, surgical wounds, indwelling catheters, and prolonged hospital stays, all of which increase susceptibility to healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) [7].

The burden of HAIs in solid organ transplant recipients is substantial. Studies consistently demonstrate that infections are among the leading causes of early and late morbidity following transplantation and remain a major contributor to graft dysfunction and mortality. Bloodstream infections, surgical site infections, pneumonia, urinary tract infections, and device-associated infections are the most frequently reported HAIs in transplant units. Compared with non-transplant hospitalized patients, SOT recipients experience higher infection-related mortality and longer lengths of stay, translating into increased healthcare costs and resource utilization [8].

Microbiologically, infections in transplant units are increasingly dominated by multidrug-resistant organisms (MDROs). The frequent use of broad-spectrum antimicrobials, repeated hospital admissions, and exposure to intensive care settings create strong selective pressure for resistant pathogens. Carbapenem-resistant Gram-negative bacteria, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, vancomycin-resistant enterococci, and invasive fungal pathogens have all been reported with greater frequency in SOT populations, posing significant challenges for treatment and infection control [9].

From a population health perspective, the burden of HAIs in transplant units extends beyond individual patients to healthcare systems and society. Infection-related complications lead to increased readmissions, higher antimicrobial consumption, and the need for costly isolation and supportive measures. Economic evaluations indicate that HAIs are among the most preventable adverse events in healthcare, and reductions in infection rates can yield substantial improvements in patient outcomes and system efficiency, particularly in high-risk settings such as transplant units [10].

Understanding the epidemiology and burden of infection in solid organ transplant units underscores the critical importance of robust infection prevention and control programs. Given the vulnerability of transplant recipients and the complexity of care, even small improvements in adherence to IPC measures can have disproportionate benefits. This context highlights why healthcare workers' knowledge, compliance, and the determinants shaping IPC practices are central to reducing infection risk and improving patient safety in solid organ transplant settings [11].

Healthcare Workers' Knowledge of Infection Prevention and Control in Solid Organ Transplant Units

Healthcare workers' (HCWs') knowledge of infection prevention and control (IPC) principles is a foundational component of safe care in solid organ transplant units. Given the extreme vulnerability of transplant recipients, HCWs are required to understand not only general IPC concepts but also transplant-specific risks related to immunosuppression, invasive devices, and exposure to multidrug-resistant organisms. Adequate knowledge encompasses awareness of standard and transmission-based precautions, hand hygiene indications, appropriate use of personal protective equipment, environmental cleaning, vaccination principles, and prevention of device-associated infections [12].

Evidence from multiple settings indicates that gaps in IPC knowledge among HCWs remain common, even in specialized units. Systematic reviews have shown that deficiencies in understanding guideline recommendations, modes of pathogen transmission, and indications for specific precautions are frequently reported across professional categories, including physicians, nurses, and allied health staff. In transplant units, these gaps may be magnified by the complexity of care and the evolving nature of infection risks, underscoring the need for targeted, context-specific education [13].

Knowledge of standard precautions is particularly critical, as these measures form the baseline for preventing cross-transmission in healthcare settings. Studies assessing HCWs' knowledge have identified inconsistent understanding of hand hygiene indications, safe handling of sharps, and appropriate use of gloves and gowns. Such gaps are concerning in transplant units, where breaches in basic precautions can rapidly lead to outbreaks or severe infections among immunocompromised patients [14].

Awareness of transmission-based precautions is another key knowledge domain. Correct identification of patients requiring contact, droplet, or airborne precautions and appropriate implementation of isolation measures are essential to preventing transmission of respiratory viruses, multidrug-resistant bacteria, and opportunistic fungal pathogens. Inadequate knowledge in this area has been associated with delayed initiation of precautions and inappropriate discontinuation, increasing the risk of exposure for transplant recipients and staff [15].

International guidelines emphasize that knowledge alone is insufficient unless it is continuously updated and reinforced. Organizations such as the World Health Organization highlight education and training as core components of effective IPC programs, recommending structured, ongoing training tailored to local epidemiology and patient populations. In transplant units, where infection risks and preventive strategies evolve rapidly, continuous professional development is essential to maintain high levels of IPC knowledge [16].

From a public health perspective, strengthening HCWs' knowledge of IPC in solid organ transplant units represents an upstream intervention with downstream benefits for patient safety, antimicrobial resistance containment, and health system efficiency. However, knowledge must be translated into practice through supportive organizational environments, adequate resources, and strong leadership to achieve sustained reductions in healthcare-associated infections [17].

Compliance With Infection Prevention and Control Measures in Solid Organ Transplant Units

Compliance with infection prevention and control (IPC) measures is essential for reducing healthcare-associated infections in solid organ transplant units, yet consistent adherence remains challenging. Despite the availability of clear guidelines, studies repeatedly demonstrate variability in healthcare workers' (HCWs') compliance with standard precautions, hand hygiene, personal protective equipment (PPE) use, and device-associated infection prevention bundles. In transplant settings, where patients are profoundly immunocompromised, even brief or minor lapses in adherence can result in severe infections and outbreaks [18].

Hand hygiene is widely recognized as the single most effective IPC measure; however, compliance rates among HCWs remain suboptimal worldwide. Observational studies have reported wide variation in hand hygiene adherence, often influenced by workload, staff-to-patient ratios, and perceived urgency of care. In transplant units, competing clinical demands and frequent high-acuity interventions may further compromise adherence, underscoring the need for targeted strategies to promote consistent hand hygiene practice [19].

Appropriate use of PPE represents another critical component of IPC compliance. Incorrect selection, donning, doffing, or disposal of gloves, gowns, masks, and eye protection has been documented across healthcare settings, including transplant units. Poor compliance with PPE protocols increases the risk of pathogen transmission to both patients and staff, particularly during care of patients colonized or infected with multidrug-resistant organisms or respiratory viruses [20].

Compliance with transmission-based precautions and isolation policies is also variable. Delays in initiating isolation, inconsistent signage, and lack of adherence to room entry and exit protocols have been reported as common issues. In transplant units, such lapses are especially concerning due to the high susceptibility of recipients to airborne, droplet, and contact-transmitted pathogens. Effective compliance requires not only individual vigilance but also clear institutional policies and environmental support [21].

Device-associated infection prevention bundles, including those targeting central-line–associated bloodstream infections, ventilator-associated pneumonia, catheter-associated urinary tract infections, and surgical site infections, rely heavily on consistent HCW adherence. Evidence indicates that incomplete or inconsistent bundle implementation diminishes their effectiveness, while high compliance is associated with significant reductions in infection rates. In transplant units, where invasive devices are frequently used, sustaining high bundle adherence is particularly important [22].

International guidance emphasizes that compliance is influenced by multiple interacting factors rather than individual behavior alone. The World Health Organization advocates for multimodal IPC strategies that combine education, monitoring, feedback, reminders, leadership engagement, and a supportive safety culture. In solid organ transplant units, integrating these approaches into routine practice is essential to achieving sustained improvements in IPC compliance and patient safety [23].

Determinants of Infection Prevention and Control Compliance in Solid Organ Transplant Units

Compliance with infection prevention and control (IPC) measures in solid organ transplant units is shaped by a complex interplay of individual, organizational, and system-level determinants. Understanding these determinants is essential for designing effective interventions that move beyond knowledge dissemination alone. In transplant settings, where infection risks are amplified, identifying and addressing barriers to compliance is a critical component of patient safety and quality improvement efforts [24].

At the individual level, healthcare workers' knowledge, attitudes, risk perception, and professional experience strongly influence IPC compliance. Studies indicate that limited understanding of guidelines, misconceptions about routes of transmission, and underestimation of infection risk contribute to poor adherence. Conversely, positive attitudes toward IPC, perceived personal and patient safety benefits, and a strong sense of professional responsibility are associated with higher compliance, particularly in high-risk clinical environments such as transplant units [25].

Workload and time pressure are consistently reported as major barriers to IPC adherence. High patient acuity, staff shortages, and frequent interruptions can reduce opportunities for proper hand hygiene, correct PPE use, and full implementation of prevention bundles. In transplant units, the intensity and complexity of care further exacerbate these challenges, increasing the likelihood of unintentional noncompliance even among knowledgeable and motivated healthcare workers [26].

Organizational factors play a pivotal role in shaping IPC practices. Availability of supplies, accessibility of hand hygiene facilities, clarity of protocols, and consistency of training all influence compliance. Strong leadership support, visible commitment to patient safety, and integration of IPC into routine workflows have been shown to foster a culture of safety and accountability. In contrast, inadequate supervision, weak enforcement of policies, and limited feedback mechanisms undermine sustained adherence [27].

Education and training are central determinants but are most effective when delivered as part of a broader, multimodal strategy. Evidence suggests that isolated educational interventions may improve knowledge temporarily but fail to produce lasting behavior change unless reinforced by monitoring, feedback, reminders, and supportive organizational policies. In transplant units, continuous, context-specific training tailored to evolving infection risks is particularly important [28].

From a health system perspective, national policies, accreditation standards, and regulatory frameworks also influence IPC compliance. International guidance from organizations such as the World Health Organization emphasizes the need for system-wide approaches that align individual behavior with institutional priorities. Addressing determinants of IPC compliance across multiple levels is therefore essential to achieving sustainable reductions in healthcare-associated infections in solid organ transplant units [29].

Role of Education and Training in Improving Infection Prevention and Control Compliance

Education and training constitute the backbone of effective infection prevention and control (IPC) programs and are indispensable in solid organ transplant (SOT) units, where patients are uniquely susceptible to healthcare-associated infections. In these high-risk settings, IPC education must be continuous, structured, and tailored to the complex clinical realities of transplantation, including immunosuppression, invasive procedures, prolonged hospital stays, and exposure to multidrug-resistant organisms. Education serves not only to disseminate guidelines but also to build the competencies required for safe, consistent practice in dynamic care environments [30].

Health education in IPC is grounded in behavioral science and public health principles that emphasize the translation of knowledge into sustained practice. Modern definitions of health education highlight its role in improving health literacy, developing life skills, and empowering individuals to make informed decisions. In the context of IPC, education aims to enhance healthcare workers' understanding of infection risks, foster positive attitudes toward preventive measures, and strengthen self-efficacy in applying standard and transmission-based precautions. Educational models based on the knowledge–attitude–practice (KAP) framework consistently demonstrate that increased knowledge can positively influence attitudes, which in turn support improved compliance, although this pathway is moderated by environmental and organizational factors [31].

A growing body of evidence supports the effectiveness of structured educational interventions in improving IPC compliance. Studies using quasi-experimental and interventional designs have shown that targeted education programs can significantly improve healthcare workers' adherence to hand hygiene, appropriate use of personal protective equipment, aseptic techniques, and device-care bundles. In transplant units, educational interventions focusing on central line care, ventilator-associated pneumonia prevention, and surgical site infection bundles have been associated with measurable reductions in infection rates, highlighting the direct impact of education on patient outcomes [32].

The mode of educational delivery is a critical determinant of effectiveness. Passive, lecture-based approaches alone are often insufficient to achieve lasting behavior change. In contrast, interactive and multimodal strategies—such as hands-on workshops, simulation-based training, role-playing, case discussions, and scenario-based learning—are more effective in reinforcing correct practices. Simulation training, in particular, allows healthcare workers to practice complex IPC procedures, such as donning and doffing personal protective equipment or managing isolation protocols, in a safe environment before applying them in real clinical settings [33].

Continuing and in-service education are essential to sustain IPC compliance over time. Solid organ transplant units are characterized by staff turnover, evolving clinical guidelines, and emerging infectious threats, all of which necessitate regular refresher training. Evidence indicates that periodic education combined with competency assessments, audits, and feedback is more effective than one-time interventions. Feedback mechanisms that provide healthcare workers with data on compliance rates and infection outcomes help reinforce accountability and promote continuous improvement [34].

Importantly, the success of IPC education is closely linked to organizational culture and leadership support. Education is most effective when embedded within a broader institutional commitment to patient safety, supported by adequate resources, clear policies, and visible leadership engagement. International guidance from the World Health Organization identifies education and training as core components of IPC programs but emphasizes that they must be implemented as part of multimodal strategies that address system-level barriers to compliance [35].

From a public health and community medicine perspective, investing in IPC education in solid organ transplant units yields benefits that extend beyond individual healthcare workers. Improved compliance contributes to reductions in healthcare-associated infections, containment of antimicrobial resistance, enhanced occupational safety, and more efficient use of healthcare resources. However, education alone is not a panacea; it must be continuous, context-specific, and reinforced by supportive organizational structures to achieve sustained improvements in IPC compliance and transplant patient safety [36].

Vaccination as a Component of Infection Prevention and Control in Solid Organ Transplant Units

Vaccination is a fundamental yet often underutilized component of infection prevention and control (IPC) strategies in solid organ transplant (SOT) units. Transplant recipients are at exceptionally high risk for severe and preventable infections due to lifelong immunosuppression, frequent healthcare exposure, and reduced immune responses to pathogens. Vaccine-preventable diseases such as influenza, hepatitis B, pneumococcal disease, varicella, and COVID-19 are associated with higher morbidity, mortality, graft dysfunction, and prolonged hospitalization in SOT recipients compared with the general population, underscoring the critical importance of comprehensive vaccination strategies in transplant care [37].

The effectiveness of vaccination in transplant populations is strongly influenced by timing. Immunogenicity is often reduced in patients with end-stage organ disease and is particularly diminished during the early post-transplant period, when immunosuppressive therapy is most intense. Consequently, international guidelines consistently recommend that transplant candidates receive all indicated vaccinations as early as possible in the course of chronic organ disease and ideally before transplantation. Pre-transplant vaccination not only improves immune response but also reduces the risk of post-transplant infectious complications that are difficult to manage in immunocompromised patients [38].

Post-transplant vaccination remains an essential component of long-term IPC, despite reduced vaccine responsiveness. Inactivated vaccines are generally considered safe after transplantation and can provide partial protection that translates into clinically meaningful reductions in disease severity and complications. Live attenuated vaccines, however, are generally contraindicated after transplantation due to the risk of uncontrolled replication and severe infection, highlighting the importance of completing live vaccine schedules prior to transplant whenever feasible [39].

Healthcare workers' (HCWs') knowledge and compliance play a pivotal role in the success of vaccination strategies within solid organ transplant units. HCWs are responsible for assessing vaccination status, providing education to patients and families, coordinating vaccine delivery, and ensuring adherence to recommended schedules. Gaps in HCWs' knowledge regarding vaccine indications, contraindications, timing, and safety have been identified as significant barriers to optimal vaccine uptake among transplant candidates and recipients [40].

Vaccination of healthcare workers themselves is a critical yet sometimes overlooked IPC measure. HCWs can serve as vectors for transmission of respiratory and contact-transmitted pathogens to highly vulnerable transplant recipients. Annual influenza vaccination, up-to-date immunization against measles, mumps, rubella, varicella, hepatitis B, and COVID-19 among HCWs is strongly recommended to reduce nosocomial transmission. Vaccinated staff not only protect patients but also contribute to workforce resilience by reducing staff illness and absenteeism during outbreaks [41].

Household contacts and visitors also represent important links in the chain of infection prevention. Education of family members regarding vaccination and infection prevention practices is an essential extension of IPC beyond the hospital setting. Ensuring that close contacts of transplant recipients are fully immunized creates a protective "cocooning" effect that reduces the likelihood of introducing vaccine-preventable infections into transplant units or patients' homes [42].

From a systems and policy perspective, integrating vaccination into IPC programs in solid organ transplant units requires clear protocols, multidisciplinary collaboration, and continuous education. International guidance from organizations such as the World Health Organization emphasizes vaccination as a core component of comprehensive IPC and patient safety strategies. Embedding vaccination assessment and delivery into routine transplant workflows, supported by institutional policies and monitoring systems, is essential for improving uptake and reducing preventable infections in this high-risk population [43].

In summary, vaccination represents a powerful, evidence-based IPC intervention in solid organ transplant units that operates at the intersection of individual behavior, healthcare worker practice, and health system organization. Optimizing vaccination strategies through improved knowledge, compliance, and institutional support can substantially reduce infection risk, improve transplant outcomes, and enhance overall patient safety [44].

Role of Healthcare Workers and Visitors in Preventing Infection Transmission in Solid Organ Transplant Units

Healthcare workers (HCWs) and visitors play a decisive role in infection prevention and control (IPC) within solid organ transplant (SOT) units. Transplant recipients are profoundly immunocompromised due to lifelong immunosuppression, frequent exposure to invasive procedures, prolonged hospitalization, and repeated healthcare encounters. Consequently, even minor lapses in IPC practices by HCWs or visitors may result in severe infections, graft dysfunction, or death. Effective prevention of infection transmission in SOT units therefore depends not only on written protocols, but also on sustained knowledge, compliance, and responsible behaviors of all individuals interacting with transplant recipients [45].

Role of Healthcare Workers in Infection Transmission and Prevention

HCWs represent both a potential source of pathogen transmission and the primary agents of infection prevention in transplant units. Routine care activities such as medication administration, wound and catheter care, respiratory interventions, and environmental contact create frequent opportunities for cross-transmission if standard precautions are not rigorously applied. Evidence consistently demonstrates that suboptimal adherence to hand hygiene and PPE use is a major contributor to healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) in high-risk settings, including SOT units [46].

Adequate knowledge of IPC principles is a prerequisite for safe practice. HCWs working in transplant units must understand modes of transmission, transplant-specific infection risks, isolation policies, and prevention of device-associated infections. However, multiple studies have reported persistent knowledge gaps among HCWs regarding transmission-based precautions, appropriate PPE use, and prevention of multidrug-resistant organism spread. These gaps often translate into inconsistent or incorrect practices, increasing infection risk among transplant recipients [47].

Compliance with IPC measures is influenced by multiple interacting factors beyond knowledge alone. High workload, staff shortages, time pressure, limited access to supplies, discomfort associated with PPE, and insufficient managerial support are frequently cited barriers. In transplant units, where patient acuity and care complexity are high, these challenges are often intensified. Organizational culture is therefore critical; units with strong leadership commitment, adequate resources, and regular monitoring demonstrate significantly higher levels of IPC compliance [48].

Hand hygiene remains the most effective single measure for preventing HAIs. Nevertheless, compliance among HCWs remains suboptimal worldwide. In transplant units, strict adherence to hand hygiene at all recommended moments is essential because transplant recipients are highly susceptible to opportunistic and resistant pathogens. Multimodal strategies that combine education, reminders, audits, feedback, and leadership engagement are required to achieve sustained improvement, as emphasized by the World Health Organization [49].

Healthcare Worker Vaccination and Occupational Health

HCWs may also act as vectors for vaccine-preventable diseases, including influenza, measles, varicella, and COVID-19. Transmission from asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic HCWs to transplant recipients can result in severe disease and outbreaks. Therefore, vaccination of HCWs is a critical IPC intervention in SOT units. International guidelines strongly recommend that all HCWs caring for transplant recipients maintain up-to-date immunization against influenza, hepatitis B, measles, mumps, rubella, varicella, and COVID-19, unless contraindicated [50].

Occupational health programs should ensure routine assessment of HCWs' immunization status, facilitate vaccine access, and enforce policies restricting patient contact for staff with communicable infections. Encouraging early reporting of illness and providing supportive sick-leave policies are essential to prevent presenteeism, which has been identified as an important risk factor for nosocomial transmission in high-risk units [51].

Education, Training, and Competency Assessment

Continuous education and training are cornerstones of IPC effectiveness in SOT units. Orientation programs for new staff should include transplant-specific IPC training, highlighting the extreme vulnerability of transplant recipients. Ongoing in-service education, simulation-based training, and periodic competency assessments reinforce correct practices and help address emerging threats such as antimicrobial resistance and novel pathogens [52].

Importantly, IPC education must extend beyond physicians and nurses to include all staff involved in patient care or the patient environment, such as housekeeping, porters, and laboratory personnel. Environmental cleaning staff play a critical role in reducing environmental contamination and must be adequately trained in cleaning and disinfection protocols appropriate for transplant settings [53].

Role of Visitors and Family Members

Visitors and family caregivers provide essential psychosocial support but may also introduce infections into transplant units. Unlike HCWs, visitors often lack formal IPC training and may underestimate the risks they pose. Respiratory and gastrointestinal infections and vaccine-preventable diseases can be transmitted through close contact, poor hand hygiene, or non-adherence to isolation precautions [54].

Transplant units should implement clear visitor policies, including screening for symptoms of infection, restrictions during outbreaks, and guidance on hand hygiene, respiratory etiquette, and PPE use. Education through verbal instruction, written materials, and visual reminders can enhance visitor compliance. Family members involved in direct patient care should receive targeted training on infection prevention measures, including catheter care, wound care, and early recognition of infection signs [55].

Vaccination of household contacts and frequent visitors is an essential preventive strategy. Ensuring that close contacts are immunized against influenza, measles, varicella, and other vaccine-preventable diseases creates a protective "cocooning" effect that reduces the likelihood of introducing infections into hospital and home environments [56].

Institutional Policies and Multidisciplinary Responsibility

Preventing infection transmission in SOT units requires coordinated, multidisciplinary efforts supported by institutional policies and leadership. Infection control teams should collaborate closely with transplant teams to tailor IPC policies to transplant-specific risks, conduct surveillance, investigate outbreaks, and provide feedback. Regular audits and transparent reporting of compliance and infection rates help identify gaps and promote continuous improvement [57].

Creating a culture of safety, where IPC is viewed as a shared responsibility among HCWs, visitors, and caregivers, is essential for sustainable success. Such a culture supports accountability, encourages reporting of lapses, and ultimately improves patient and graft outcomes in solid organ transplantation [58].

Health Education and Its Impact on Knowledge, Attitude, and Compliance With Infection Control Measures in Solid Organ Transplant Units

Health education is a cornerstone of effective infection prevention and control (IPC) in solid organ transplant (SOT) units, where patient vulnerability necessitates the highest standards of care. In these settings, health education extends beyond simple information delivery and functions as a structured, continuous process aimed at improving healthcare workers' (HCWs') knowledge, shaping positive attitudes, and ultimately enhancing compliance with IPC measures. From a public health and community medicine perspective, health education represents a cost-effective and sustainable intervention to reduce healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) and improve transplant outcomes [59].

Impact of Health Education on Knowledge

Knowledge is the foundational domain influenced by health education. Numerous studies have demonstrated that structured educational interventions significantly improve HCWs' understanding of standard precautions, transmission-based precautions, hand hygiene indications, appropriate use of personal protective equipment, and prevention of device-associated infections. In SOT units, where infection risks are complex and dynamic, education tailored to transplant-specific scenarios—such as immunosuppression-related risks, multidrug-resistant organisms, and invasive device management—is particularly effective [60].

Baseline assessments in many healthcare settings reveal substantial gaps in IPC knowledge among HCWs, even in specialized units. Educational programs that combine theoretical content with practical demonstrations and case-based discussions have been shown to address these gaps more effectively than passive learning methods. Improved knowledge following education has been consistently documented across professional groups, including nurses, physicians, and allied health staff [61].

Influence of Health Education on Attitudes

Attitudes toward IPC measures play a critical mediating role between knowledge and practice. Health education contributes to attitude change by increasing risk perception, reinforcing the value of preventive behaviors, and fostering a sense of professional responsibility toward patient safety. In SOT units, where the consequences of infection are often severe, education that emphasizes real-world outcomes—such as graft loss, prolonged hospitalization, and mortality—has been shown to strengthen HCWs' commitment to IPC practices [62].

Positive attitudes toward IPC are associated with higher motivation, greater willingness to comply with guidelines, and increased advocacy for safe practices among peers. Educational interventions that encourage discussion, reflection, and shared problem-solving are particularly effective in addressing misconceptions and resistance, thereby promoting a safety-oriented mindset [63].

Effect of Health Education on Compliance and Practice

The ultimate goal of health education is behavior change and sustained compliance with IPC measures. A growing body of interventional research demonstrates that educational programs can lead to significant improvements in HCWs' compliance with hand hygiene, PPE use, aseptic techniques, and care bundles targeting device-associated infections. In SOT units, such improvements have been associated with measurable reductions in HAIs, including central-line–associated bloodstream infections and ventilator-associated pneumonia [64].

However, evidence also indicates that improvements in knowledge and attitudes do not always translate automatically into improved practice. Compliance is influenced by contextual factors such as workload, staffing, availability of supplies, and organizational culture. Consequently, health education is most effective when integrated into multimodal IPC strategies that include audits, feedback, reminders, and leadership support [65].

Educational Models and Strategies in IPC

Health education interventions in IPC commonly draw on the knowledge–attitude–practice (KAP) framework, which posits that increased knowledge influences attitudes and, in turn, practices. While this model provides a useful conceptual foundation, contemporary research emphasizes the need to address environmental and system-level barriers alongside individual-level education. In SOT units, combining education with system redesign—such as improving access to hand hygiene facilities or simplifying protocols—enhances the likelihood of sustained behavior change [66].

Effective educational strategies include in-service training, simulation-based learning, mentorship, peer education, and e-learning platforms. Simulation and hands-on training are particularly valuable in transplant units, as they allow HCWs to practice complex IPC procedures in a controlled environment. Regular refresher training is essential to maintain competencies, especially in the context of staff turnover and evolving guidelines [67].

Health Education Within a Public Health Framework

From a public health perspective, health education in IPC contributes not only to individual patient safety but also to broader goals such as antimicrobial resistance containment, occupational health protection, and health system resilience. The World Health Organization emphasizes that education is a core component of IPC programs and should be implemented as part of a comprehensive, multimodal approach that addresses individual behavior, organizational culture, and health system structures [68].

In SOT units, health education should be continuous, evidence-based, and context-specific, targeting HCWs, patients, and caregivers alike. By strengthening knowledge, shaping positive attitudes, and supporting compliance, health education plays a pivotal role in reducing infection risks and improving outcomes for transplant recipients [69].

Barriers and Facilitators to Effective Health Education and IPC Implementation in Solid Organ Transplant Units

Although health education is central to improving infection prevention and control (IPC) in solid organ transplant (SOT) units, its effectiveness varies widely depending on individual, organizational, and system-level contexts. In practice, educational interventions may succeed in improving knowledge but fail to achieve sustained compliance if structural barriers remain unaddressed. Understanding the barriers and facilitators influencing IPC education and implementation is therefore essential to designing practical, durable improvement strategies in transplant settings [70].

Individual-Level Barriers and Facilitators

At the individual level, variability in baseline knowledge, risk perception, and professional attitudes shapes how healthcare workers (HCWs) respond to education. Lack of understanding of IPC guidance, limited awareness of transmission risks during routine care, and misconceptions about the effectiveness of preventive measures contribute to poor engagement and weak translation of education into practice. In transplant units, these gaps are particularly consequential because the clinical consequences of infection are severe and often rapid. Conversely, higher perceived vulnerability of transplant recipients and stronger professional commitment to patient safety can facilitate better engagement with training and improved adherence [71].

Behavioral barriers also include forgetfulness, low motivation, discomfort with PPE, and "risk normalization" that develops over time in busy units. When IPC practices are perceived as time-consuming or secondary to urgent clinical tasks, education alone may not change behavior. Facilitators at this level include practical, skills-based training, reinforcement through reminders, and education approaches that enhance self-efficacy by focusing on real-world problem-solving rather than abstract recommendations [72].

Workload, Staffing, and Time Constraints

Workload is one of the most consistently reported barriers to effective IPC implementation. High patient acuity, staff shortages, frequent interruptions, and time pressure reduce opportunities for correct hand hygiene, proper PPE donning and doffing, and full completion of infection prevention bundles. These realities are especially prominent in transplant units, where patients often require intensive monitoring and frequent invasive interventions. In such circumstances, compliance may decline even among well-trained staff, indicating that education must be paired with staffing and workflow solutions [73].

A major facilitator is workload-sensitive design of IPC interventions. Simplifying protocols, ensuring easy access to hand hygiene stations, placing PPE at point-of-care, and reducing unnecessary steps in procedures can help staff maintain compliance under pressure. From a public health quality-improvement perspective, these are structural facilitators that improve the likelihood that education results in consistent behavior change [74].

Resource and Infrastructure Barriers

Inadequate resources limit the effectiveness of both education and implementation. Shortages of PPE, limited access to alcohol-based hand rub, insufficient sinks, inadequate isolation rooms, and lack of cleaning supplies directly undermine compliance. Even the most comprehensive education program cannot succeed if staff lack the tools needed to implement recommended practices. WHO identifies availability of supplies and a supportive built environment as essential components of IPC systems, particularly in high-risk clinical settings [75].

Facilitators include consistent supply chains, adequate budget allocation for IPC materials, clear stock monitoring systems, and strong logistical support. In transplant units, prioritizing resources for isolation, environmental cleaning, and high-risk device care is especially important due to the high susceptibility of recipients and the increased risk of outbreaks [76].

Organizational Culture, Leadership, and Policy Environment

Organizational culture is a major determinant of whether IPC education translates into practice. In environments where leadership visibly supports IPC, compliance is higher and education is more likely to result in sustained change. Conversely, weak enforcement of policies, unclear accountability, and lack of feedback reduce staff motivation and normalize noncompliance. WHO emphasizes the importance of IPC programs, guidelines, training, surveillance, monitoring/audit, staffing, and infrastructure as core components that must function together to enable effective implementation [77].

Facilitators include leadership engagement, presence of active IPC teams, strong role modeling by senior clinicians, clear written protocols, and transparent audit-and-feedback systems. Regular multidisciplinary meetings, case reviews of HAIs, and open discussion of near-misses can strengthen safety culture and make IPC a shared responsibility rather than an individual burden [78].

Training Design and Sustainability Challenges

A frequent barrier is the design of educational programs that are too generic, infrequent, or overly didactic. One-time lectures may improve short-term knowledge but rarely achieve long-term compliance without reinforcement. Training that is not adapted to the local transplant unit context—such as transplant-specific device risks, local MDRO epidemiology, or outbreak history—may be perceived as irrelevant and less likely to change practice. Another barrier is high staff turnover, which creates persistent gaps unless training is embedded in routine orientation and continuing education systems [79].

Facilitators include multimodal training strategies that combine didactic sessions with practical demonstrations, simulation, periodic refresher training, competency assessments, and peer mentoring. Integrating education into performance monitoring and clinical governance strengthens sustainability. WHO recommends multimodal strategies, which are especially appropriate in transplant units where infection consequences are high and compliance demands are complex [80].

Patient, Family, and Visitor Factors

Implementation is also influenced by patient and visitor behaviors. Visitors may have limited understanding of isolation precautions and may unintentionally introduce infections. Without visitor education, screening, and clear policies, even high HCW compliance may be insufficient. Facilitators include structured visitor guidance, signage, screening at entry points, and caregiver training for those involved in direct patient care [81].

Summary

In solid organ transplant units, education is necessary but not sufficient for sustained IPC improvement. Barriers such as workload, staffing shortages, resource limitations, weak organizational support, and ineffective training design can prevent knowledge from translating into consistent compliance. Facilitators include multimodal training, leadership engagement, resource availability, workflow redesign, monitoring with feedback, and strong safety culture. Addressing these determinants together offers the most practical and evidence-based pathway to reducing HAIs in transplant settings [82].

Core Infection Prevention and Control Measures in Solid Organ Transplant Units: Standard Precautions

Standard precautions constitute the foundation of infection prevention and control (IPC) in all healthcare settings and are of paramount importance in solid organ transplant (SOT) units, where patients are at exceptionally high risk for severe and opportunistic infections. These precautions are designed to reduce the risk of transmission of bloodborne and other pathogens from recognized and unrecognized sources. In transplant units, strict and consistent application of standard precautions is essential to prevent healthcare-associated infections (HAIs), protect healthcare workers (HCWs), and improve graft and patient survival [83].

Hand Hygiene

Hand hygiene is universally recognized as the most effective and cost-efficient IPC measure. In SOT units, hand hygiene is critical because transplant recipients are highly susceptible to infections transmitted via transient flora carried on HCWs' hands. Compliance with hand hygiene before and after patient contact, before aseptic tasks, after exposure to body fluids, and after contact with patient surroundings is essential. Despite strong evidence supporting its effectiveness, hand hygiene compliance remains suboptimal in many settings, often due to workload, forgetfulness, and poor accessibility to hand hygiene facilities [84].

The use of alcohol-based hand rubs has been shown to improve compliance and reduce HAIs when readily available at the point of care. Multimodal strategies combining education, reminders, audits, and feedback have been demonstrated to significantly improve hand hygiene adherence. International guidance from the World Health Organization emphasizes hand hygiene as a core component of IPC programs and highlights its central role in protecting immunocompromised populations such as transplant recipients [85].

Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)

Appropriate use of personal protective equipment is a key element of standard precautions. PPE—including gloves, gowns, masks, respirators, and eye protection—serves as a barrier to prevent transmission of pathogens between HCWs and patients. In SOT units, PPE is particularly important during contact with blood, body fluids, mucous membranes, non-intact skin, and contaminated equipment, as well as during care of patients colonized or infected with multidrug-resistant organisms [86].

Incorrect selection, donning, doffing, or disposal of PPE has been frequently reported and is associated with increased risk of self-contamination and cross-transmission. Education and hands-on training are therefore essential to ensure correct PPE use. Ensuring availability of appropriate PPE at the point of care and integrating PPE protocols into routine workflows are critical facilitators of compliance in transplant units [87].

Sharps Safety and Injection Practices

Sharps injuries pose a dual risk of occupational exposure for HCWs and potential transmission of bloodborne pathogens. Standard precautions mandate safe injection practices, use of safety-engineered devices, avoidance of needle recapping, and proper disposal of sharps in puncture-resistant containers. In transplant units, where invasive procedures are frequent, adherence to sharps safety protocols is essential to protect HCWs and maintain a safe care environment [88].

Education and training on sharps safety, coupled with institutional policies and availability of safety devices, have been shown to reduce needlestick injuries. Reporting systems and post-exposure management protocols are also critical components of comprehensive sharps injury prevention programs [89].

Environmental Cleaning and Equipment Decontamination

The healthcare environment plays an important role in pathogen transmission, particularly in high-risk units such as transplant wards. Environmental surfaces, shared medical equipment, and high-touch areas can serve as reservoirs for multidrug-resistant organisms and opportunistic pathogens. Standard precautions include routine cleaning and disinfection of patient care areas and proper reprocessing of reusable medical equipment [90].

In SOT units, enhanced environmental cleaning protocols may be required due to prolonged patient stays and frequent invasive procedures. Training of environmental services staff, clear cleaning protocols, and regular monitoring of cleaning effectiveness are essential to minimize environmental contamination and reduce infection risk [90].

Respiratory Hygiene and Cough Etiquette

Respiratory hygiene and cough etiquette are integral components of standard precautions, particularly during respiratory infection seasons or outbreaks. Measures include covering the mouth and nose during coughing or sneezing, use of masks by symptomatic individuals, hand hygiene after respiratory secretions, and spatial separation when feasible. These measures are especially important in SOT units to prevent transmission of respiratory viruses, which can cause severe disease in transplant recipients [90].

Summary

Standard precautions form the cornerstone of IPC in solid organ transplant units. Consistent adherence to hand hygiene, appropriate PPE use, sharps safety, environmental cleaning, and respiratory hygiene is essential to prevent HAIs and protect both patients and HCWs. While knowledge of these measures is necessary, sustained compliance requires continuous education, adequate resources, supportive leadership, and a strong culture of safety. Strengthening standard precautions in transplant units is a critical public health intervention that directly contributes to improved patient outcomes and safer healthcare systems [93].

Conclusion

Infection prevention and control in solid organ transplant units represents a critical intersection between clinical care, public health, and patient safety. Transplant recipients are uniquely vulnerable to healthcare-associated infections due to lifelong immunosuppression, frequent exposure to invasive procedures, prolonged healthcare contact, and reduced immune responses to pathogens. Consequently, even minor lapses in infection prevention practices can lead to severe morbidity, graft dysfunction, prolonged hospitalization, and increased mortality.

This review highlights that healthcare workers' knowledge, attitudes, and compliance with infection prevention and control measures are central determinants of patient safety in transplant settings. While adequate knowledge is a prerequisite for safe practice, it is insufficient on its own. Sustained compliance depends on a complex interplay of individual behavior, effective health education, organizational culture, leadership support, availability of resources, and supportive health system structures. Multimodal strategies that integrate education, training, monitoring, feedback, and system-level interventions are consistently shown to be the most effective approach for improving compliance and reducing healthcare-associated infections.

Health education emerges as a powerful and cost-effective tool for strengthening infection prevention in solid organ transplant units. When education is continuous, context-specific, and grounded in behavioral and public health frameworks, it can meaningfully improve healthcare workers' knowledge, shape positive attitudes, and promote safer practices. However, the impact of education is maximized only when barriers such as workload, staffing shortages, resource limitations, and weak institutional support are addressed concurrently.

Vaccination of transplant candidates, recipients, healthcare workers, and close contacts represents an essential yet often underutilized component of infection prevention. Optimizing vaccination strategies through timely administration, clear protocols, and comprehensive education can substantially reduce the burden of vaccine-preventable diseases in transplant populations. Similarly, strict adherence to standard and transmission-based precautions, supported by robust institutional policies and a strong safety culture, remains fundamental to preventing infection transmission.

From a public health and community medicine perspective, strengthening infection prevention and control in solid organ transplant units extends benefits beyond individual patients. Effective IPC reduces antimicrobial resistance, enhances occupational safety, improves healthcare quality, and contributes to more efficient use of healthcare resources. Ultimately, sustained investment in education, leadership, and system-level support is essential to protect transplant recipients and ensure the long-term success of solid organ transplantation programs.

How to cite this article: Noha Hesham El-Awady, Amel Elwan Mohammed , Amira Abdelsalam, Wafaa Atwa Elnemr (2024). Infection Prevention and Control in Solid Organ Transplant Units: Healthcare Workers' Knowledge, Compliance, and Determinants, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2024,892-906.

Source of support: None.

Conflict of interest: Nil.

Accepted: 26.06.2024 **Received** 03.06.2024

REFERENCES

1. Fishman JA. Infection in organ transplantation. *Am J Transplant*. 2017;17(4):856-879.
2. Fishman JA, Rubin RH. Infection in organ-transplant recipients. *N Engl J Med*. 1998;338(24):1741-1751.
3. Chong PP, Avery RK. A comprehensive review of immunization practices in solid organ transplant recipients. *Clin Ther*. 2017;39(8):1581-1598.
4. Danziger-Isakov L, Kumar D. Vaccination of solid organ transplant candidates and recipients. *Clin Transplant*. 2019;33:e13563.
5. Velikova T, Gerasoudis S, Batselova H. Vaccination for solid organ transplanted patients. *World J Transplant*. 2024;14(4):92172.
6. Viganò M, Beretta M, Lepore M, et al. Vaccination recommendations in solid organ transplant adult candidates and recipients. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2023;11(10):1611.
7. Rubin LG, Levin MJ, Ljungman P, et al. Vaccination of the immunocompromised host. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(3):309-318.
8. Banach DB, Seville MT, Kusne S. Infection prevention and control issues after solid organ transplantation. *Transplant Infect Dis*. 2016;15:843-910.
9. Pergam SA. Infection prevention in transplantation. *Curr Infect Dis Rep*. 2016;18(2):7.
10. Guenette A, Husain S. Infectious complications following solid organ transplantation. *Crit Care Clin*. 2019;35(1):151-168.
11. San Juan R, Aguado JM, Lumbreras C, et al. Incidence, clinical characteristics and risk factors of late infection in solid organ transplant recipients. *Am J Transplant*. 2007;7(4):964-971.
12. Helanterä I, Anttila VJ, Lappalainen M, et al. Outbreak of influenza A(H1N1) in a kidney transplant unit. *Am J Transplant*. 2015;15(9):2470-2474.
13. Perez-Romero P, Bulnes-Ramos A, Torre-Cisneros J. Influenza vaccination after solid organ transplantation. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2015;21:1040.e1-1040.e11.
14. Delden C. De novo anti-HLA antibodies after influenza immunization. *Am J Transplant*. 2011;11:1727-1733.
15. Rubin RH. Infectious disease complications of renal transplantation. *Kidney Int*. 1993;44(2):221-236.

16. Siegel JD, Rhinehart E, Jackson M, Chiarello L. Guideline for isolation precautions. *Am J Infect Control*. 2007;35(10 Suppl 2):S65-S164.
17. Pittet D, Allegranzi B, Boyce J. WHO guidelines on hand hygiene in health care. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2009;30(7):611-622.
18. World Health Organization. *WHO Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care*. Geneva; 2009.
19. World Health Organization. *Guidelines on Core Components of Infection Prevention and Control Programmes*. Geneva; 2016.
20. World Health Organization. *Improving Infection Prevention and Control at the Health Facility*. Geneva; 2018.
21. World Health Organization. *Minimum Requirements for Infection Prevention and Control Programmes*. Geneva; 2019.
22. World Health Organization. *Transmission-Based Precautions for IPC*. Geneva; 2022.
23. World Health Organization. *Health Care Without Avoidable Infections*. Geneva; 2016.
24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Guideline for Isolation Precautions*. Atlanta; 2007.
25. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Sharps Safety Workbook*. Atlanta; 2008.
26. Alhumaid S, Al Mutair A, Al Alawi Z, et al. Knowledge of IPC among healthcare workers. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2021;10:86.
27. Moralejo D, El Dib R, Prata RA, Barretti P, Corrêa I. Improving adherence to standard precautions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2018;2:CD010768.
28. Fayaz SH, Higuchi M, Hirosawa T, et al. Knowledge and practice of standard precautions. *J Infect Dev Ctries*. 2014;8(4):535-542.
29. Assefa J, Diress G, Adane S. Infection prevention knowledge and practice. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2020;9:1-9.
30. Ward DJ. The role of education in infection control. *Nurse Educ Today*. 2011;31(1):9-17.
31. Gaikwad UN, Basak S, Kulkarni P, et al. Educational intervention to improve IPC practices. *Int J Infect Control*. 2018;14(2).
32. Rav-Marathe K, Wan T, Marathe S. KAP framework for health education. *Med Res Arch*. 2016;4(1):1-21.
33. Senbato F, Wolde D, Belina M, et al. IPC compliance among healthcare workers. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2024;13(1):32.
34. Negm E, Othman H, Tawfeek M, et al. Impact of IPC education on device-associated infections. *Germs*. 2021;11:381-390.
35. Mehta Y, Gupta A, Todi S, et al. Prevention of hospital-acquired infections. *Indian J Crit Care Med*. 2022;26(Suppl 2):S1-S38.
36. Tolvanen M, Lahti S, Miettunen J, Hausen H. Knowledge, attitudes and behavior. *Acta Odontol Scand*. 2012;70(2):169-176.
37. Neuwirth M, Mattner F, Otchwemah R. PPE adherence among HCWs. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2020;9:199.
38. Kilinc F. Isolation gowns in healthcare settings. *Am J Infect Control*. 2016;44(1):104-111.
39. Lavoie MC, Verbeek JH, Pahwa M. Preventing needlestick injuries. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;3:CD009740.
40. Szymczak JE, Smathers S, Hoegg C, et al. Presenteeism among clinicians. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2015;169(9):815-821.
41. Dancer SJ. Role of environment in HAIs. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2014;27(4):665-690.
42. Birnbach DJ. Hand hygiene compliance by visitors. *Am J Infect Control*. 2015;43(2):159-160.
43. Rosenthal VD, Al-Abdely HM, El-Kholy AA, et al. INICC report. *Am J Infect Control*. 2016;44(12):1495-1504.
44. Umscheid CA, Mitchell MD, Doshi JA, et al. Preventable HAIs. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2011;32(2):101-114.
45. Cassini A, Plachouras D, Eckmanns T, et al. Burden of HAIs in Europe. *PLoS Med*. 2016;13(10):e1002150.
46. Suetens C, Hopkins S, Kolman J. HAIs in Europe. *Euro Surveill*. 2013;18(46):20617.
47. Marschall J. CLABSI prevention strategies. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2014;35(7):753-771.
48. Pittet D. Improving hand hygiene compliance. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2001;7(2):234-240.
49. Allegranzi B, Pittet D. Role of hand hygiene in healthcare safety. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9658):228-229.
50. Pittet D, Hugonnet S, Harbarth S, et al. Effectiveness of hand hygiene promotion. *Lancet*. 2000;356(9238):1307-1312.
51. Larson EL. APIC guideline for hand hygiene. *Am J Infect Control*. 1995;23(4):251-269.
52. Zingg W, Holmes A, Dettenkofer M, et al. Hospital organization and IPC. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2015;15(2):212-224.
53. Luangasanatip N, Hongsuwan M, Limmathurotsakul D, et al. Hand hygiene interventions. *BMJ*. 2015;351:h3728.
54. Saito H, Inoue K, Ditai J. Alcohol-based hand rub intervention. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2017;6:129.
55. Allegranzi B, Sax H, Bengaly L, et al. Multimodal IPC strategies. *BMJ*. 2011;343:d5522.
56. Johnston L. Nurse education and waste reduction. *J Nurs Care Qual*. 2017;32(4):E1-E6.

57. Claflin S, Klekociuk S, Fair H, et al. Online health education interventions. *Am J Health Promot*. 2022;36(1):201-224.
58. Prom-Wormley E, Clifford J, Bourdon J, et al. Community-based health education. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021;271:112160.
59. Zajacova A, Lawrence EM. Education and health disparities. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2018;39:273-288.
60. Raghupathi V, Raghupathi W. Education and health outcomes. *Arch Public Health*. 2020;78:20.
61. World Health Organization. *Health Promotion Glossary*. Geneva; 1998.
62. World Health Organization. *IPC Core Components*. Geneva; 2018.
63. World Health Organization. *Transmission-Based Precautions*. Geneva; 2022.
64. CDC. *Standard Precautions for All Patient Care*. Atlanta; 2024.
65. CDC. *Healthcare-Associated Infection Progress Report*. Atlanta; 2019.
66. KDIGO. Clinical practice guideline for the care of kidney transplant recipients. *Am J Transplant*. 2009;9(Suppl 3):S1-S155.
67. Singh N, Limaye AP. Infections in solid-organ transplant recipients. In: *Mandell, Douglas, and Bennett's Principles and Practice of Infectious Diseases*. Elsevier; 2015.
68. Rana A, Gruessner A, Agopian VG, et al. Survival benefit of solid-organ transplant. *JAMA Surg*. 2015;150(3):252-259.
69. Park B, Yoon J, Choi D. De novo cancer after transplantation. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9:17202.
70. Neofytos D, Garcia-Vidal C, Lamoth F. Invasive fungal infections in transplant patients. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2021;21:296.
71. Miller R, Assi M. Endemic fungal infections in solid organ transplant recipients. *Clin Transplant*. 2019;33:e13553.
72. Bodro M, Sanclemente G, Lipperheide I. UTI in kidney transplant recipients. *Am J Transplant*. 2015;15(4):1021-1027.
73. Lanini S, Costa A, Puro V. Carbapenem-resistant infections in transplant recipients. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0123706.
74. Paudel S, Zacharioudakis IM, Zervou FN, et al. Clostridioides difficile in transplant recipients. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0124483.
75. Camargo LF, Marra AR, Pignatari AC. Bloodstream infections in transplant patients. *Transpl Infect Dis*. 2015;17(2):308-313.
76. Berenger BM, Doucette KE, Smith SW. Nosocomial bloodstream infections in transplant patients. *Transpl Infect Dis*. 2016;18(2):183-190.
77. Cuza A, Bravo G, Bernal P, et al. HAIs in solid organ transplant recipients. *Transplant Proc*. 2020;52(2):509-511.
78. Said M. Infections in solid organ transplant recipients. *Ukr J Nephrol Dial*. 2021;2(70):64-76.
79. American Society of Transplantation. Infectious Diseases Community of Practice Guidelines. *Clin Transplant*. 2019.
80. WHO-ONT. Global Observatory on Donation and Transplantation. 2019.
81. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. HAIs and antimicrobial use. Stockholm; 2017.
82. Forrester JD, Maggio PM, Tennakoon L. Cost of HAIs in the United States. *J Patient Saf*. 2022;18:e477-e484.
83. Nelson RE, Slayton RB, Stevens VW, et al. Cost of HAIs. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2022;74(6):e260-e267.
84. Allegranzi B, Bagheri Nejad S, Combescure C, et al. Burden of endemic HAIs. *Lancet*. 2011;377(9761):228-241.
85. Cassini A, Colzani E, Pini A, et al. Impact of HAIs on mortality. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2019;19(1):56-66.
86. Pittet D, Donaldson L. Clean care is safer care. *Lancet*. 2005;366(9493):1246-1247.
87. WHO. *Patient Safety: A World Alliance for Safer Health Care*. Geneva; 2009.
88. WHO. *Health-Care Waste Management*. Geneva; 2024.
89. CDC. *Transmission-Based Precautions*. Atlanta; 2024.
90. World Health Organization. *Improving IPC Compliance Through Multimodal Strategies*. Geneva; 2018.