



The Brazilian Journal of INFECTIOUS DISEASES

www.elsevier.com/locate/bjid



Original Article

Effect of work environment and specialty degree of dentists on cross-infection control in COVID-19 pandemic

Merve Mutluay ^a, Edibe Egil ^{b,*}

^a Kirikkale University, Vocational School of Health Services, Department of Dental Hygiene, Kirikkale, Turkey

^b Istanbul Gelisim University, School of Dentistry, Department of Pediatric Dentistry, Istanbul, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 5 March 2021

Accepted 5 May 2021

Available online xxx

Keywords:

COVID-19

Dentists

SARS-CoV-2

Infection control

Attitude to Health

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of the work environment and expertise/specialty degree of dentists on their behavior, awareness, and attitudes regarding cross-infection control during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Design: The study population consisted of Turkish dentists who work in private clinics, public clinics, and university hospitals. The demographic information of the participants, their awareness of the COVID-19 acute respiratory disease, and clinical measures taken against cross-infection were evaluated with an online survey. Between the 10th and 20th of November 2020, 2,400 surveys were e-mailed to dentists.

Results: A total of 454 professionals answered the survey. According to the results, 29.3% of the participants performed only urgent care during the pandemic period, whereas 59.9% of them performed both urgent and routine treatments. Among the responding dentists, 90.6% stated that they were worried about aerosol-generating dental procedures, but there was no differences between genders ($p = 0.119$). Most participants, especially specialists ($p = 0.160$), applied strict cross-infection control methods during the COVID-19 pandemic (77.2%). These dentists used personal protective equipment (PPE) at rates that varied between 75.5% and 98.4%. Nonetheless, the rate of PPE use was different between genders and degrees of expertise: women used PPE more frequently than men ($p = 0.025$), and specialists used PPE more often than the other dentists ($p = 0.04$). Finally, there was a weak positive correlation between the level of PPE use and expertise ($r = 0.121$; $p = 0.010$).

Conclusions: Despite the overall knowledge of the participants regarding COVID-19 symptoms, transmission routes, and the guidelines needed to prevent the virus from spreading, the dental specialists followed infection control methods more strictly. Even though the participants were concerned about dental practices that create microbial aerosols during the pandemic period, they continued their clinical routines using high PPE levels and taking extra clinical precautions to avoid cross-infection.

© 2021 Sociedade Brasileira de Infectologia. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

* Corresponding author:

E-mail addresses: mervkrts@hotmail.com (M. Mutluay),

eezil@gelisim.edu.tr (E. Egil).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjid.2021.101592>

1413-8670/© 2021 Sociedade Brasileira de Infectologia. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

1 Introduction

2 In late December 2019, several patients with viral pneumonia
3 were epidemiologically associated with a seafood market in
4 Wuhan, China. The identified coronavirus that caused the
5 infections was designated as “2019 novel coronavirus”
6 (COVID-19) using next-generation sequencing.^{1,2} The infec-
7 tion by COVID-19, confirmed by droplet transmission and
8 human-to-human transmission, is a significant public health
9 problem, with 88 million reported infection cases and over
10 1.9 million deaths globally.^{3,4} COVID-19 uses the angiotensin-
11 converting enzyme II (ACE2), which is an enzyme and a cell
12 entry receptor to invade the host cells. The typical clinical
13 symptoms of infected patients are fever, dry cough, dyspnea,
14 headache, and pneumonia. The progression of the disease
15 may result in respiratory failure, pneumonia, alveolar dam-
16 age, and even death.⁵

17 Aerosols are suspensions of liquid or solid particles con-
18 taining all kinds of microorganisms and are responsible for
19 the airborne transmission of microorganisms.^{6,7} Aerosols
20 consist of small particles called droplet nuclei (1–5 μm) or
21 droplets (> 5 μm). Aerosols can contaminate surfaces in a
22 range of one meter and form a potential infection route in the
23 lungs because they can penetrate the alveoli.^{7,8}

24 Cross-contamination is the spreading of pathogens from
25 one source to another through direct patient-to-patient con-
26 tact, patient-to-clinical staff contact, or droplet transmission.
27 The conjunctival, nasal, or oral mucosa from infected
28 people produces droplets and aerosols containing
29 microorganisms.^{8,9} Dentists are at a high risk of cross-con-
30 tamination due to frequent direct or indirect contact with
31 dental instruments and surfaces contaminated with aerosols,
32 blood, and saliva.¹⁰ Aerosols containing microorganisms in
33 the oral cavity of the patient are created when high-speed
34 handpieces and air/water sprays are used in dental proce-
35 dures. Aerosols^{11,12} emitted into the air from high-speed
36 handpieces used during caries removal or composite resin
37 polishing increase the cross-contamination risk for dentists.
38 Tooth preparation, removal of old fillings, debonding or
39 removal of orthodontic composite remnants, scaling with a
40 dental ultrasonic scaler, and oral prophylaxis are procedures
41 that carry a cross-contamination risk.^{11,13} However, the infec-
42 tious character of aerosols produced in dental procedures
43 depends on the virulence dose, the pathogenicity of the
44 microorganism, and the contaminated contents of the
45 patient, such as plaque, blood, calculus, and saliva.^{14,15}

46 According to the American Dental Association (ADA), the
47 practice of the dental profession during the COVID-19 pan-
48 demic poses a unique challenge due to the high amount of
49 aerosols and droplets produced, which are inevitable during
50 routine dental procedures.¹⁶ Therefore, effective infection
51 control strategies are needed to prevent the spread of COVID-
52 19 during dental procedures.⁹ For this purpose, the American
53 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recom-
54 mends the performance of additional infection prevention,
55 control procedures, and standard clinical practices during the
56 COVID-19 pandemic. Such extra clinical precautions, which
57 should be applied to all patients and not only to those with
58 suspected or confirmed COVID-19 cases, can prevent the

spread of microbial aerosols and the contamination of dental 59
equipment and materials.^{17,18} 60

The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of the work 61
environment and expertise/specialty degree of dentists on 62
their behavior, awareness, and attitudes regarding cross- 63
infection control during the COVID-19 pandemic. 64

Methods

Sample size

The study population consisted of Turkish dentists who 67
worked in private, public clinics, and university hospitals. 68
The sample size required for the study was calculated based 69
on the total number of dentists (34,045) in Turkey. With a 95% 70
confidence interval, the power analysis estimated that 384 or 71
more people should be involved. The Ethics Committee of the 72
Istanbul Gelisim University approved the study protocol (ethi- 73
cal approval number: 2020/29). 74

Survey instrument

The study questionnaire consisted of two parts and contained 76
20 closed-ended questions. The first part of the questionnaire 77
aimed to learn the demographic characteristics of the partici- 78
pants (i.e., sex, age, work experience, workplace profile). The 79
second part of the questionnaire aimed to evaluate the 80
awareness of the participants about COVID-19 and clinical 81
precautions against cross-infection based on the “COVID-19 82
infection control guidelines” published by the CDC.¹⁷ Experts 83
previously examined the content adequacy of the question- 84
naire to evaluate the construct validity of the questions. 85

As a first pilot evaluation, the questions were sent to five 86
dentistry specialists (two pediatric dentists, a restorative den- 87
tistry specialist, a statistician, and a general dentist). The 88
questionnaire was revised according to the suggestions made 89
by the experts. Two experts (a pediatric dentist and a restor- 90
ative dentistry specialist) retested the questionnaire to check 91
whether they were consistent with semantics and conceptual 92
framework. After a language suitability review by a Turkish 93
language expert, the questionnaire was created with Google 94
Documents and directed to dentists by e-mail. The e-mail 95
announced that participation was voluntary and that the per- 96
sonal data would remain confidential. The study was 97
designed and implemented under the Helsinki Declaration. 98

Statistical analysis

The survey results were analyzed with descriptive statistics, 100
such as total numbers and percentages. The data were ana- 101
lyzed using IBM® SPSS® (version 24.0; IBM, Chicago, IL, USA). 102
The mean, standard deviation, range, and frequency of the 103
variables were calculated. Pearson's chi-square analysis was 104
used for the crosstab of variables. The Spearman's rank 105
correlation test was used to evaluate the correlation between 106
gender, specialty, and attitudes of the dentists toward cross- 107
infection. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically 108
significant. 109

110 Results

111 Between November 10th and 20th, 2020, 2,400 questionnaires
112 were e-mailed to the dentists, and 454 of them returned their
113 responses, indicating a response rate of 18.9%. The demo-
114 graphic data revealed that 41% of the study population were
115 aged < 30 years, 39.2% were aged between 31–40 years, and
116 19.8% had > 40 years. A total of 67.8% of the participants were
117 female (Table 1).

118 In terms of professional experience, 33.5% of participants
119 had > 10 years, 33.5% had 5–10 years, and 33% had approxi-
120 mately five years of professional experience. A large propor-
121 tion of participants (51.8%) were either general dentists,
122 dental specialists (32.4%), or post-graduate students (15.6%).
123 A total of 46% of the respondents worked in private clinics,
124 22.9% in public clinics, and 31.1% in university hospitals
125 (Table 1).

126 Of all the respondents, 81.9% indicated that they followed
127 the current developments regarding COVID-19, and 74.2% fol-
128 lowed the guidelines and recommendations published by
129 national or international authorities regarding the COVID-19
130 pandemic. There was no statistically significant difference
131 between the responses given by men and women ($p = 0.374$,
132 $p = 0.974$, respectively) or between specialists and other den-
133 tists ($p = 0.061$, $p = 0.137$, respectively). Around 5.7% of the par-
134 ticipants had symptomatic COVID-19 infection, 2.2%
135 experienced a non-symptomatic infection, 73.5% did not have
136 the disease, and the remaining participants indicated that
137 they were not sure whether they had it or not (Table 2).

138 Most respondents knew that droplet inhalation (98.2%),
139 nasal mucosa (78.6%), fecal-oral route (26.7%), eye mucosa
140 (74.7%), saliva/blood (54.2%), and contaminated sharp instru-
141 ments (20.3%) were COVID-19 transmission routes. The
142 knowledge level of specialist dentists about the COVID-19
143 transmission routes was higher than others ($p = 0.012$). There
144 was no statistically significant difference between the

**Table 1 – Description of the demographic and profes-
sional characteristics of participants.**

Characteristics	N	(%)
Sex		
Male	146	32.2
Female	308	67.8
Age		
<30 yr	186	41
31-40 yr	178	39.2
>40 yr	90	19.8
Experience		
0–5 yr	141	32
5–10 yr	128	29
<10 yr	172	39
Professional Qualification		
General dental practitioner	235	51.8%
Specialist	147	32.4%
Postdoctoral student	71	15.6%
Place of Occupation		
Private clinic	209	46%
Public hospital	104	46%
University hospital	141	31.1%

**Table 2 – Dentists' awareness of the COVID-19 pandemic
and their answers about cross infection control measures**

Question	N	(%)
Do you follow the current developments regarding the Covid-19 pandemic?		
Yes	372	81.9
No	78	17.2
Sometimes	4	0.9
Do you follow the guidelines and recommendations published by national or international authorities on the Covid-19 pandemic?		
Yes	337	74.2
No	26	5.7
Sometimes	91	20
Did your patient evaluation criteria change during the Covid-19 pandemic?		
Yes, I do not treat patients during the pandemic period.	23	5.1
Yes, I am just performing oral examination.	26	5.7
Yes, I only treat emergency patients.	133	29.3
No, I treat both emergency and routine patients	272	59.9
Have you ever been infected with Covid-19?		
Yes, I had the infection symptomatically.	26	5.7
Yes, I had the infection asymptotically.	10	2.2
No, I did not have the infection.	334	73.6
I am not sure	84	18.5
What are the transmission ways of Covid-19 virus? (multiple choice)		
Droplet inhalation	446	98.2
Nasal mucosa	357	78.6
Fecal-oral route	121	26.7
Eye mucosa	339	74.7
Saliva, blood	246	54.2
Sharp tools	92	20.3
Fecal route	25	5.5
Do you adhere to strict cross infection control measures during the Covid-19 pandemic period?		
Yes	344	77.1
No	78	17.5
Sometimes	24	5.4
Which of the personal protective equipment do you use during the Covid-19 pandemic? (multiple choice)		
Glove	442	98.4
Surgical mask	409	91.1
N95 mask	382	85.1
Bonnet	340	75.5
Visor	411	91.5
Glasses	229	51
Protective clothing	387	86.2
Do you use an antiseptic mouthwash before dental procedures during the Covid-19 pandemic? If so, what is the content?		
No I do not use.	224	50.1
Yes, with chlorhexidine gluconate	68	15.2
Yes, with hydrogen peroxide	102	22.8
Yes, with povidone-iodine content	78	17.4
Yes, with cetylpyridinium chloride	5	1.1
Did you take any extra precautions regarding dental unit care and unit water during the Covid-19 pandemic?		
Yes	145	32.4
No	221	49.4
Not quite sure	81	18.1
Did you take any extra precautions regarding the sterilization of hand and tools during the Covid-19 pandemic?		

Table 2 (continued)

Question	N	(%)
Yes	133	29.8
No	258	57.8
Not quite sure	55	12.3
Are you worried about dental procedures that generate aerosol during the Covid-19 pandemic?		
Yes	405	90.6
No	30	6.7
Not quite sure	12	2.7
Which of the dental procedures that generates aerosol during the Covid-19 pandemic did you discontinue? (multiple choice)		
Cleaning tartar with cavitron	187	42.2
Restorative procedures	110	24.8
Endodontic procedures	74	16.7
Orthodontic treatments	74	16.7
Intraoral radiography	64	14.4
Asymptomatic tooth extraction	73	16.5
Esthetic dental procedures	165	37.2
None	207	46.7
Do you use minimally invasive techniques during the Covid-19 pandemic?		
Yes	277	63
No	120	27.3
Sometimes	43	9.8
Do you apply rubber-dam during dental procedures during the Covid-19 pandemic?		
Yes	50	11.2
No	340	76.4
Sometimes	55	12.4
Do you apply an extraoral vacuum during the dental procedure during the Covid-19 pandemic?		
Yes	72	16.3
No	343	77.6
Sometimes	27	6.1
After the Covid-19 pandemic, what measures did you take regarding the clinic waiting room?		
Phone call before appointment	193	43.4
Use of masks in the waiting room	413	92.8
Social distance measures in the waiting room	401	90.1
Availability of hand sanitizer in the waiting room	381	85.6
No magazines, food or drinks in the waiting room	295	66.3
Patients should come with minimum company	385	86.5
During the Covid-19 pandemic period, which ones do you apply regarding clinical assistant personnel?		
Special training course for staff	282	64.7
Monitoring the symptoms of clinical staff	239	54.8
Assistant personnel wear masks in rooms	303	69.5
Social distance measures in the rest rooms of the staff	303	69.5
Use of personal protective equipment	402	92.2

145 answers provided by female/male participants regarding their
146 knowledge of COVID-19 transmission routes ($p = 0.258$).

147 Only 5.1% of the participants stated that they did not per-
148 form dental procedures during the pandemic, whereas 5.7%
149 stated that they only performed oral examinations. Also,
150 29.3% of the professionals mentioned that they only per-
151 formed urgent procedures. Most respondents (77.2%) followed
152 strict cross-infection control methods, and no statistically

significant difference among genders ($p = 0.261$) was observed 153
regarding the cross-infection control methods. On the other 154
hand, specialists performed cross-infection controls more 155
strictly than the others did ($p = 0.16$). 156

The PPE usage rates varied from 75.5% to 98.4% among the 157
participants (Table 2). The rate of PPE usage was higher in 158
females than in their male counterparts ($p = 0.025$) and spe- 159
cialists compared to other dentists ($p = 0.04$). There was a 160
weak positive correlation between the frequency of PPE use 161
and the expertise of the professionals ($r = 0.121$; $p = 0.01$). 162
Among the respondents, 90.6% stated that they were worried 163
about aerosol-generating dental procedures, and no statisti- 164
cal difference between genders was detected ($p = 0.119$). A 165
total of 46.7% of the participants reported that they did not 166
suspend any dental procedures. Of these, 11.3% used a rubber 167
dam and 16.3% used an oral aerosol vacuum during the dental 168
procedures to prevent COVID-19 infections. Still, this differ- 169
ence was not statistically significant between genders 170
($p = 0.235$) regarding this question. The use rate of rubber dam 171
by general dentists was statistically higher than that of the 172
other professionals ($p = 0.005$). Still, there was no difference 173
regarding the use of the oral aerosol vacuum. 174

About half of the respondents (49.9%) reported perform- 175
ing antiseptic mouthwashes on patients before the dental 176
procedure. The use of hydrogen peroxide mouthwash by 177
specialists was significantly higher ($p = 0.008$), but no signifi- 178
cant difference was observed for other types of mouth- 179
washes ($p > 0.05$). 180

Extra precautions regarding the dental unit and steriliza- 181
tion of hand instruments were reported by 32.4% and 29.8% of 182
the participants, respectively. Around 92.8% of the partici- 183
pants took precautions toward patients and their relatives/ 184
companions in the waiting room, whereas 92.2% took precau- 185
tions toward the dental staff to prevent contamination. 186

Discussion 187

Dental procedures include the use of high-speed handpieces 188
and air/water sprays and other processes that generate drop- 189
lets and aerosols. Due to the microorganisms that survive in 190
these particles, dental clinics are among the highest-risk 191
environments for cross-contamination and COVID-19 192
infections.^{15,19} Therefore, all dental staff, especially dentists, 193
face cross-infection risk caused by aerosols that can move 194
deeper into their respiratory systems and even the lungs dur- 195
ing the COVID-19 pandemic.^{8,20} The presence of COVID-19 in 196
the saliva of infected patients poses an additional risk after 197
an aerosol-forming dental procedure.²¹ A recent report sug- 198
gests that coronaviruses associated with severe acute respira- 199
tory syndrome can survive in aerosols for at least three hours, 200
even if their infectious potential is reduced.²² It is necessary 201
to establish and implement cross-infection control criteria 202
according to evidence-based principles during the COVID-19 203
pandemic to minimize the microbial load of the aerosols 204
produced.^{8,19} 205

This research aimed to evaluate the effect of the expertise/ 206
specialty degree of dentists and their work environment on 207
their behavior, awareness, and attitudes toward cross-infec- 208
tion control during the COVID-19 pandemic. The results of 209

210 this questionnaire are crucial for highlighting the transmis-
211 sion prevention strategies by professionals during the COVID-
212 19 pandemic.

213 The findings of present study suggested that 5.7% of par-
214 ticipants reported having had symptomatic COVID-19 infec-
215 tion (Table 2). According to a study conducted in Lombardy,
216 Italy, 4.43% of participants had suffered one or more symp-
217 toms referable to COVID-19, and only 2% of dentists were con-
218 fident in avoiding infection.²³

219 The present study determined the knowledge of the partic-
220 ipants regarding most common COVID-19 transmission
221 routes was acceptable (76.42%). The awareness of specialist
222 dentists on this question was higher than others ($p = 0.012$). In
223 a similar study conducted in the Milan region, the awareness
224 of dentists about transmission routes was reported to be
225 71.82%.²⁴

226 According to Peng et al.⁹, as dental professionals play
227 essential roles in preventing the transmission of COVID-19,
228 they should take extra infection control measures during den-
229 tal practice to prevent person-to-person transmission routes
230 in the clinics. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the first step of
231 the infection control protocol recommended by the ADA¹⁶
232 and CDC¹⁷ is to evaluate whether the patient is in an emer-
233 gency or not. Elective and non-emergency procedures should
234 be postponed, and dental treatments should be performed
235 after considering the risk of COVID-19 transmission during
236 the pandemic. Since the pandemic has been present in Tur-
237 key since March 2020, this may be the reason why many den-
238 tists return to routine dental procedures in this study. As
239 observed in Lombardy and Milan, the European regions where
240 the pandemic causes the most deaths, most dentists continue
241 dental routines by taking preventive measures.²³

242 The findings of our study suggested that specialists fol-
243 lowed cross-infection control methods during the COVID-19
244 pandemic more strictly ($p = 0.16$). Participants from a similar
245 study followed rigorous cross-infection control methods,
246 with rates ranging from 64% to 89%.²⁴

247 The use of PPE against saliva or blood in dental procedures
248 is considered the most crucial preventive strategy as the sec-
249 ond step in the infection control protocol.^{16,17,25}

250 In the present study, PPE use rate among the respondents
251 was satisfactory (75.5% - 98.4%). It was found that the PPE use
252 rate was statistically higher in females ($p = 0.025$) and special-
253 ists ($p = 0.04$) and there was a correlation between expertise
254 and PPE use ($r = 0.121$; $p = 0.01$). The most commonly used PPE
255 by Italian dentists were gloves (93.22%), surgical masks
256 (74.56%), glasses/visors (91.28%), headsets (63.75%), and facial
257 filters (58.84%). The PPE use rate among endodontists from
258 the United States was reported to be as follows: N95 masks
259 (83.1%), face shields (58.9%), protective suits (36.8%), and
260 headsets (55.2%).²⁶

261 Adopting professional precautions in dental practices that
262 create microbial aerosols during the COVID-19 pandemic
263 should be considered universally.¹⁹ According to Dawson
264 et al.²⁰ aerosols produced by rotary instruments can reach all
265 levels of the respiratory tract. Therefore, aerosol-forming pro-
266 cedures, including the use of handpieces, air/water spray, and
267 ultrasonic scalers, should be avoided, or professionals should
268 use PPE during the pandemic to prevent infections.^{16,20}
269 According to a study that evaluated the bacterial load in

dental treatments, the amount of bacterial load in bioaerosols 270
at a distance of 1.5 m from the oral cavity of the patient was 271
found to be higher than a 1 m distance. Handpiece use signifi- 272
cantly decreased contamination at all sampled distances 273
from the oral cavity of the patient (average 970 CFU/m²/h).¹⁸ 274
According to the results obtained here, near 53.3% of the par- 275
ticipants suspended aerosol-generating procedures, whereas 276
42.2%, 37.2%, and 24.8% stated they suspended oral scaling, 277
aesthetic dental procedures, and restorative procedures, 278
respectively. 279

280 Other recommended methods to minimize droplet and
281 aerosol spreading are to apply minimally invasive/atraumatic
282 restorative techniques, a high-powered saliva ejector, and a
283 rubber dam.¹⁷ The rubber dam isolation can reduce airborne
284 particles by up to 70% within a 3-foot diameter from the oper-
285 ational field.^{9,27}

286 The current questionnaire results revealed that 11.3% and
287 16.3% of the participants preferred rubber dam and oral aero-
288 sol vacuum during the dental procedure, respectively. Gen-
289 eral dentists used the rubber dam at a higher rate than the
290 other dentists ($p = 0.005$). Although 80% of endodontists from
291 the United States stated concerns about dental procedures,
292 82% reported that they performed treatments during the pan-
293 demic. Most of them used the rubber dam, and 16.9% added
294 the oral aerosol vacuum to their practice.²⁶

295 Mouthwashes containing antimicrobials (i.e. chlorhexidine
296 gluconate, essential oils, povidone-iodine or cetylpyridinium
297 chloride) can be used to reduce the COVID-19 viral load or pre-
298 vent contamination.^{17,25} According to the obtained results,
299 hydrogen peroxide was the preferred mouthwash by 22.8% of
300 dentists, and most of the specialists (38.7%) preferred hydro-
301 gen peroxide mouthwash ($p = 0.008$). Koletsi et al.¹⁹ reported
302 using 0.2% tempered chlorhexidine (CHX) before routine
303 ultrasonic scaling resulted in a significant reduction in aero-
304 sol-associated bacterial load. Peng et al.⁹ suggested that CHX
305 may not effectively kill the COVID-19 virus because it is vul-
306 nerable to oxidation, and it is recommended to use an oxida-
307 tive mouthwash before the procedure.

308 During the pandemic, attention should be paid to the
309 maintenance of dental units and clinical equipment. One
310 should be aware of the potential risks of contaminated water
311 intake and colonization by pathogenic microbial species.²⁸
312 Due to the pandemic, using water filters in dental units, 3–6%
313 hydrogen peroxide disinfection, CHX, or specially designed
314 biofilm removal systems is recommended.²⁹ Attention should
315 also be paid to the standard maintenance of the dental unit
316 and unit water system. The water quality of the clinic must
317 follow the safe drinking water standards (<500 CFU/mL).³⁰
318 Extra-precaution regarding the dental unit and sterilization of
319 hand instruments was reported by 32.4% and 29.8% of the
320 participants. However, routine cleaning and maintenance of
321 autoclaves, air compressors, suction systems, aspirators,
322 radiography equipment, amalgam mixers, and other dental
323 equipment should be meticulously done according to the
324 manufacturer's instructions to decrease cross-infection risks.
325 It is also recommended to use suction systems and aspirators
326 with high suction power and antiseptic agents applied to the
327 water system of the dental units.^{28,30} Additionally, COVID-19
328 has been shown to remain active at room temperature from
329 two hours to nine days and more infectious in 50% relative

330 humidity than 30%. Therefore, maintaining a clean and dry
331 environment in the clinic will help reduce COVID-19
332 persistence.⁹

333 Providing cross-infection control training to dental staff,
334 maintaining only the required sterile equipment for the den-
335 tal procedure, maintaining all other materials away from pos-
336 sible contamination in a closed cabinet, and carefully
337 sterilizing contaminated equipment after the procedure are
338 other essential strategies to prevent COVID-19 infections.¹⁷

339 When participants were asked about the precautions they
340 had taken regarding dental staff and administrative order,
341 PPE use (92.2%), social distancing measures (69.5%), and pro-
342 viding special courses (64.7%) were reported. According to
343 Table 2, the suggested precautions by the participants to pre-
344 vent COVID-19 transmission in the waiting rooms include
345 contacting patients by phone before the appointment and
346 questioning about their COVID-19 symptoms (43.3%), using
347 face masks (92.8%), applying social distance (minimum dis-
348 tances of 6-feet) measures (90.1%), using 60% alcohol-based
349 hand sanitizer (85.6%) removing objects frequently touched
350 by clients, removing foods and beverages, and limiting the
351 number of relatives/companions of patients (66.3%).

352 Conclusion

353 Although the knowledge of participants about the COVID-19
354 symptoms, transmission routes, and adherence to the infec-
355 tion prevention guidelines were sufficient, dental specialists
356 must follow infection control methods more strictly. Partici-
357 pants were concerned about dental procedures that create
358 microbial aerosols during the pandemic period, yet they con-
359 tinued to deliver dental care using high PPE levels and took
360 extra clinical precautions to avoid cross-infection by COVID-
361 19. Higher adherence by healthcare professionals to high-
362 level cross-infection methods during dental procedures that
363 generate microbial aerosols will undoubtedly reduce pan-
364 demic spreading.

365 Author Contributions

366 M.M., design, data analysis, and interpretation, drafted and
367 critically revised the manuscript; E.E. contributed to concep-
368 tion, data acquisition, contributed to analysis and interpreta-
369 tion, critically revised the manuscript; All authors gave final
370 approval and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the
371 work.

372 Declaration of Conflicting Interests

373 The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with
374 respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this
375 article.

376 Funding

377 No funding

REFERENCES

1. Tan W, Zhao X, Ma X, et al. A Novel Coronavirus Genome 379
Identified in a Cluster of Pneumonia Cases — Wuhan, China 380
2019–2020. *China CDC Wkly.* 2020;2(4):61–2. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.46234/ccdcw2020.017) 381
[10.46234/ccdcw2020.017](https://doi.org/10.46234/ccdcw2020.017). 382
2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from 383
Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med.* 384
2020;382(8):727–33. <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa2001017>. 385
3. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and 386
epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus 387
origins and receptor binding. *Lancet.* 2020;395(10224):565–74. 388
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30251-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30251-8). 389
4. World Health Organization. Coronavirus situation report. 390
5. Zhou P, Lou, Yang X, Wang XG, et al. A pneumonia outbreak 391
associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. 392
Nature. 2020;579(7798):270–3. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7) 393
[020-2012-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7). 394
6. ASHRAE Board of Directors. ASHRAE Position Document on 395
Infectious Aerosols. 2020. 396
7. Barker J, Jones MV. The potential spread of infection caused by 397
aerosol contamination of surfaces after flushing a domestic 398
toilet. *J Appl Microbiol.* 2005;99(2):339–47. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2005.02610.x) 399
[10.1111/j.1365-2672.2005.02610.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2005.02610.x). 400
8. Seto WH, Conly JM, Pessoa-Silva CL, Malik M, Eremin S. 401
Infection prevention and control measures for acute 402
respiratory infections in healthcare settings: an update. *East* 403
Mediterr Heal J. 2013;19(1):39–47. 404
9. Peng X, Xu X, Li Y, Cheng L, Zhou X, Ren B. Transmission 405
routes of 2019-nCoV and controls in dental practice. *Int J Oral* 406
Sci. 2020;1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41368-020-0075-9>. 407
10. Zemouri C, De Soet H, Crielaard W, Laheij A. A scoping review 408
on bio-Aerosols in healthcare & the dental environment. *PLoS* 409
One. 2017;12(5):e0178007. [https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178007) 410
[pone.0178007](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178007). 411
11. Ireland AJ, Moreno T, Price R. Airborne particles produced 412
during enamel cleanup after removal of orthodontic 413
appliances. *Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop.* 2003;124(6):683–6. 414
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-5406\(03\)00623-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-5406(03)00623-1). 415
12. Cokic SM, Ghosh M, Hoet P, Godderis L, Van Meerbeek B, Van 416
Landuyt KL. Cytotoxic and genotoxic potential of respirable 417
fraction of composite dust on human bronchial cells. *Dent* 418
Mater. 2020;36(2):270–83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2019.11.009) 419
[dental.2019.11.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dental.2019.11.009). 420
13. Joshi AA, Padhye AM, Gupta HS. Efficacy of Two Pre- 421
Procedural Rinses at Two Different Temperatures in Reducing 422
Aerosol Contamination Produced During Ultrasonic Scaling in a 423
Dental Set-up - A Microbiological Study - *PubMed.* *J Int Acad* 424
Periodontol. 2017;19(4):138–44. 425
14. Harrel SK, Molinari J. Aerosols and splatter in dentistry: A brief 426
review of the literature and infection control implications. *J* 427
Am Dent Assoc. 2004;135(4):429–37. [https://doi.org/10.14219/](https://doi.org/10.14219/jada.archive.2004.0207) 428
[jada.archive.2004.0207](https://doi.org/10.14219/jada.archive.2004.0207). 429
15. Laheij AMGA, Kistler JO, Belibasakis GN, Välimaa H, de Soet JJ. 430
Healthcare-associated viral and bacterial infections in 431
dentistry. *J Oral Microbiol.* 2012; 17659. [https://doi.org/10.3402/](https://doi.org/10.3402/jom.v4i0.17659) 432
[jom.v4i0.17659](https://doi.org/10.3402/jom.v4i0.17659). 433
16. American Dental Association. ADA develops guidance on 434
dental emergency, nonemergency care. 435
17. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Guidance for 436
Dental Settings. 437
18. Rautemaa R, Nordberg A, Wuolijoki-Saaristo K, Meurman JH. 438
Bacterial aerosols in dental practice - a potential hospital 439
infection problem? *J Hosp Infect.* 2006;64(1):76–81. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2006.04.011) 440
[org/10.1016/j.jhin.2006.04.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2006.04.011). 441
19. Koletsi D, Belibasakis GN, Eliades T. Interventions to Reduce 442
Aerosolized Microbes in Dental Practice: A Systematic Review 443

- 444 with Network Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. 468
445 J Dent Res. 2020: 1228–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/> 469
446 [0022034520943574](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034520943574). 470
- 447 20. Dawson M, Soro V, Dymock D, et al. Microbiological 471
448 assessment of aerosol generated during debond of fixed 472
449 orthodontic appliances. Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop. 473
450 2016;150(5):831–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajodo.2016.04.022>. 474
- 451 21. Azzi L, Carcano G, Gianfagna F, et al. Saliva is a reliable tool to 475
452 detect SARS-CoV-2. J Infect. 2020;81(1):e45–50. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.005) 476
453 [10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.005). 477
- 454 22. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, et al. Aerosol and 478
455 Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV- 479
456 1. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(16):1564–7. [https://doi.org/10.1056/](https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmc2004973) 480
457 [nejmc2004973](https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmc2004973). 481
- 458 23. Cagetti MG, Cairoli JL, Senna A, Campus G. COVID-19 outbreak 482
459 in North Italy: An overview on dentistry. A questionnaire 483
460 survey. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(11). [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17113835) 484
461 [org/10.3390/ijerph17113835](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17113835). 485
- 462 24. Al-Khalifa KS, AlSheikh R, Al-Swuailem AS, et al. Pandemic 486
463 preparedness of dentists against coronavirus disease: A Saudi 487
464 Arabian experience. PLoS One. 2020;15(8):e0237630. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0237630) 488
465 doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0237630. 489
- 466 25. Sethi K, Mamajiwala A, Mahale S, Raut C, Karde P. 490
467 Comparative evaluation of the chlorhexidine and cinnamon 491
extract as ultrasonic coolant for reduction of bacterial load in 492
dental aerosols. J Indian Soc Periodontol. 2019;23(3):226–33. 493
https://doi.org/10.4103/jisp.jisp_517_18. 494
26. Martinho FC, Griffin IL. A Cross-sectional Survey on the 495
Impact of Coronavirus Disease 2019 on the Clinical Practice of 496
Endodontists across the United States. J Endod. 2021;47(1):28– 497
38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joen.2020.10.002>. 498
27. Samaranyake L, Reid J, Evans D. The efficacy of rubber dam 499
isolation in reducing atmospheric bacterial contamination - 500
PubMed. ASDC J Dent Child. 1989;56(6):442–4. 501
28. Pankhurst CL, Coulter WA. Do contaminated dental unit 502
waterlines pose a risk of infection? J Dent. 2007: 712–20. 503
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdent.2007.06.002>. 504
29. Baudet A, Lizon J, Martrette JM, Camelot F, Florentin A, 505
Clément C. Efficacy of BRS® and Alpron®/Bilpron® 506
disinfectants for dental unit waterlines: A six-year study. Int J 507
Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(8):2634. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082634) 508
[10.3390/ijerph17082634](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082634). 509
30. Mamajiwala A, Sethi K, Raut C, Karde P, Khedkar S. 510
Comparative evaluation of chlorhexidine and cinnamon 511
extract used in dental unit waterlines to reduce bacterial load 512
in aerosols during ultrasonic scaling. Indian J Dent Res. 513
2018;29(6):749–54. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijdr.IJDR_571_17. 514