

retrospective, while the prospective surveys showed no significant differences.^{11 12} This important difference in findings illustrates the potential for bias in retrospective studies and similarly supports the value of carefully designed prospective studies, even if it is not feasible to generate a randomised cohort of patients.

Back pain in pregnancy

We found that reported rates of low back pain were high during pregnancy and at long term follow up in both groups of women. The proportions were similar to those observed by Ostgaard and Andersson in their prospective study of 817 women during pregnancy who were followed up for 12 months or more after delivery.¹³ They found that more than 67% of women experienced low back pain directly after delivery and 37% at the later follow up examination. Factors associated with persistent pain were the presence of low back pain before or during pregnancy, physically heavy work, and multiple pregnancy. This figure is somewhat higher than the overall prevalence of low back pain in women in developed countries.¹⁰ It is also significantly higher than the prevalence found in men, which supports the view that pregnancy may influence the development (or course) of low back pain.¹³⁻¹⁵

This paper is dedicated to Richard Johanson, who died a few months before publication. Dr G Waddell gave advice on methodology. We are grateful to all the women who participated.

Contributors: See bmj.com

Funding: National Back Pain Association. RJ, KD, and LL's clinical trials activities were supported by grants from the NHS(E) West Midlands research and development programme. Competing interests: None declared.

- 1 Chamberlain G, Wraight A, Steer P. *Pain and its relief in childbirth. The results of a national survey conducted by the National Birthday Trust.* Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1993.
- 2 Scott DB, Hibbard BM. Serious non-fatal complications associated with extradural block in obstetric practice. *Br J Anaesth* 1990;64:537-41.

What is already known on this topic

Previous research has suggested an association between epidural analgesia during labour and low back pain

It is not known whether this association is causal

What this study adds

This long term follow up study found no evidence of a causal link between epidural analgesia during labour and low back pain

- 3 Waddell G, Allan DB, Newton M. *Clinical evaluation of disability in back pain. The adult spine: principles and practice.* New York: Raven Press, 1991:155-68.
- 4 Howell CJ, Kidd C, Roberts W, Upton P, Lucking L, Jones PW, et al. A randomised controlled trial of epidural compared with non-epidural analgesia in labour. *BJOG* 2001;108:27-33.
- 5 MacArthur C, Lewis M, Knox EG, Crawford JS. Epidural anaesthesia and long term backache after childbirth. *BMJ* 1990;301:9-12.
- 6 Roland M, Morris R. A study of the natural history of back pain. Part 1: development of a reliable and sensitive measure of disability in low-back pain. *Spine* 1983;8:141-4.
- 7 Waddell G, Somerville D, Henderson I, Newton M. Objective clinical evaluation of physical impairment in chronic low back pain. *Spine* 1992;17:617-28.
- 8 Howell CJ. Epidural vs non epidural analgesia for pain relief in labour. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2000;(3):CD000331.
- 9 Moher D, Schulz KF, Altman DG, for the CONSORT Group. The CONSORT statement: revised recommendations for improving the quality of reports of parallel-group randomised trials. *Lancet* 2001;357:1191-4.
- 10 MacArthur AJ, MacArthur C, Weeks SK. Is epidural anaesthesia in labor associated with chronic low back pain? A prospective cohort study. *Anesth Analg* 1997;85:1066-70.
- 11 Breen TW, Ransil BJ, Groves PA, Oriol NE. Factors associated with back pain after childbirth. *Anesthesiology* 1994;81:29-34.
- 12 MacArthur A, MacArthur C, Weeks S. Epidural anaesthesia and long term back pain after delivery: a prospective cohort study. *BMJ* 1995;311:1336-9.
- 13 Ostgaard HC, Andersson GB. Postpartum low-back pain. *Spine* 1992;17:53-5.
- 14 Svensson HO, Andersson GBJ, Hagstad A, Jansson PO. The relationship of low-back pain to pregnancy and gynecologic factors. *Spine* 1990;15:371-5.
- 15 Orvieto R, Achiron A, Ben-Rafael Z, Gelernter I, Achiron R. Low-back pain of pregnancy. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* 1994;73:209-14. (Accepted 21 March 2002)

Birth weight of offspring and insulin resistance in late adulthood: cross sectional survey

Debbie A Lawlor, George Davey Smith, Shah Ebrahim

Abstract

Objective To investigate the association between birth weight of offspring and mothers' insulin resistance in late adulthood.

Design Cross sectional survey.

Setting General practitioner's surgeries in 23 towns in Great Britain.

Participants 4286 women aged 60-79 years.

Main outcome measures Maternal insulin resistance.

Results Birth weight of offspring was inversely related to maternal insulin resistance in late adulthood. For each 1 kg higher birth weight of offspring, women had a 15% reduction in the odds of being in the fourth with highest insulin resistance, compared to other fourths (odds ratio 0.85; 95% confidence interval 0.71 to 1.00). This increased to 27% (0.73; 0.60 to 0.90) after adjusting data for potential confounders. A U shaped relation between birth

weight of offspring and diabetes in older age was found; women with the lightest and heaviest offspring had the highest prevalence of diabetes.

Conclusions Birth weight of offspring is inversely related to the mother's insulin resistance in late adulthood, despite the association of glucose intolerance during pregnancy with heavier offspring at birth. Common genetic factors probably contribute to the relation between birth weight and risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes in adults.

Introduction

Low birth weight is associated with cardiovascular disease and type 2 diabetes in adulthood, but the mechanisms underlying these associations are unclear.¹ Poor intrauterine nutrition leads to babies with low birth weight and may "programme" selective changes in body composition, hormonal axes, and metabolism,

ELPS

The full version of this article appears on bmj.com

Department of Social Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol BSS 2PR

Debbie A Lawlor
MRC research training fellow

George Davey Smith
professor of clinical epidemiology
Shah Ebrahim
professor of epidemiology of ageing

Correspondence to: D A Lawlor
d.a.lawlor@bristol.ac.uk

BMJ 2002;325:359-62

leading to increased risk of cardiovascular disease in later life.¹ Alternatively, the fetal insulin hypothesis suggests that the specific genetic polymorphisms lead to increased insulin resistance and impaired growth and that these polymorphisms underlie the association between birth weight and cardiovascular disease.² Studies have shown that low birth weight of offspring is related to an increased risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes in their parents.³⁻⁹

The relation between low birth weight and later risk of disease in the individual may be explained by a programming effect of the intrauterine environment,¹ but the relation between a baby's low birth weight and its parents' risk must have a different explanation: A plausible explanation for these transgenerational associations is that birth weight and cardiovascular disease are linked by a common genetic factor.

No previous study has directly assessed the fetal insulin hypothesis by looking at the association between birth weight of offspring and parental insulin resistance. Mothers with gestational glucose intolerance tend to have heavier babies,¹⁰ and since these mothers are more likely to be insulin resistant and to develop diabetes later in life,¹¹ the expectation is of a positive correlation between birth weight of offspring and maternal insulin resistance. If an inverse association between birth weight of offspring and parental insulin resistance exists, particularly in mothers, it would support the fetal insulin hypothesis. We investigated the associations between offspring birth weight and maternal insulin resistance in late adulthood.

Participants and methods

The British women's heart and health study is a sample of 60-79 year old women, randomly selected from general practitioners' lists in 23 towns in Great Britain. We selected towns, general practitioners, and participants in the same way as for the British regional heart study of men.¹² Of the 7143 women invited, 4286 (60%) participated.

Details of all measurements are published elsewhere.¹³ Participants were asked how many pregnancies and live births they had experienced. We asked women with at least one live birth to provide the sex

and birth weight of their first born child. We took fasting blood samples and estimated insulin resistance with the homoeostasis model assessment (the product of fasting glucose and insulin concentrations (in mmol/l) divided by 22.5).¹⁴ We considered women with a clinical diagnosis of diabetes and women with a fasting glucose concentration of ≥ 8 mmol/l to have diabetes, for the purpose of this study.¹⁴

Results

Of the 4286 women who participated, 3849 (90%) provided obstetric details. Of the 3456 (90%) women who had had at least one live birth, 3289 (94%) provided their firstborn's birth weight. For 24 women, birth weight of offspring was less than 1.5 kg; they were excluded. Of the 3265 women with offspring birth weight included in the analysis 1635 (50.1%) of the children were male with a mean birth weight of 3.38 (SD 0.53) kg and 1630 (49.9%) were female with a mean birth weight of 3.24 (0.51) kg. A total of 169 (5.2%) women had been diagnosed with diabetes by a doctor and 41 (1.3%) had a glucose concentration after fasting of ≥ 8 mmol/l.

The table gives the relations between birth weight of offspring and age adjusted insulin resistance scores and other risk factors for cardiovascular disease, together with regression coefficient or odds ratios for each variable per kilogram difference in offspring birth weight. Women who had heavier babies were less resistant to insulin, had lower systolic blood pressure, had a higher body mass index, were less likely to smoke, and were more likely to belong to non-manual social classes both in childhood and adulthood.

Offspring birth weight was not linearly associated with maternal diabetes prevalence; women who had had babies with birth weights in the lowest and highest quarters were most likely to be diabetic in older age. When a quadratic term for birth weight of offspring was fitted, this model suggested a non-linear association ($P=0.08$). The relation between diabetes prevalence and birth weight of offspring was unaffected by control for current body mass index. The inverse relation between offspring birth weight and maternal insu-

Relation of maternal characteristics to birth weight of offspring

Maternal characteristics	Fourth of offspring birth weight (kg)				Age adjusted difference per kg offspring birth weight [*]	P value
	1.56-2.94	2.95-3.26	3.27-3.58	3.59-4.88		
Age (years)	68.4 (68.1 to 68.8)	68.4 (68.1 to 68.8)	68.7 (68.4 to 69.2)	68.9 (68.6 to 69.4)	0.48 (0.12 to 0.84)	0.009
Insulin resistance (HOMA score) [†]	1.75 (1.67 to 1.83)	1.61 (1.54 to 1.69)	1.67 (1.59 to 1.75)	1.60 (1.53 to 1.67)	-0.04 (-0.08 to -0.01)	0.04
Diabetes (%) [‡]	8.1 (6.3 to 10.3)	7.5 (5.7 to 9.7)	6.3 (4.7 to 9.7)	7.9 (6.1 to 10.1)	0.93 (0.71 to 1.22)	0.67
Systolic blood pressure (mm Hg)	149.5 (147.8 to 151.2)	147.3 (145.6 to 149.1)	145.8 (144.1 to 147.5)	146.8 (145.1 to 148.5)	-1.79 (-3.42 to -0.15)	0.03
HDLc (mmol/l)	1.64 (1.61 to 1.67)	1.66 (1.63 to 1.69)	1.68 (1.65 to 1.72)	1.63 (1.59 to 1.66)	0.003 (-0.03 to 0.03)	0.85
LDLc (mmol/l)	4.17 (4.09 to 4.25)	4.15 (4.07 to 4.23)	4.17 (4.09 to 4.25)	4.15 (4.07 to 4.23)	-0.03 (-0.10 to 0.05)	0.49
Triglyceride (mmol/l) [†]	1.70 (1.65 to 1.76)	1.63 (1.58 to 1.68)	1.65 (1.59 to 1.71)	1.68 (1.62 to 1.73)	-0.01 (-0.04 to 0.02)	0.48
Body mass index (kg/m ²)	27.2 (26.9 to 27.6)	27.2 (26.9 to 27.6)	27.6 (27.3 to 28.0)	28.2 (27.9 to 28.6)	0.74 (0.41 to 1.07)	<0.001
Waist to hip ratio	0.817 (0.813 to 0.822)	0.817 (0.812 to 0.821)	0.816 (0.811 to 0.820)	0.821 (0.816 to 0.826)	0.003 (-0.002 to 0.007)	0.46
Ever smoked (%)	52.9 (49.5 to 56.3)	51.6 (48.1 to 55.0)	49.0 (45.6 to 52.5)	47.1 (43.7 to 50.0)	0.87 (0.77 to 0.99)	0.01
Current smokers (%)	14.3 (12.1 to 16.8)	10.7 (8.7 to 13.0)	10.5 (8.6 to 12.8)	8.3 (6.5 to 10.4)	0.64 (0.52 to 0.79)	<0.001
Non-manual social class (%):						
Adult	40.5 (37.0 to 44.2)	48.3 (44.7 to 52.0)	50.5 (46.8 to 54.1)	46.3 (42.6 to 50.0)	1.14 (1.00 to 1.32)	0.02
Child	20.6 (17.9 to 23.6)	21.3 (18.5 to 24.4)	23.3 (20.3 to 26.5)	24.4 (21.4 to 27.6)	1.18 (1.00 to 1.40)	0.05

HOMA=homoeostasis model assessment score. HDLc=high density lipoprotein cholesterol. LDLc=low density lipoprotein cholesterol.

^{*}Difference per kg of offspring birth weight: regression coefficients for continuous variables to odds ratios per kilogram of offspring birth weight for binary variables.

[†]Geometric mean and logged regression coefficient.

[‡]Doctor diagnosis of diabetes or fasting glucose ≥ 8 mmol/l.

lin resistance contradicted the positive relation between birth weight of offspring and maternal body mass index. For each increase of 1 kg to offspring birth weight, the logarithm of the insulin resistance scores fell by 0.04, whereas body mass index (weight (kg)/(height (m)²) increased by 0.74.

The odds of maternal insulin resistance (top quarter of birth weights compared with all other participants, adjusted by age) decreased with increasing birth weight of offspring (odds ratio 0.85; 95% confidence interval 0.71 to 1.00). For each 1 kg increase in birth weight, after adjustment for body mass index alone, the odds of high maternal insulin resistance fell by 27% (odds ratio 0.73; 0.60 to 0.87), and there was no further change after full adjustment for a wide range of other potential confounders (systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, high density lipoprotein cholesterol, low density lipoprotein cholesterol, triglycerides, smoking status, adult social class, childhood social class). Because body mass index is positively related to insulin resistance (Pearson's correlation coefficient 0.43; 0.40 to 0.46) and also to birth weight of offspring, it acts as an important negative confounder between birth weight of offspring and maternal insulin resistance. The fully adjusted regression coefficient for the insulin resistance log scores and the birth weight of offspring was -0.08 (-0.12 to -0.04) per kilogram of offspring birth weight, compared with -0.04 (-0.08 to -0.01) per kilogram of offspring birth weight, for the coefficient adjusted for age. Adjustment for age and body mass index alone essentially produced the same findings as full adjustment (-0.08 ; -0.13 to -0.04) per kilogram of offspring birth weight.

Discussion

Birth weight of offspring is inversely related to maternal insulin resistance in later life. This supports the fetal insulin hypothesis, which says that genetic factors related to both insulin resistance and birth weight explain at least part of the relation between birth weight and risk of adult cardiovascular disease and diabetes.²

We expected birth weight of offspring to be positively associated with maternal insulin resistance in later life, since maternal gestational diabetes is associated with increased birth weight of offspring and also with maternal diabetes in later life.^{11 15} Although the proportion of women with gestational diabetes may be insufficient to account for a population effect on the distribution of birth weight, there is evidence that gestational glycaemia across the population distribution (rather than a simple diabetic threshold effect) is positively associated with offspring birth weight and insulin resistance and frank diabetes in the mother in later life.^{10 11 16} Our results are contrary to this expectation and provide important support for the fetal insulin hypothesis. Definitive support of this hypothesis requires the identification of genes that are associated with both low birth weight and insulin resistance. Although there is some evidence for potential genes, further research is required in this area.^{2 17 18}

Limitations of the study

We have relied on maternal recall of offspring birth weight; this may be inaccurate. Most of the women in our study had their firstborn offspring in the 1950s.

What is already known on this topic

Small birth weight is related to increased risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes in adulthood; the underlying mechanisms are unclear

Small birth weight of offspring is related to parental cardiovascular disease, suggesting that common genetic factors affect birth weight and the risk of disease in adulthood

Genetic factors associated with the metabolism of insulin are plausible in linking birth weight and cardiovascular disease (the fetal insulin hypothesis)

What this study adds

Birth weight of offspring is inversely related to maternal insulin resistance in older age

Genetic factors related to both insulin resistance and birth weight explain at least part of the association between birth weight and risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes in adulthood

Mean birth weights for boys and girls included in the 1958 British birth cohort are similar to those reported for offspring in our study (boys 3.40 (SD 0.45) kg *v* 3.38 (0.53) kg in our study; girls, 3.26 (0.43) kg *v* 3.24 (0.51) kg) suggesting that maternal recall of offspring birth weight is unlikely to have importantly biased our results.¹⁹ The association between birth weight of offspring and insulin resistance in older age, rather than during the mothers' reproductive years, is more supportive of a genetic mechanism than a temporary hormonal effect of pregnancy on metabolic risk factors for cardiovascular disease.²⁰

Implications

Our study provides epidemiological support for the fetal insulin hypothesis. This is important because it indicates that at least some of the association between the birth weight of individuals and their later risk of diabetes and cardiovascular disease may be genetic, and therefore not modifiable by interventions that influence intrauterine development. Future studies should aim to identify specific polymorphisms that are associated with low birth weight, insulin resistance, and cardiovascular disease.

The British women's heart and health study is codirected by Shah Ebrahim, Peter Whincup, Goya Wannamethee, and Debbie Lawlor. We thank Carol Bedford, Alison Emerton, Nicola Frecknall, Karen Jones, Mark Taylor, and Katherine Wornell for collecting and entering data, all of the general practitioners and their staff who have supported data collection and the women who have participated in the study.

Contributors: See bmj.com

Funding: The British women's heart and health study is funded by the Department of Health. DAL is funded by a Medical Research Council and Department of Health training fellowship. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Department of Health or MRC.

Competing interests: None declared.

1 Barker DJP. *Mothers, babies and health in later life*. London: Churchill Livingstone, 1998.

2 Hattersley AT, Tooke JE. The fetal insulin hypothesis: an alternative explanation of the association of low birthweight with diabetes and vascular disease. *Lancet* 1999;353:1789-92.

- 3 Davey Smith G, Hart C, Ferrell C, Upton M, Hole D, Hawthorne V, et al. Birth weight of offspring and mortality in the Renfrew and Paisley study: prospective observational study. *BMJ* 1997;315:1189-93.
- 4 Davey Smith G, Harding S, Rosato M. Relation between infants' birth weight and mothers' mortality: prospective observational study. *BMJ* 2000;320:839-40.
- 5 Smith GC, Pell JP, Walsh D. Pregnancy complications and maternal risk of ischaemic heart disease: a retrospective cohort study of 129,290 births. *Lancet* 2001;357:2002-6.
- 6 Davey Smith G, Whitley E, Gissler M, Hemminki E. Birth dimensions of offspring, premature birth, and the mortality of mothers. *Lancet* 2000;356:2066-7.
- 7 Rasmussen F, Sterne J, Davey Smith G, Tynelius P, Leon DA. Fetal growth is associated with parents' cardiovascular mortality. *Am J Epidemiol* 2001;153(suppl):98S.
- 8 Rasmussen F, Davey Smith G, Sterne J, Tynelius P, Leon DA. Birth characteristics of offspring and parental diabetes. *Am J Epidemiol* 2001;153(suppl):47S.
- 9 Stoltenberg C, Magnus P, Bakketeig LS, Samuelsen SO, Leon DA, Davey Smith G. Infants' birth weight and parents' coronary heart mortality. *Am J Epidemiol* 2001;153(suppl):98S.
- 10 Scholl TO, Sowers M, Chen X, Lenders C. Maternal glucose concentration influences fetal growth, gestation, and pregnancy complications. *Am J Epidemiol* 2001;154:514-20.
- 11 Dornhorst A, Rossi M. Risk and prevention of type 2 diabetes in women with gestational diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 1998;21(suppl 2):43-9S.
- 12 Shaper AG, Pocock SJ, Walker M, Cohen NM, Wale CJ, Thomson AG. British regional heart study: cardiovascular risk factors in middle-aged men in 24 towns. *BMJ* 1981;283:179-86.
- 13 Lawlor DA, Bedford C, Taylor M, Ebrahim S. Geographic variation in cardiovascular disease, risk factors and their control in older women: British women's heart and health study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* (in press).
- 14 Matthews DR, Hosker JP, Rudenski AS, Naylor BA, Treacher DF, Turner RC. Homeostasis model assessment: insulin resistance and beta-cell function from fasting plasma glucose and insulin concentrations in man. *Diabetologia* 1985;28:412-9.
- 15 Pennison EH, Egerman RS. Perinatal outcomes in gestational diabetes: a comparison of criteria for diagnosis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2001;184:1118-21.
- 16 Sermer M, Naylor CD, Gare DJ, Kenshole AB, Ritchie JW, Farine D, et al. Impact of increasing carbohydrate intolerance on maternal-fetal outcomes in 3637 women without gestational diabetes. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1995;173:146-56.
- 17 Hattersley AT, Beards F, Ballantyne E, Appleton M, Harvey R, Ellard S. Mutations in the glucokinase gene of the fetus result in reduced birth weight. *Nat Genet* 1998;19:268-70.
- 18 Casteels K, Ong K, Phillips D, Bendall H, Pembrey M. Mitochondrial 16189 variant, thinness at birth, and type-2 diabetes: ALSPAC study team: Avon longitudinal study of pregnancy and childhood. *Lancet* 1999;353:1499-500.
- 19 Butler N, Alberman E. *Perinatal problems: the second report of the 1958 British perinatal mortality survey*. London: Livingstone, 1969.
- 20 Ness RB, Schotland HM, Flegal KM, Shofer FS. Reproductive history and coronary heart disease risk in women. *Epidemiol Rev* 1994;16:298-314.

(Accepted 28 March 2002)



The full version of this article appears on bmj.com

Efficacy of handrubbing with alcohol based solution versus standard handwashing with antiseptic soap: randomised clinical trial

Emmanuelle Girou, Sabrina Loyeau, Patrick Legrand, Françoise Oppein, Christian Brun-Buisson

Infection Control Unit, Hôpital Henri Mondor, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Créteil, France

Emmanuelle Girou
hospital epidemiologist
Sabrina Loyeau
infection control technician
Françoise Oppein
infection control nurse

Microbiology Laboratory, Hôpital Henri Mondor, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris

Patrick Legrand
microbiologist

Medical Intensive Care Unit, Hôpital Henri Mondor, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris

Christian Brun-Buisson
infection control unit director

Correspondence to: E Girou
emmanuelle.girou@hmn.ap-hop-paris.fr

BMJ 2002;325:362-5

Abstract

Objective To compare the efficacy of handrubbing with an alcohol based solution versus conventional handwashing with antiseptic soap in reducing hand contamination during routine patient care.

Design Randomised controlled trial during daily nursing sessions of 2 to 3 hours.

Setting Three intensive care units in a French university hospital.

Participants 23 healthcare workers.

Interventions Handrubbing with alcohol based solution (n=12) or handwashing with antiseptic soap (n=11) when hand hygiene was indicated before and after patient care. Imprints taken of fingertips and palm of dominant hand before and after hand hygiene procedure. Bacterial counts quantified blindly.

Main outcome measures Bacterial reduction of hand contamination.

Results With handrubbing the median percentage reduction in bacterial contamination was significantly higher than with handwashing (83% v 58%, P=0.012), with a median difference in the percentage reduction of 26% (95% confidence interval 8% to 44%). The median duration of hand hygiene was 30 seconds in each group.

Conclusions During routine patient care handrubbing with an alcohol based solution is significantly more efficient in reducing hand contamination than handwashing with antiseptic soap.

Introduction

Handwashing is emphasised as the single most important measure to prevent cross transmission of

micro-organisms and thus to prevent nosocomial infections.¹ However, under routine hospital practice compliance with this measure is still unacceptably low, less than 50% in most studies published in the past 20 years.²⁻³ Recent studies have shown that this level of compliance will not reduce the risk of transmission of multiresistant bacteria in hospital.⁴ Attempts to improve compliance have included increasing the number of accessible sinks⁵ and educating healthcare workers,^{6,7} but none of these interventions led to a marked and sustained improvement in compliance.

Handrubbing with an alcohol based, waterless hand antiseptic seems to be the best method of increasing compliance with hand hygiene. It seems, however, that there is reluctance to accept handrubbing as a substitute for handwashing. In one study the main reason raised for not adhering to the recommendation to use handrubbing was the lack of confidence about its efficacy.⁸

We performed a randomised clinical trial to assess the efficacy of an alcohol based solution compared with standard handwashing with a medicated soap in reducing hand contamination during routine patient care.

Methods

Enrolment of participants

The study was a prospective randomised clinical trial with blinded evaluation of microbiological results. It was performed from June to July 2000 in three intensive care units (two surgical and one medical) of a 940 bed university. Eligible healthcare workers were all permanent and temporary nurses and nursing assistants of each unit.