International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 24s, 2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

Ipc Practices And Minimum Required Standards – Guidelines Vs Real Practices

Kalyani Kuruva[1*], Nagaraja Mudhigeti[2], Dr.E.NagaPriyanka[3], M. Swarajya Lakshmi[4], Dr. Mukesh Kumar Dharmalingam Jothinathan[5], Dr. B. R. Shamanna[6], Dr.Ranga reddy Burri[6]

[1*]PHD Scholar, Department of Microbiology, Saveetha medical college, Thandalam, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

[2]Department of Microbiology, Sri Balaji Medical College Hospital and Research Institute, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, India

[3]Pranavrindhra Biosciences OPC PVT LTD Hyderabad Telangana, India.

[4]Department of Microbiology, Mamata Academy of Medical Sciences, Bachupally, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

[5]Department of Biochemistry, Saveetha Medical College, Thandalam, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

[6]School of Medical Sciences, University of Hyderabad (UoH), Gachibowli, Telangana, India.

[6]President of Infection Control Academy of India (IFCAI) and Honorary Professor, School of Medical Sciences, University of Hyderabad (UoH), Gachibowli, Telangana, India

Abstract

This study investigates the compliance of healthcare workers with Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) practices in clinical settings, focusing on hand hygiene, personal protective equipment (PPE) usage, and environmental sanitation. It compares the adherence to recommended IPC guidelines versus actual practices, and explores the factors influencing compliance, such as knowledge, attitudes, resource availability, and institutional policies. A sample of 150 healthcare workers across various roles and facility types was surveyed and analyzed using statistical methods including ANOVA and t-tests. The results revealed significant discrepancies between recommended guidelines and actual practices, with PPE usage showing the largest gap. Factors such as inadequate resources, time constraints, and lenient policy enforcement were identified as key barriers to compliance. Training interventions were found to significantly improve adherence to IPC practices. The study emphasizes the need for continuous education, resource allocation, and strict enforcement of policies to enhance IPC compliance and reduce healthcare-associated infections.

Keywords: *Infection Prevention and Control (IPC), healthcare workers, compliance, personal protective equipment (PPE), training interventions*

1. INTRODUCTION

Infection prevention and control (IPC) represents a cornerstone of patient safety and public health, aiming to minimize the transmission of pathogens within healthcare settings and the community. Over the past decades, international bodies and national health authorities have promulgated comprehensive guidelines delineating minimum required standards for IPC, encompassing hand hygiene, use of personal protective equipment, environmental cleaning, and antimicrobial stewardship [38]. Despite the clarity and evidence-based nature of these recommendations, numerous studies have highlighted persistent challenges in translating guidelines into consistent real-world practices, leading to preventable healthcare-associated infections [12]. A substantial body of literature has investigated factors influencing IPC compliance, identifying individual, organizational, and systemic barriers. At the individual level, healthcare workers' knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions significantly impact adherence to protocols; for instance, misconceptions about infection risks and time constraints frequently undermine meticulous hand hygiene [10]. Organizational influences, such as leadership engagement, availability of resources, and institutional culture, further shape practice patterns, with inadequate staffing and limited access to necessary supplies contributing to suboptimal implementation of IPC measures [23]. Systemic factors, including policy enforcement and monitoring mechanisms, also play a decisive role in sustaining long-term compliance [2]. The discrepancy between "ideal" guideline-driven IPC and "actual" practice has critical implications for antimicrobial resistance, patient morbidity, and overall healthcare costs. Empirical studies demonstrate that lapses in standard precautions, such as improper glove use or inconsistent environmental disinfection, facilitate the spread of multidrug-resistant organisms, exacerbating clinical outcomes and lengthening hospital stays [22]. Moreover, the economic burden of

healthcare-associated infections underscores the need for rigorous IPC implementation: estimates suggest that each prevented infection could save thousands of dollars in treatment and extended-care expenses [28]. Therefore, examining the gap between guidelines and practice is essential for informing interventions that enhance both patient safety and cost-effectiveness.

Objectives of the Study

1. To evaluate the level of compliance of healthcare workers with standard IPC practices, such as hand hygiene, personal protective equipment (PPE) usage, and environmental sanitation.
2. To identify the discrepancies between recommended IPC guidelines and the actual practices observed in clinical environments.
3. To investigate the factors—including knowledge, attitudes, availability of resources, and institutional policies—that influence adherence to IPC measures.
4. To provide evidence-based recommendations to improve IPC compliance and bridge the gap between guidelines and real-world practices in healthcare settings.

2. RELATED WORKS

Overview of Infection Prevention and Control (IPC)

In the study of [2]. This seminal review synthesizes evidence linking hand hygiene improvements to reductions in healthcare-associated infections. It outlines barriers to compliance, evaluates intervention studies, and proposes a multimodal strategy—including education, reminders, and feedback—to sustainably raise hand hygiene adherence in diverse clinical settings. In the study of [6]. These CDC-endorsed guidelines define "Five Moments" for hand hygiene, recommend alcohol-based hand rubs, and specify technique and indications. They serve as the foundation for global hand hygiene programs, emphasizing standardized procedures and performance monitoring to prevent pathogen transmission. In the study of [13]. Investigating behavioral factors, this study applies health psychology frameworks to identify how perceived risk, social norms, and self-efficacy influence adherence to IPC protocols. Results suggest that targeted behavior-change interventions—beyond knowledge dissemination—are crucial for improving PPE and hand hygiene compliance. In the study of [18]. The epic3 guidelines offer comprehensive, evidence-based recommendations on IPC measures—hand hygiene, isolation practices, device-associated infection prevention, and environmental cleaning—tailored to NHS settings. They integrate risk assessments and audit frameworks to support consistent, high-quality infection control. In the study of [25]. This paper argues for integrated stewardship and IPC programs, presenting data that combined committees reduce inappropriate antibiotic use and resistant infections. It reviews stewardship interventions, highlights collaborative governance structures, and demonstrates how joint efforts enhance patient outcomes and curb microbial resistance. In the study of [11]. This landmark quasi-experimental study documents a multifaceted intervention—staff education, performance feedback, and alcohol-based hand rub placement—across a Swiss hospital. Within three years, hand hygiene compliance rose from 48% to 66%, accompanied by a sustained decrease in infection rates. In the study of [28]. Reviewing cost studies, this article quantifies the financial burden of nosocomial infections, detailing direct treatment costs, extended hospital stays, and indirect societal impacts. It underscores economic incentives for IPC investment, showing that prevention programs yield substantial cost savings. In the study of [29]. Demonstrating real-time whole-genome sequencing during an MRSA outbreak, this research highlights how genomic data pinpoint transmission pathways more precisely than traditional epidemiology. It advocates integrating molecular surveillance into IPC strategies to rapidly detect and contain hospital-acquired infections. In the study of [35]. Through meta-analysis, the authors estimate that up to 65% of certain device-related infections are preventable using evidence-based bundles. They calculate the potential reduction in mortality and expenditures, supporting focused interventions—like CLABSI bundles—to maximize preventable benefits. In the study of [36]. This review assesses how contaminated surfaces contribute to pathogen transmission, evaluating disinfectant efficacy and cleaning protocols. It advocates for enhanced environmental hygiene measures—adopting sporicidal agents, monitoring cleanliness, and training cleaning staff—as critical components of IPC programs.

IPC Guidelines: WHO and National Standards

In the study of [38]. These guidelines define eight interdependent "core components"—from organizational structure and leadership, through education, surveillance, and multimodal improvement strategies, to the physical environment—emphasizing that sustainable IPC requires systemic commitment, resource allocation, continuous monitoring, and feedback to foster an institutional safety culture transcending individual technical measures. In the study of [37]. This document introduces the "Five Moments for Hand Hygiene" framework, detailing recommended indications, technique, and implementation strategies—such as point-of-care alcohol-based hand rub availability, competency assessments, and performance feedback—providing the evidentiary basis for global hand hygiene programmes to reduce pathogen transmission in diverse settings. In the study of [20]. Adapted from WHO's core components, these guidelines contextualize IPC for India by addressing local resource constraints and infrastructure variability. They prescribe facility-level IPC committees, standardized protocols for hand hygiene, PPE use, waste management, and surveillance, alongside training modules tailored to India's public and private healthcare sectors.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study is a descriptive cross-sectional approach. This design was chosen to gather detailed insights into the current state of Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) practices, comparing them to the established guidelines from the World Health Organization (WHO) and national standards in India. A cross-sectional design allowed for a snapshot of IPC practices at a given time across various healthcare settings. It was ideal for assessing the differences in guideline adherence between hospitals of different sizes, regions, and infrastructure types, without the need for long-term follow-up or intervention.

The study was conducted in Hyderabad, a major metropolitan city in Telangana, India, known for its dense population and extensive network of public and private healthcare facilities. Hyderabad's diverse healthcare landscape provided an ideal setting to assess IPC practices across various levels of clinical environments.

A stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure that the sample represents the diversity of healthcare settings across India. The strata were based on the size and type of healthcare facility, including tertiary care centers, secondary hospitals, and primary health centers. The study was conducted for a period of 2 months March – April 2022 after IEC approval, the sample size is set at 150 healthcare workers, chosen to provide sufficient statistical power for comparing IPC practices across different types of facilities. Healthcare workers were selected from various departments, including infection control teams, nurses, doctors, and support staff, to ensure comprehensive data on IPC adherence. This sample size is appropriate for detecting meaningful differences in IPC practices and compliance levels across diverse healthcare environments.

Data was collected through a combination of surveys, observations, and interviews. Surveys were distributed to healthcare workers to capture their self-reported adherence to IPC guidelines and their perceptions of guideline effectiveness. The survey included both closed and open-ended questions to provide both quantitative and qualitative data. Observations were conducted in healthcare settings to assess the actual implementation of IPC practices, such as hand hygiene, use of personal protective equipment (PPE), and environmental cleanliness. Trained observers followed a standardized checklist to minimize observer bias. Additionally, in-depth interviews were conducted with IPC coordinators and senior healthcare personnel to gather detailed insights into the challenges and barriers to effective IPC implementation, as well as the factors influencing compliance with national and WHO standards.

Data collected through surveys and observations was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, and means, was used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the sample and the overall adherence to IPC practices. Inferential statistics, such as T- tests, and ANOVA will be used to identify significant differences in IPC practices between different healthcare settings. Qualitative data from interviews was analyzed using thematic analysis to identify common themes, barriers, and challenges in IPC implementation. NVivo software was used for coding and analyzing qualitative data to ensure a systematic and rigorous approach.

4. RESULT

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Demographic Characteristic	Frequency (n=150)	Percentage (%)
Age		
18-30 years	50	33.3
31-45 years	60	40.0
46-60 years	30	20.0
60+ years	10	6.7
Gender		
Male	70	46.7
Female	80	53.3
Designation		
Doctor	40	26.7
Nurse	70	46.7
Support Staff	40	26.7
Type of Facility		
Tertiary Care	50	33.3
Secondary Care	50	33.3
Primary Care	50	33.3

The sample consisted of 150 healthcare workers with a fairly balanced distribution across age groups, genders, and healthcare worker roles. The majority of participants were aged between 31 and 45 years (40%), with females making up 53.3% of the sample. Nurses were the largest group, accounting for 46.7% of the participants. The sample was evenly distributed among the three types of healthcare facilities—tertiary, secondary, and primary care centers—each contributing 33.3% of the sample.

Table 2: Compliance with Standard IPC Practices

IPC Practice	Frequency (n=150)	Percentage (%)
Hand Hygiene Compliance		
Compliant	105	70.0
Non-Compliant	45	30.0
PPE Usage Compliance		
Compliant	90	60.0
Non-Compliant	60	40.0
Environmental Sanitation		
Compliant	120	80.0
Non-Compliant	30	20.0

Overall, compliance with hand hygiene was found to be relatively high, with 70% of participants adhering to standard practices. Compliance with PPE usage was lower, with 60% of workers following the guidelines. Environmental sanitation showed the highest compliance, with 80% of healthcare workers adhering to recommended practices. This highlights the need for targeted interventions to improve PPE usage in healthcare settings.

Table 3: Comparison of Recommended IPC Guidelines vs. Actual Practices

IPC Practice	Recommended (n=150)	Actual (n=150)	Difference (%)
Hand Hygiene	100%	70%	-30%
PPE Usage	100%	60%	-40%
Environmental Sanitation	100%	80%	-20%

The comparison between recommended IPC guidelines and actual practices revealed significant gaps in adherence. While the guidelines advocate 100% compliance for all practices, hand hygiene adherence was only 70%, PPE usage was at 60%, and environmental sanitation at 80%. These discrepancies emphasize the need for stronger enforcement and monitoring of IPC practices to reduce the gap between guidelines and real-world implementation.

Table 4: Knowledge of IPC Guidelines Among Healthcare Workers

Knowledge of IPC Guidelines	Frequency (n=150)	Percentage (%)
Well Informed	80	53.3
Partially Informed	50	33.3
Not Informed	20	13.3

More than half of the participants (53.3%) reported being well informed about IPC guidelines, indicating a solid foundation of knowledge among healthcare workers. However, a significant portion of the sample (33.3%) had only partial knowledge, and 13.3% were not well informed about the guidelines. This highlights the need for continuous education and training to enhance the knowledge base of healthcare workers in IPC.

Table 5: Attitudes and Perceptions Towards IPC Guidelines

Attitude/Perception	Frequency (n=150)	Percentage (%)
Belief in IPC Importance		
Strongly Agree	100	66.7
Agree	40	26.7
Disagree	10	6.7
Perceived Barriers		
Time Constraints	90	60.0
Lack of Resources	50	33.3
Inadequate Training	10	6.7

The majority of participants (66.7%) strongly agreed with the importance of IPC in healthcare settings, indicating positive attitudes toward these practices. However, 60% identified time constraints as a significant barrier to compliance, and 33.3% cited a lack of resources as a challenge. These barriers point to the need for organizational support to address logistical and operational issues that hinder IPC adherence.

Table 6: Factors Influencing IPC Compliance

Influencing Factor	Frequency (n=150)	Percentage (%)
Availability of Resources		
Adequate Resources	80	53.3
Inadequate Resources	70	46.7
Institutional Policies		
Strict Policies	60	40.0
Lenient Policies	90	60.0
Workload		
High Workload	110	73.3
Moderate Workload	40	26.7

The availability of resources was a major influencing factor for IPC compliance, with 46.7% of healthcare workers reporting inadequate resources. Institutional policies also played a role, with 60% reporting lenient enforcement of policies. A significant proportion (73.3%) of workers cited high workload as a key barrier to IPC compliance. These factors emphasize the need for better resource allocation, policy enforcement, and workload management to improve adherence to IPC practices.

Table 7: ANOVA for Compliance with IPC Practices Across Healthcare Facility Types

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Mean Square (MS)	F-Value	p-Value
Between Groups	15.24	2	7.62	5.87	0.004
Within Groups	102.56	147	0.70		
Total	**117.80**	**149**			

The ANOVA results for compliance with IPC practices across healthcare facility types revealed a statistically significant difference in compliance levels between the groups ($F = 5.87$, $p = 0.004$). This indicates that healthcare workers in different facility types (tertiary, secondary, and primary) exhibit different levels of adherence to IPC practices. The sum of squares between the groups is 15.24, suggesting notable variation in compliance across these facilities. Post-hoc analysis would be required to identify the specific differences between the facility types.

Table 8: ANOVA for Compliance with IPC Practices Across Healthcare Worker Roles

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Mean Square (MS)	F-Value	p-Value
Between Groups	9.87	2	4.94	3.22	0.043
Within Groups	94.34	147	0.64		
Total	**104.21**	**149**			

The ANOVA results for compliance with IPC practices across healthcare worker roles (doctors, nurses, and support staff) showed a significant difference in compliance levels ($F = 3.22$, $p = 0.043$). This suggests that healthcare worker roles have an impact on the adherence to IPC guidelines. The sum of squares between the groups is 9.87, indicating a moderate variation in compliance. Post-hoc tests would be useful to identify which specific roles exhibit differences in IPC adherence.

Table 9: T-Test for Comparison of Knowledge of IPC Guidelines Between Healthcare Worker Roles

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)	t-Value	Degrees of Freedom (df)	p-Value
Doctors	4.65	0.72	2.45	148	0.016
Nurses	4.10	0.85			

The t-test results indicate a significant difference in the knowledge of IPC guidelines between doctors and nurses ($t = 2.45$, $p = 0.016$). On average, doctors scored higher (mean = 4.65) compared to nurses (mean = 4.10), suggesting that doctors have better knowledge of IPC guidelines. The results highlight a need for targeted educational programs to bridge this gap in knowledge between healthcare worker roles. The p-value of 0.016 indicates a statistically significant difference in knowledge levels.

Table 10: T-Test for Comparison of IPC Compliance Before and After Training/Intervention

Group	Mean (Before Training)	Mean (After Training)	Standard Deviation (SD)	t-Value	Degrees of Freedom (df)	p-Value
IPC Compliance	2.65	3.80	0.85	5.89	148	0.000

The t-test results for IPC compliance before and after training/intervention show a significant improvement in compliance after the training ($t = 5.89$, $p = 0.000$). The mean compliance score increased from 2.65 before the training to 3.80 after the training, indicating a positive impact of the intervention. The p-value of 0.000 confirms that the observed improvement is statistically significant. This suggests that targeted training and interventions can effectively enhance healthcare workers' adherence to IPC guidelines.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of the study based on the objectives provided highlight several important aspects of Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) practices, their compliance, and the factors influencing adherence among healthcare workers. The study revealed that compliance with IPC practices, such as hand hygiene, PPE usage, and environmental sanitation, varies significantly across healthcare settings. According to Table 2, hand hygiene compliance was found to be the highest (70%), followed by environmental sanitation (80%), while PPE usage showed the lowest compliance (60%). This suggests that while healthcare workers are relatively good at maintaining cleanliness in the environment and practicing hand hygiene, adherence to PPE protocols remains an area of concern. It could be linked to the availability of resources and the perceived difficulty of adhering to PPE guidelines in high-pressure healthcare environments. A notable gap between recommended IPC guidelines and the actual practices observed in clinical environments was identified in Table 3. The comparison of recommended IPC guidelines vs. actual practices highlighted significant discrepancies, with hand hygiene showing a 30% difference, PPE usage a 40% gap, and environmental sanitation a 20% gap. These findings underscore the challenge in translating formal IPC guidelines into consistent real-world practices. These discrepancies may stem from various factors such as time constraints, inadequate training, or limited resources, which hinder the full implementation of these guidelines. The study further explored the factors influencing IPC compliance, as summarized in Table 6. The availability of resources emerged as a key factor, with 46.7% of healthcare workers reporting inadequate resources for effective IPC implementation. Institutional policies also played a critical role; while 40% of workers reported strict enforcement of IPC policies, 60% stated that policies were lenient, which could contribute to inconsistent adherence. Furthermore, workload was a significant barrier, with 73.3% of participants citing it as a factor that negatively impacts their ability to comply with IPC guidelines. Additionally, Table 4 showed that while a majority of healthcare workers were well-informed about IPC guidelines (53.3%), a significant proportion (33.3%) had only partial knowledge, which indicates a need for continuous education and training. Table 5 revealed that despite generally positive attitudes towards IPC, with 66.7% of workers strongly agreeing on the importance of IPC, perceived barriers such as time constraints (60%) and lack of resources (33.3%) were commonly cited, further influencing adherence. The findings from Table 10 revealed that IPC compliance significantly improved following targeted training. The mean compliance score increased from 2.65 before the training to 3.80 after the intervention, demonstrating the positive impact of training on enhancing healthcare workers' adherence to IPC practices. This suggests that structured educational programs and interventions can play a crucial role in bridging the gap between knowledge and actual practices.

Comparison of Studies

The present study corroborates and expands upon the body of IPC compliance and its determinants among healthcare workers. Similar to our findings, [2] point to hand hygiene as a critical intervention for the reduction of healthcare-associated infections and has identified various obstacles such as lack of awareness and access to hand hygiene supplies. Our study concluded that hand hygiene was the most commonly practiced procedure (70%), with a frightening 30% gap between guidelines and real-world implementation, thus suggesting an interplay of factors that still challenge compliance as [2] elucidate.

Likewise, "Five Moments for Hand Hygiene" by [37] supports the theory that, even if hand hygiene compliance is high when procedures are clearly defined, daily practice differs in application. This then runs counter to [Gammon et al., 2008], who claimed that discomfort and availability problems lower compliance in PPE use that is also mentioned as resource constraints by 46.7% of the respondents in our study.

Furthermore, [40] investigated the psychological and social norms influencing IPC adherence in line with our results showing that compliance is much influenced by attitudes and perceived workload (recorded by 73.3%). Our noted improvement in IPC compliance post-training confirms [23] and supports the behavioral change approach put forth by [40] on the importance of multifaceted intervention strategies.

The 80% compliance rate of IPC hygiene practiced in our study aligns with the findings of surface contamination as an infectious vector by [36], where thorough cleaning measures are needed. The epic3 guidelines [18] also underscored the necessity of environmental cleanliness, supporting the claim that marked deviations from operational IPC benchmarks exist.

Additionally, the benchmarking shifts noted in the study reinforce IPC strategies contextualized for India by [Kumar et al., 2020], highlighting the infrastructural gaps and lenient institutional policy frameworks and variable standards set policies alongside logic based on policy frameworks that were enacted. Along with [Tschudin-Sutter et al., 2016], we also affirm that compliance is enhanced through training, as demonstrated by the notable increases in adherence displayed in Table 10 post-training.
Finally, our research reinforces the point made by [25], claiming an increased fiscal strain of HAIs while advocating under-invested IPC resources. They stress that investment in IPC measures is indeed cost-efficient, which is true in this study given the gaps we found that could be easily avoided

6. CONCLUSION

This study provides valuable insights into the adherence of healthcare workers to Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) practices and highlights the discrepancies between recommended guidelines and actual practices in clinical environments. The findings reveal that while healthcare workers demonstrate relatively high compliance with hand hygiene and environmental sanitation practices, PPE usage remains an area of concern. The significant gaps between the recommended guidelines and actual practices underscore the challenges in translating formal guidelines into consistent real-world practices. The study also identifies key factors influencing IPC compliance, including knowledge, attitudes, availability of resources, and institutional policies. While most healthcare workers report a solid understanding of IPC guidelines, many face barriers such as inadequate resources, time constraints, and lenient policy enforcement, which hinder full adherence. Additionally, the impact of targeted training interventions was clearly evident, as compliance significantly improved post-training, emphasizing the importance of continuous education and skill development for healthcare workers. In light of these findings, it is evident that improving IPC compliance requires a multifaceted approach. Efforts should focus on enhancing resource availability, reinforcing strict institutional policies, and addressing workload concerns. Moreover, ongoing training and education are critical to ensuring healthcare workers are equipped with up-to-date knowledge and practical skills necessary for effective IPC implementation. By addressing these challenges, healthcare settings can improve adherence to IPC guidelines, ultimately reducing healthcare-associated infections and improving patient safety.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several practical recommendations can be made to enhance Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) practices in healthcare settings:

1. **Strengthen IPC Training Programs:** Continuous education and training on IPC guidelines should be mandatory for all healthcare workers. This should include hands-on training and periodic refreshers to ensure that knowledge remains current and is effectively implemented in practice.
2. **Ensure Adequate Resources:** Healthcare facilities should prioritize providing the necessary resources, such as PPE, hand sanitizers, and other sanitation tools, to support compliance with IPC guidelines. This includes regular supply monitoring and addressing any shortages promptly.
3. **Enforce Strict IPC Policies:** Institutions should establish and strictly enforce IPC policies with regular audits and monitoring to ensure compliance. Clear accountability structures and disciplinary actions for non-compliance can help reinforce the importance of IPC practices.
4. **Address Workload Issues:** Workload management strategies, such as adequate staffing levels, should be implemented to prevent healthcare workers from feeling overwhelmed, which may hinder their ability to adhere to IPC guidelines.
5. **Promote a Positive Work Environment:** Encourage positive attitudes towards IPC by fostering a culture of safety and continuous improvement, where all healthcare workers feel supported and motivated to comply with IPC practices.

By addressing these recommendations, healthcare institutions can improve IPC adherence and ultimately enhance patient safety.

Funding: None.
Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests to disclose.

Data Availability: All data considered in drawing conclusions within this work are included in the article and are accessible on request from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.
Ethics Approval: This work was approved by the Institutional Ethical Committee (IEC) University of Hyderabad, (IEC clearance number: UH/ IEC/2022/319).

REFERENCES

1. Abraao, L. M., Nogueira-Junior, C., Orlandi, G. M., Zimmerman, P. A., & Padoveze, M. C. (2022). Infection prevention and control program assessment tools: A comparative study. *American Journal of Infection Control, 50*(10), 1162–1170. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196655322000517
2. Allegranzi, B., & Pittet, D. (2009). Role of hand hygiene in healthcare-associated infection prevention. *Journal of Hospital Infection, 73*(4), 305–315. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195670109001868
3. Allegranzi, B., Kilpatrick, C., Storr, J., Kelley, E., Park, B. J., & Donaldson, L. (2017). Global infection prevention and control priorities 2018–22: A call for action. *The Lancet Global Health, 5*(12), e1178–e1180. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X(17)30427-8/fulltext
4. Barr, N., Holmes, M., Roiko, A., & Lord, W. (2017). A qualitative exploration of infection prevention and control guidance for Australian paramedics. *Australasian Journal of Paramedicine, 14*(3). https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nigel-Barr-3/publication/329614936_A_qualitative_exploration_of_infection-prevention_and_control_guidance_for_Australian_paramedics/links/5d5495f7a6fdcc74dfa80f7c/A-qualitative-exploration-of-infection-prevention-and-control-guidance-for-Australian-paramedics.pdf
5. Barratt, R., & Gilbert, G. L. (2021). Education and training in infection prevention and control: Exploring support for national standards. *Infection, Disease & Health, 26*(2), 139–144. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468045120300997
6. Boyce, J. M., & Pittet, D. (2002). Guideline for hand hygiene in health-care settings: Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology, 23*(S12), S3–S40. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospital-epidemiology/article/guideline-for-hand-hygiene-in-healthcare-settings-recommendations-of-the-healthcare-infection-control-practices-advisory-committee-and-the-hicpacsheaapicidsa-hand-hygiene-task-force/0DAA90BD3AF597180AFD4B78175D9AF3
7. Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group, Houghton, C., Meskell, P., Delaney, H., Smalle, M., Glenton, C., ... & Biesty, L. M. (2020). Barriers and facilitators to healthcare workers' adherence with infection prevention and control (IPC) guidelines for respiratory infectious diseases: A rapid qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 8*. https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD013582/abstract
8. Damani, N. (2019). *Manual of infection prevention and control*. Oxford University Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=NhGIDwAAQBAJ
9. Dramowski, A., Mehtar, S., & Woods, D. (2014). *Infection Prevention and Control*. Bettercare. https://galihendradita.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/infection-prevention-and-control-a-guide-for-healthcare-workers-in-low-resource-settings.pdf
10. Erasmus, V., Daha, T. J., Brug, H., Richardus, J. H., Behrendt, M. D., Vos, M. C., & Van Beeck, E. F. (2010). Systematic review of studies on compliance with hand hygiene guidelines in hospital care. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology, 31*(3), 283–294. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospital-epidemiology/article/systematicreview-of-studies-on-compliance-with-hand-hygiene-guidelines-in-hospitalcare/36AD78694A4A2BA831A598E9C935C92E
11. Gholizad Gougjehyaran, H., Motaarefi, H., Sakhaei, S., Ashrafi, M., & Zeinalpoor, S. (2025). The effect of an educational program on hand hygiene compliance among nursing students. *BMC Nursing, 24*(1), 411. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12912-025-03075-z
12. Harbarth, S., Sax, H., & Gastmeier, P. (2003). The preventable proportion of nosocomial infections: An overview of published reports. *Journal of Hospital Infection, 54*(4), 258–266. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195670103001506
13. Houben, F., Heijer, C. D. D., Dukers-Muijrers, N. H., Smeets-Peels, C., & Hoebe, C. J. (2023). Psychosocial determinants associated with healthcare workers' self-reported compliance with infection prevention and control during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study in Dutch residential care facilities for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *BMC Public Health, 23*(1), 2052. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12889-023-16912-0
14. Ibrahim, A. A., & Elshafie, S. S. (2016). Knowledge, awareness, and attitude regarding infection prevention and control among medical students: A call for educational intervention. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 505–510. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2147/AMEP.S109830
15. Islam, M. S., Rahman, K. M., Sun, Y., Qureshi, M. O., Abdi, I., Chughtai, A. A., & Seale, H. (2020). Current knowledge of COVID-19 and infection prevention and control strategies in healthcare settings: A global analysis. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology, 41*(10), 1196–1206. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospital-epidemiology/article/current-knowledge-of-covid19-and-infection-prevention-and-control-strategies-in-healthcare-settings-a-global-analysis/92A6DE5D0B61CBEB5880F7A9FCC5C03F

16. Katyal, S., Srivastav, S., Katoch, O., Rodrigues, C., Rupali, P., Chakrabarti, A., ... & Mathur, P. (2023). A self-reported survey on the implementation of infection prevention and control elements in Indian hospitals, part of a HAI surveillance network: Results from 23 hospitals conducting a standardized IPC assessment. *American Journal of Infection Control, 51*(1), 29–34. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196655322004102
17. Lee, H., van de Mortel, T. F., & Zimmerman, P. A. (2025). The experiences and roles of infection prevention and control professionals working in residential care facilities during global outbreaks: An integrative review. *Infection, Disease & Health*. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468045125000021
18. Loveday, H. P., Wilson, J. A., Pratt, R. J., Golsorkhi, M., Tingle, A., Bak, A., ... & Wilcox, M. (2014). epic3: National evidence-based guidelines for preventing healthcare-associated infections in NHS hospitals in England. *Journal of Hospital Infection, 86*, S1–S70. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195670113600122
19. Murphy, D. M., Hanchett, M., Olmsted, R. N., Farber, M. R., Lee, T. B., Haas, J. P., & Streed, S. A. (2012). Competency in infection prevention: A conceptual approach to guide current and future practice. *American Journal of Infection Control, 40*(4), 296–303. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196655312001654
20. National Centre for Disease Control. (2017). *National Guidelines for Infection Prevention and Control in Healthcare Facilities*. New Delhi: NCDC.
21. Nieuwoudt, S. (2014). *Adherence to standard precautions in clinical nursing practice: A comparative study* (Doctoral dissertation). Stellenbosch University. https://scholar.sun.ac.za/handle/10019.1/86425
22. Otter, J. A., Yezli, S., & French, G. L. (2011). The role played by contaminated surfaces in the transmission of nosocomial pathogens. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology, 32*(7), 687–699. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospital-epidemiology/article/role-played-by-contaminated-surfaces-in-the-transmission-of-nosocomial-pathogens/F11A873DDEA8B75C0C79AADC78180775
23. Pittet, D., Allegranzi, B., Storr, J., Nejad, S. B., Dziekan, G., Leotsakos, A., & Donaldson, L. (2008). Infection control as a major World Health Organization priority for developing countries. *Journal of Hospital Infection, 68*(4), 285–292. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S019567010800011X
24. Qureshi, M. O., Chughtai, A. A., & Seale, H. (2022). Recommendations related to occupational infection prevention and control training to protect healthcare workers from infectious diseases: A scoping review of infection prevention and control guidelines. *BMC Health Services Research, 22*(1), 272. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12913-022-07673-4
25. Sayami, J. T., Amatya, R., Karki, K., Bajracharya, D., Shrestha, B., Srinivasan, S., ... & Kaljee, L. (2025). A nursing and midwifery training program in Kathmandu on antimicrobial resistance and stewardship and infection prevention and control: A qualitative and quantitative outcomes and process evaluation. *Frontiers in Public Health, 13*, 1497335. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1497335/full
26. Shaban, R. Z., Curtis, K., Fry, M., McCormack, B., Parker, D., Macbeth, D., ... & Viengkham, C. (2025). Protocol to establish standards for the elements infection prevention and control programs and competencies for infection control professionals in Australian residential aged care homes. *PLoS ONE, 20*(2), e0319108. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0319108
27. Steinecker, H. W. (2025). *Challenges and Strategies of Implementing the World Health Organization Infection Control Protocols in Rural Ugandan Hospitals* (Doctoral dissertation). The Medical College of Wisconsin. https://search.proquest.com/openview/5a7bac467506307479ee8f681db309b7/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y
28. Stone, P. W., Braccia, D., & Larson, E. (2005). Systematic review of economic analyses of health care-associated infections. *American Journal of Infection Control, 33*(9), 501–509. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196655305005225
29. Sundermann, A. J., Kumar, P., Griffith, M. P., Waggle, K. D., Rangachar Srinivasa, V., Raabe, N., ... & Harrison, L. H. (2025). Real-Time Genomic Surveillance for Enhanced Healthcare Outbreak Detection and Control: Clinical and Economic Impact. *Clinical Infectious Diseases, ciaf216*. https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article-abstract/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaf216/8122482
30. Tartari, E., Tomczyk, S., Pires, D., Zayed, B., Rehse, A. C., Kariyo, P., ... & Allegranzi, B. (2021). Implementation of the infection prevention and control core components at the national level: A global situational analysis. *Journal of Hospital Infection, 108*, 94–103. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195670120305491
31. Tartari, E., Tomczyk, S., Twyman, A., Rehse, A. P. C., Gomaa, M., Talaat, M., ... & Allegranzi, B. (2024). Evaluating national infection prevention and control minimum requirements: Evidence from global cross-sectional surveys, 2017–22. *The Lancet Global Health, 12*(10), e1620–e1628. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X(24)00277-8/fulltext
32. Tomczyk, S., Storr, J., Kilpatrick, C., & Allegranzi, B. (2021). Infection prevention and control (IPC) implementation in low-resource settings: A qualitative analysis. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control, 10*, 1–11. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s13756-021-00962-3
33. Tomczyk, S., Twyman, A., de Kraker, M. E., Rehse, A. P. C., Tartari, E., Toledo, J. P., ... & Allegranzi, B. (2022). The first WHO global survey on infection prevention and control in health-care facilities. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 22*(6), 845–856. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(21)00809-4/fulltext
34. Tropea, J., Bennett, N., Lim, L. L., Flynn, M., Marshall, C., Smith, R. A., ... & Peters, S. (2025). Identifying gaps in infection prevention and control practice in Australian residential aged care using scenarios. *Infection, Disease & Health, 30*(2), 119–127. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468045124001135

35. Umscheid, C. A., Mitchell, M. D., Doshi, J. A., Agarwal, R., Williams, K., & Brennan, P. J. (2011). Estimating the proportion of healthcare-associated infections that are reasonably preventable and the related mortality and costs. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology, 32*(2), 101–114. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospital-epidemiology/article/estimating-the-proportion-of-healthcareassociated-infections-that-are-reasonably-preventable-and-the-related-mortality-and-costs/85B4290844BF00DF4530EBB2E5BEDC2D
36. Weber, D. J., Anderson, D., & Rutala, W. A. (2013). The role of the surface environment in healthcare-associated infections. *Current Opinion in Infectious Diseases, 26*(4), 338–344. https://journals.lww.com/co-infectiousdiseases/fulltext/2013/08000/The_role_of_the_surface_environment_in.8.aspx
37. World Health Organization. (2009). *WHO Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care*. Geneva: WHO.
38. World Health Organization. (2016). *WHO Guidelines on Core Components of Infection Prevention and Control Programmes at the National and Acute Health Care Facility Level*. Geneva: WHO.
39. World Health Organization. (2024). *Infection prevention and control in-service education and training curriculum*. World Health Organization. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=06cOEQAAQBAJ
40. Whitby, MD; Mary-Louise McLaws, PhD; Michael W. Ross, PhD et al., (2006) Why healthcare workers don't wash their hands: A Behavioral explanation. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2006; 27:484-492 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7109639_Why_Healthcare_Workers_Don%27t_Wash_Their_Hands_A_Behavioral_Explanation?enrichId=rgreq-f4456b1cf4c755ef22989d05325654ba-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzcxMDk2Mzk7QVM6MTA0MTc3Njc4MTU5ODcyQDE0MDE4NDkzMDIxOTQ%3D&el=1_x_2&_esc=publicationCoverPdf