ABSTRACT

Background: It is necessary to train a large number of healthcare workers (HCW) within a limited time to ensure adequate human resources during an epidemic. There remains an urgent need for best practices on development and implementation of training programmes.

Objective: To explore published literature in relation to training and education for viral epidemics as well as the effect of these interventions to inform training of HCW.

Data sources: Systematic searches in five databases performed between 1 January 2000 and 24 April 2020 for studies reporting on educational interventions in response to major viral epidemics.

Study eligibility criteria: All studies on educational interventions developed, implemented and evaluated in response to major global viral outbreaks from 2000 to 2020.

Participants: Healthcare workers.

Interventions: Educational or training interventions.

Study appraisal and synthesis methods: Descriptive information were extracted and synthesised according to content, competency category, educational methodology, educational effects and level of educational outcome. Quality appraisal was performed using a criterion-based checklist.

Results: A total of 15 676 records were identified and 46 studies were included. Most studies were motivated by the Ebola virus outbreak with doctors and nurses as primary learners. Traditional didactic methods were commonly used to teach theoretical knowledge. Simulation-based training was used mainly for training of technical skills, such as donning and doffing of personal protective equipment. Evaluation of the interventions consisted mostly of surveys on learner satisfaction and confidence or tests of knowledge and skills. Only three studies investigated transfer to the clinical setting or effect on patient outcomes.

Conclusions and implications of findings: The included studies describe important educational experiences from past epidemics with a variety of educational content, design and modes of delivery. High-level educational evidence is limited. Evidence-based and standardised training programmes that are easily adapted locally are recommended in preparation for future outbreaks.

INTRODUCTION

Global-scale infectious diseases engender threat, vulnerability and risk to health and healthcare capacity as well as the economic and political stature of a nation. In the last 20 years, the world has seen several major epidemic outbreaks caused by viral agents—namely SARS in 2003, swine influenza (H1N1 influenza virus infection) in 2009–2019, Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) in 2012, and Ebola virus disease (EVD) in 2014–2016. Currently, the entire world is facing a pandemic with a COVID-19, a new and fast spreading viral agent that can challenge and even overwhelm healthcare delivery and capacity as well as human resources. These viral outbreaks have prompted the need for global communities to swiftly plan, prepare and ensure continuous healthcare functionality, resource availability and skilled manpower to increase surge capacity.

Healthcare professionals from across different areas were called to help and needed to learn new procedures including correct use of personal protective equipment (PPE) and management of critically ill patients on ventilatory support. To ensure adequate resources and staffing, it was necessary to quickly train...
a large number of healthcare workers (HCW) to be on the frontlines. Ideally, training and education in preparation for a new infectious threat should be continuous and planned ahead of time. Specialised training equips HCW with the knowledge and skills to safely provide patient care; to reduce fatalities during an outbreak; and to prevent and control nosocomial infections.10–12

The experiences learnt from previous viral epidemics have helped some countries such as China and Saudi Arabia to deal with and respond to the current COVID-19 pandemic.13 14 However, this is not always the case: some countries that ranked high in the preparedness for pandemics assessed via the Global Health Security Index showed inconsistencies with their actual performance during the current COVID-19 pandemic.15 While there are key capacities that were considered in this performance assessment, the current pandemic has highlighted the need to increase the number of sufficiently trained HCW.16 There remains an urgent need for best practices on development and implementation of training programmes during an epidemic.

In this systematic review, we sought to answer three specific research questions:
1. What are the educational content and types of competencies being trained in relation to HCW as a result of a major viral epidemic?
2. How can training be delivered under these conditions?
3. What are the reported effects of the training interventions?

The overall aim of the study was to provide an overview of the published literature in relation to training and education of HCW during viral epidemics and to explore the educational content of these interventions and the level of competencies being trained. We also sought to present a status on the evidence of effects of these training interventions.

METHODS
This systematic review was conducted and reported in adherence with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses guideline.17

Study eligibility
We considered all studies on educational or training interventions developed, evaluated and/or implemented in response to major global viral outbreaks transmitted via close person-to-person contact from 2000 to 2020: SARS, H1N1, MERS, EVD and COVID-19. Inclusion criteria included studies reporting on development, implementation and evaluation of educational interventions for HCW, while the exclusion criteria were studies that were not in English language, descriptive studies, and those reporting on organisational outcomes with no relevance to training nor any outcome measures to evaluate the effect of training (table 1).

Search strategy
The search strategy was designed to access published literature in health professions education and clinical journals.

<p>| Table 1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria for inclusion in a systematic review on training and education of healthcare workers during viral epidemics |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: Healthcare professionals, healthcare workers and healthcare students at any level.</td>
<td>Studies that were not in English language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention: Studies reporting on the development, evaluation and implementation of educational interventions regarding treatment and prevention control.</td>
<td>Unpublished literature or not available through online access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison: Any studies investigating educational interventions.</td>
<td>Abstracts with insufficient description, quantitative or qualitative data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes: Studies with learner outcome measures.</td>
<td>Descriptive papers that only describe development of the educational intervention without any evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design: Any quantitative or qualitative interventional study.</td>
<td>Studies reporting on organisational outcomes with no relevance to training nor evaluation of educational or training effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: Studies conducted in any healthcare or healthcare professions educational setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five databases were searched from 1 January 2000 to 24 April 2020 (PubMed, Excerpta Medica (EMBASE)/Ovid, Cochrane Library, Web of Science and Directory of Open Access Journals) using the search terms (training OR educat* OR teach*) AND (coronavirus OR SARS OR H1N1 OR MERS OR EBOLA OR COVID-19). See table 2 for full search details.

Study selection
The search results were retrieved and imported into the Mendeley software (London, UK). Two authors (LJN and SA) independently reviewed and screened titles and abstracts, and eligible studies were included for full-text screening using Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia). The same reviewers independently screened the studies for eligibility and final inclusion. Disagreements were resolved with the remaining co-authors.

Data extraction and synthesis
A data extraction form was developed in REDCap (Vanderbilt University, USA) and was piloted with five randomly selected studies. Discrepancies in extraction and analysis by the two reviewers were discussed and the form was revised. The following details were extracted: general study information including study design; viral illness; target learner population and learner level; competency category; educational modality; description of intervention; description of educational
outcomes; quality appraisal of the educational intervention in different stages (preparation, intervention and evaluation) based on a structured criterion-based checklist\(^{18}\); and level of educational outcome based on Kirkpatrick’s levels and education evidence.\(^{19}\) Synthesis was aligned with the three research questions. It was decided a priori to forego meta-analyses because of our specific research questions and expected variety of study population, interventions, context and educational outcomes.

Patient and public involvement

There were no patients nor the public that were involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this systematic review.

RESULTS

Study selection process

Flow chart is provided in figure 1. A total of 15,676 records were identified through the searches. Of these, 10,092 studies remained after removal of duplicates and studies not reported in English. Overall, 304 studies were included for full-text screening, of which 46 studies fulfilled the inclusion criteria (online supplemental table S1).

Study characteristics

Study characteristics are presented in table 3. A majority of the studies reported on learning interventions developed in response to EVD (n=24, 52\%),\(^{20–43}\) eight studies were motivated by SARS (17\%),\(^{44–51}\) seven studies by H1N1 influenza (15\%),\(^{52–58}\) one study by MERS (2\%)\(^{59}\) and three studies were motivated by more than one disease.\(^{60–62}\) Three studies were published in relation to COVID-19.\(^{63–65}\)

The majority of the studies used a single-group study design (n=16, 37\%) or were educational cohort studies (n=16, 35\%). Two were non-randomised trials (4\%)\(^{36,47}\) and six studies were randomised controlled trials (13\%).\(^{21,42,45,50,57,64}\) Medical doctors and nurses were the targeted learners in most of the studies (n=18 (39\%) and n=25 (54\%), respectively). Other healthcare professionals included were for example paramedics,\(^{30,39,42,43}\) respiratory therapists,\(^{38,50,58}\) pharmacists\(^{43,58,61}\) and midwives.\(^{39,42,43}\) Students in relevant fields were included in some studies.\(^{28,29,48,49,55,60,64,65}\)

Educational content and competency category

Theoretical knowledge

Thirty-five studies (76\%) reported on development of theoretical courses to educate and inform HCW regarding general principles of epidemic preparedness, disease presentation, surveillance and treatment. Resources for course content could originate from international agencies such as the WHO, from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention\(^{66}\) or from official guidelines implemented by local health and infectious disease authorities to aid the hospitals.\(^{26}\) Knowledge on infection prevention and control (IPC) including patient care principles and safety practices were central in many of the included studies.\(^{23,27,33,36,43,47,51}\)

Technical skills

In 26 studies (57\%), the focus was on technical skills particularly on risk management strategies such as donning and doffing of PPE.\(^{20,21,27,28,31,36–38,40,43,52,59,63,64}\) One study reported that while PPE skills can be mastered in a controlled learning environment, maintaining the

---

**Table 2** Search strings used in a systematic review on training and education of healthcare workers during viral epidemics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datebase</th>
<th>Search strings used to search for evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PubMed</td>
<td>(training OR educat* OR teach*) AND (coronavirus OR SARS OR H1N1 OR MERS OR EBOLA OR COVID-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane</td>
<td>ID Search #1 TRAINING #2 educat* #3 teach* #4 coronavirus #5 SARS #6 H1N1 #7 MERS #8 EBOLA #9 COVID-19 #10 #1 OR #2 OR #3 #11 #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 or #8 OR #9 #12 #10 AND #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBASE</td>
<td>(training OR educat* OR teach*) AND (coronavirus OR sars OR h1n1 OR mers OR ebola OR ‘covid 19’) AND(2000–2020)/py AND (english)/lim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>(training OR educat* OR teach*) AND (coronavirus OR SARS OR H1N1 OR MERS OR EBOLA OR COVID-19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOAJ, Directory of Open Access Journals; EMBASE, Excerpta Medica; EDV, Ebola virus disease; H1N1, H1N1 influenza virus infection; MERS, Middle East respiratory syndrome.
The integrity of the procedure during critical situations is challenging, as well as measures to reduce risk of self-contamination. Critical care management skills were also often trained including endotracheal intubation, airway management techniques, manual and mechanical ventilation, advanced cardiac and airway life support (ACLS/AALS); and extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) management.

'Non-technical' skills
Eight (17%) studies described a variety of other skills such as teamwork and cognitive load, interpersonal skills, reporting and decision making, attitude, critical thinking skills, concern and confidence. Psychological support for HCW was highlighted in three studies that designed educational interventions on psychological first aid and resilience. Another study highlighted the importance of interpersonal skills for screening personnel to manage the high number of potentially anxious patients and visitors.

Training delivery
Traditional didactics
Thirteen out of forty-six studies (28%) used traditional didactics such as lectures and other adult learning strategies including interactive group and learner-led discussions, case-based learning, problem-based learning, demonstrations/return demonstrations and role playing. Most of the studies that aimed to convey theoretical knowledge consisted of brief sessions, that is, less than a day (n=8/13, 62%).

E-learning
E-learning has been used to rapidly disseminate information during an epidemic outbreak. One study found that e-learning could be used to significantly increase knowledge on a prelearning and postlearning test as well as retention test. Other studies used CD/DVD or USB drives to disseminate course materials for self-learning, as well as audio/video mini lectures and specific software for interactive online learning.
Simulation-based training

In 31 studies (67%), simulation-based training (SBT) was an integral part of the training intervention. This ranged from skills stations to practice relevant clinical procedures such as airway management or central venous catheter placement, to the use of high-fidelity and interactive simulation equipment for large scale scenario training. The majority of the studies focused on training of correct use of PPE, while a few studies also used simulation to train interpersonal skills and team training. The duration of SBT was variable across studies, ranging from shorter sessions to multi-day courses.

Effects and level of educational outcome

Eight out of forty-six studies (17%) evaluated the learning outcome at Kirkpatrick level 1, that is, the learners' satisfaction and experience with the training intervention. All these studies concordantly found that learners were satisfied with training regardless of the intervention. Modification of attitude or perceptions (Kirkpatrick level 2a) were an outcome in five studies (11%). In one of these studies it was reported that the participants felt more confident after the intervention that consisted of 80 hours of lectures and SBT of care and management of the infected patient. The majority of the studies (n=29, 63%) reported on modification of knowledge and/or skills (Kirkpatrick level 2b) resulting from the educational intervention. A significant decrease in number of errors in donning and doffing of PPE was demonstrated in one study after a single 1-hour theoretical session combined with three simulation sessions, which were repeated after 72 hours. A longer 3-day course of e-learning and SBT regarding safety measures in patient with EVD care reported a significant increase in knowledge scores from pre to post intervention as well as an overall high performance in the simulation scenario on PPE use.

Only one study reported on behavioural change in the clinic among the participants who correctly used PPE after supplemental SBT as compared with the ones who underwent the standard training (Kirkpatrick level 3). Change in organisational practice (Kirkpatrick level 4a) was reported following SBT in IPC, which led to a decrease in infection rate among HCW. Two studies included Kirkpatrick level 4b evaluation by demonstrating a benefit to patients or clients directly attributable to the training intervention. In one of these, decreased mortality rates in ECMO patients was found after implementation of an ECMO training programme (66.7% vs 91.3%, p=0.013).

DISCUSSION

In this systematic review, we identified 46 studies on training and educational interventions for HCW that were developed and implemented due to an ongoing or a recent major viral epidemic.

Target population and characteristics

Most of the educational interventions were prompted by the urgent need to train HCW, especially in relation to the EVD outbreak, which had the highest case fatality rate at 40.4% compared with SARS (9.6%), MERS (34%), H1N1 (0.02%) and COVID-19 (3.4% as of 3 March 2020). EVD training programmes were initiated for all HCW who were deployed to the frontlines mainly focused on IPC procedures and the proper use of PPE. For the other viral diseases, a surge of critically ill patients with respiratory failure has prompted many of the simulation-based interventions to train critical care management skills such as ACLS/AALS and ECMO. All these high-risk infections also expose HCW to psychological hazards such as fatigue, occupational burnout and distress, furthermore...
highlighting that psychological support to maintain the well-being of HCW during a pandemic is imperative, as seen in a number of studies.\textsuperscript{34, 42, 62, 68}

\textbf{Educational content and competency category}

The use of traditional didactic methods to teach theoretical knowledge is common when a large number of learners need to be targeted at the same time. Depending on the learning goals, theoretical knowledge can be efficiently delivered in less than a day, and brief sessions are particularly efficient if modules are spaced (ie, distributed learning) as demonstrated in several of the included studies.\textsuperscript{28, 46, 61}

The advent of e-learning, including web based and other technology enhanced learning, has opened immense opportunities for flexible dissemination of information notwithstanding time and location.\textsuperscript{69} This poses an advantage, especially for HCW in remote locations, where learning resources can be accessed in their own time and without potential transmission of infection between the learners. E-learning is dependent on online access, which could be a challenge in rural communities with limited network coverage.\textsuperscript{35} In light of COVID-19, the WHO Health Emergencies Programme has launched free online training resources, providing HCW and staff access to real-time knowledge on how to detect, prevent and respond to the new coronavirus.\textsuperscript{70} In medical education, e-learning has been found to have large positive effects and is especially effective when combined with other educational modalities.\textsuperscript{69}

SBT has also been increasingly used as an integral part of medical training with positive effects on knowledge, skills and behaviours.\textsuperscript{71, 72} In the context of a viral outbreak, simulation provides a safe and controlled environment for training of emergency response including teamwork and system readiness. This is corroborated by the included studies on PPE, which found that participants benefitted from repeated training of donning and doffing; of efficiently performing procedures while wearing a constricting PPE; and the use of full-scale scenarios for team-based training.\textsuperscript{38, 44}

These three major educational strategies can all be used in combination and integrated in a structured curriculum to achieve an optimised learning experience.\textsuperscript{73} Several of the included studies achieved this by using e-learning to provide precourse materials, allowing for self-learning prior to course start, then theoretical teaching through lectures and other interactive learning strategies such as group exercises and discussions, and finally practical skills training in a simulated setting.\textsuperscript{74} Multimodality and extensive training presents a challenge especially for countries with limited resources;\textsuperscript{75} however, standardised training programmes that are supported by the international communities and the local government bodies seem to help alleviate this.

\textbf{Training delivery and effects and level of educational outcome}

In the included studies, effect of training varied across educational strategies and mode of evaluation. Interestingly, duration of the training intervention did not seem to correlate with the relative effect on the educational outcome: for example, a 3-day workshop on EVD management resulted in an increase of correctly answered questions from a preworkshop median of 7 to a postmedian of 9 (~29\% increase);\textsuperscript{26} whereas a 3-hour training session on EVD awareness demonstrated an improvement in knowledge from the mean baseline score of 3.93 to a mean score of 13.18 after intervention (~235\% increase).\textsuperscript{41} This illustrates that training outcome is very much dependent on the objectives of the training and how it is evaluated. It is also important to be critical in regard to the size of the effects of training reported: a 2-hour session on SARS\textsuperscript{75} reported a statistically significant increase in knowledge; however, the actual change in test scores from pretraining to postraining intervention was only 3\%, and therefore of limited consequence.

Most of the included studies reported outcomes of the educational intervention at the level of learner satisfaction (level 1), modification of attitude (level 2a) and modification of knowledge and skills (level 2b) without evaluating if the training affected clinical practice. Learner satisfaction and attitude are typically measured using postcourse surveys and changes in knowledge and skills by pretraining and postraining tests. Unsurprisingly, these will almost always result in high levels of satisfaction, increase in confidence and improvement in knowledge and skills after intervention.\textsuperscript{76} Further, these outcomes provide little-to-no information on actual performance and translation into improved performance in the clinical environment and/or patient outcomes.\textsuperscript{76}

\textbf{Implications and perspectives}

The current pandemic has highlighted that despite many relevant training interventions already developed, these seem to not have been widely adapted or implemented. There is a need for structured and evidence-based training programmes that are easily replicated and adaptable to local contexts and settings.\textsuperscript{16} Development of educational interventions should follow a systematic approach such as Kern’s six-step model\textsuperscript{77}81: starting with a general needs assessment to identify gaps and learner needs; a targeted needs assessment to align to targeted context; definition of goals and objectives including plans for assessment to ensure that the learning goals are met and that learning outcomes are measured appropriately (ie, knowledge and skills transfer into the clinical environment)\textsuperscript{77, 78}; selection of educational modalities, which could include different categories of knowledge, technical skills and ‘non-technical’ skills;\textsuperscript{73, 79} and finally, plans for implementation and evaluation of the training programme.

Training should be optimised and implemented based on learning needs, conditions and resources, allowing for deliberate and distributed practice over time.\textsuperscript{80} Assessment of the effect of learning interventions plays a critical role and ultimately, provides evidence for improved patient outcomes.\textsuperscript{75, 81} At present, evidence regarding training and education in preparation for a viral epidemic...
is sparse and not any of the interventions included in this review has followed a structured model for curriculum development nor has undergone rigorous evaluation.

We recommend medical educators to share and publish their actual results or design of educational studies as additional resources in keeping with high standards and to collect evidence for their educational interventions. To ensure that key information are gathered and reported, the criterion-based checklist that was used in this study can guide the development and implementation of quality educational interventions. Interestingly, we note that scientific studies spike during or shortly after the onset of the viral epidemic and tend to decline after a few years. With more than 61,000 studies found in PubMed relating to the 5 viral diseases, less than 6% relates to education and training and of these, only 46 were educational interventional studies. This further highlights the need for careful planning and refinement of training interventions also post epidemic, by systematically improving educational approach, study design and outcome measures so that these efforts can prepare the medical community best possibly for the next epidemic. Educational research should not solely be performed during an ongoing viral epidemic where the stakes are high and the conditions for teaching and training are far from optimal. We recommend that educational interventional studies such as randomised controlled trials are performed before another pandemic happens in order to gather and establish evidence-based educational practices that will best equip and certify HCW with the competences needed in the front lines.

Strengths and limitations
A strength of this review is the inclusion of educational interventional studies in the last 20 years, providing an overview of the currently published training programmes for HCW and their evidence. A limitation relates to the exclusion of descriptive studies reporting on the development of training programmes without evaluation. Many of the included studies were not conducted to the highest standards in medical education. We also think that there is a substantial educational effort that goes unreported. Another limitation is the exclusion of non-English language studies which could have helped answer the first research question given that most of the reports concerning viral epidemics come from non-English speaking nations. Finally, we did not include studies that solely evaluated organisational or system-wide impact of interventions because we aimed in this review to focus on how to train HCW rather than how to improve systems through training.

Conclusion
Published educational interventional studies in relation to training during viral epidemics demonstrate a variety of educational content, design, strategies and modes of delivery. Overall, the included studies consistently reported positive benefits of any structured training intervention including positive effects on confidence and knowledge. However, there are very few studies evaluating that these training efforts transfer into improved clinical performance and better patient outcomes. Development and implementation of evidence-based training programmes that can be easily adapted locally are required for the medical community to be well prepared for the next viral epidemic outbreak.
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### Supplementary table

#### Table S1. Overview of the educational interventional studies included in a systematic review on training and education of healthcare workers during viral epidemics including general descriptive information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author, year of publication</th>
<th>Country of first author</th>
<th>Viral illness</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Competency category and overall educational content</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Main educational modality</th>
<th>Duration of training</th>
<th>Preparation (items 1–2), mean</th>
<th>Interventio n (items 3–15), mean</th>
<th>Evaluation (items 16–17), mean</th>
<th>Kirkpatrick’s Levels</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrahamson, 2006</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses</td>
<td>Knowledge and technical skills on advanced cardiac life support protocol for SARS patients</td>
<td>Simulation-based training (scenario-based)</td>
<td>2-hour session</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participants rated the comprehensiveness, duration, and effectiveness of teaching methods favorably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abualenain, 2018</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses, paramedics, anesthesia technicians, others</td>
<td>Technical skills: donning and doffing of PPE</td>
<td>Simulation-based training</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Pre- and post-training test written scores for the participants improved significantly (p &lt;0.01) from 67% (range 57–75%) to 85% (range 81–91%), respectively. All 179 HCW completed the Ebola PPE checklist, about half compromised (different levels of compromising) the PPE protocol at some point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adini, 2012</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>H1N1</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses</td>
<td>Knowledge and technical skills related to avian flu (management of patient; donning and doffing of PPE)</td>
<td>Lectures; small group discussions and tabletop exercises</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>The overall mean score for the 14-item multiple choice questions for emergency department medical personnel was 75.6. The correlation between the level of knowledge related to pandemic flu and the performance in the avian flu exercise was not significant (Spearman’s rho &lt; 0.25).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiello, 2011</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>SARS, H1N1</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses, other hospital staff</td>
<td>&quot;Non-technical&quot; skill: resilience</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Multiple 1-hour sessions over a 5-month period</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A high proportion of participants found the session relevant to work life and personal life, useful, helpful, and informative. Ten themes emerged from the comments: family-work balance, antiviral prophylaxis, need for information, education and preparedness, ethical concerns, visibility of leadership, valuing frontline staff, mistrust/fears, information relating to redeployment, need for ongoing resilience training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andonian, 2019</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>HCW (not specified)</td>
<td>Technical skill: donning and doffing of PPE; &quot;Non-technical&quot; skills: teamwork, cognitive load</td>
<td>Lectures; video demonstrations, simulation-based training</td>
<td>2-hour session</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Any type of self-contamination was high in both groups (84.6–100 %) during doffing, but the intervention group contaminated fewer sites (p = 0.002). Intervention group demonstrated more teamwork behaviors (median 27.1) compared to controls (median 9.1). Participants in the intervention group perceived marginally higher mental demand than the controls (p = 0.055).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors, Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Target HCW</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Pre-course Score</td>
<td>Post-course Score</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazeyo, 2015</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses and other district HCW including lab technicians, immigration officers and security officers, media persons</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD</td>
<td>Small group work and discussions; demonstrations, visual aids, role play, case studies; practical exercises</td>
<td>5-day course</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Knowledge increased from ~56–78 % pre-intervention to ~68–88 % post-intervention on a knowledge test.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benah, 2019</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>HCW (not specified)</td>
<td>Knowledge related to PPC, EVD and IPC</td>
<td>Classroom-based teaching; simulated patients; clinical mentoring</td>
<td>8-day course</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Both clinicians (n = 188) and non-clinicians (n = 149) showed statistically significant improvements in knowledge on clinical care and IPC concepts as measured by the 9-item pre-and post-training questionnaires (both p &lt; 0.001). HCW infection rate was 9% by October 2014 (pre-course) and had dropped to 1% by January 2015 (post-course). Furthermore, after the conclusion of training in March 2015, no infections reported among HCW exposed to the confirmed cases despite the resurgence of Ebola cases in June and November 2015, and April 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazzi, 2012</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>H1N1</td>
<td>Anesthesiologists</td>
<td>Knowledge: gas exchange during extracorporeal bypass; Technical skill: ECMO</td>
<td>Lectures; simulation-based training</td>
<td>3-day course</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participants rated the relevance, quality and efficacy of the training favorably.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredmose, 2014</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Helicopter Emergency Medical Service (HEMS) crew</td>
<td>Technical skill: Helicopter Emergency Medical Service in relation to EVD patients</td>
<td>Simulation-based training (in-situ simulation)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All participants reported high degrees of satisfaction and realism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustamente, 2015</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Doctors, respiratory therapists</td>
<td>Technical skill: PPE</td>
<td>Simulation-based training</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>The intervention increased the confidence of participants. 95% and 87% of participants, respectively, rated the program and faculty as good or outstanding on a five-point Likert scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos, 2015</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Doctors, medical technologists</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD</td>
<td>Lecture and practical hands-on workshop</td>
<td>3-day workshop</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>The percentage of participants who correctly answered all 10 questions was 2.8% (8 of 285) and 22.5% (82 to 364) pre- and post the workshop, respectively. The number of questions correctly answered by participants increased from a pre-workshop median of 7 (IQR 6–8; range 3–10) to a post-workshop median of 9 (IQR 8–9; range 4–10) (p &lt; 0.009).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrico, 2007</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Knowledge of respiratory pathogen transmission as well as standard precautions; Technical skill: donning and doffing of PPE</td>
<td>Classroom training and simulation-based training</td>
<td>Not specified, but &lt;1 day</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pre- and post-training test scores were similar for the two groups and increased from 0.64 to 0.76. Participants who received the visual training demonstrated use of PPE more often (74% vs 53%, respectively).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvalho, 2019</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses, cleaning personnel, nursing assistants, security personnel, stretcher bearers</td>
<td>Knowledge: principles of care and management of infected patient. Technical skill: donning and doffing of PPE, other procedures such as blood extraction, catheter placement, endotracheal intubation, hygiene, stool and vomit, cleaning, emergency situations, patient transfer</td>
<td>Classes and seminars; simulation-based training (full scale scenarios)</td>
<td>80-h course over 10 days</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Participants felt that the course increased their sense of security, predisposition to take care of these patients and confidence in management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casalino, 2015</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Medical and nursing students</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD; Technical skill: donning and doffing of PPE</td>
<td>Classroom lecture; specific skills training</td>
<td>1-hour theoretical session; and a practical session repeated every 72 hours for each group</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>In all 4 groups, the frequency and number of total errors and critical errors decreased significantly over the course of the training sessions (p &lt; .01). The intervention was associated with a greater reduction in the number of total errors and critical errors (p &lt; .0001). The B-PPE intervention groups had the fewest errors and critical errors (p &lt; .0001).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, 2009</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>Technical skills: Advanced Airway Life Support</td>
<td>Lecture; simulation-based training</td>
<td>2-hour lecture, 4-hour hands-on workshop</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Residents received higher scores during re-simulation regardless of scoring methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi, 2020</td>
<td>Hongkong</td>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>Doctors and nurses</td>
<td>Technical skills: donning and doffing of PPE, intubation, central venous catheter</td>
<td>Simulation-based training</td>
<td>20-30 min simulation and 30-mins debriefing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>The domains for feedback and discussion included the following key events in chronological order: donning PPE, pre-intubation check, intubation procedure, and doffing PPE. Local guideline changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last name, Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Virus</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, 2020</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>Technical skills: donning and doffing of PPE</td>
<td>Demonstration/return demonstration; video-based</td>
<td>2- to 3-hour training session for control group; intervention group watched videos as many times as they wished at home</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>19 of 21 participants returned for 1-month post-instruction evaluation. In donning, the scores in the instructor group ranged from 67% to 100%, and the scores in the video group ranged from 62% to 100%. The overall mean donning score was 86.5/100; the mean score was 84.8 for the instructor group and 88.0 for the video group. In doffing, the scores in the instructor group ranged from 59% to 96%, and the scores in the video group ranged from 51% to 93%. The overall mean doffing score was 76.4/100; the mean score for the instructor group was 79.1, and it was 73.9 for the video group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, 2013</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>H1N1</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>Knowledge related to H1N1</td>
<td>Lecture, interactive group sessions, role play</td>
<td>3-day course</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Critical care knowledge improved significantly from before the training to immediately after (Caribbean site: 58–80%; Indonesia site: 56–75%; p &lt;0.001 for both).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, 2018</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>H1N1</td>
<td>Undergraduate students in nursing and health sciences</td>
<td>Knowledge: Critical care management/best ICU practices, ARDS, and pregnancy influenza</td>
<td>Lectures; case-based learning</td>
<td>3-day course</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Test scores improved significantly after training (p &lt; .001) both in pilot and implementation phases; participants rated the learning units as good to very good (mean, 5-point Likert scale: 4.6–4.8).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dube, 2018</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Natural and health science major undergraduate students</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD</td>
<td>Case-based learning</td>
<td>Integrated in undergraduate curriculum</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Students improved in relation to theoretical knowledge on all 10 questions (a mix of multiple choice questions, true/false statements and free text responses). Overall score (normalized) improved from ~47%–80%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eardley, 2015</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>HCW, university and military staff</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD</td>
<td>Lectures; drills</td>
<td>4-day course</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Factual knowledge increased (a median change on the VAS of 4.0 by all delegates, p&lt;0.001). Change in confidence in teaching increased (median change on the VAS of 5.0 for all delegates, p&lt;0.001).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckes, 2016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Knowledge: Principles of EVD care and PPE; Technical skill: donning and doffing of PPE</td>
<td>Lectures; simulation-based training</td>
<td>Quarterly course (hours not mentioned)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participants completed a return demonstration and written assessment. Further details not provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elcin, 2016</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>MERS</td>
<td>Paramedics</td>
<td>Knowledge related to MERS and PPE for healthcare providers</td>
<td>Simulation-based training</td>
<td>1-day course with 3 sessions</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>16 of 19 (84%) teams recognized the possibility of MERS as a measure of their awareness in the baseline evaluation. The participating sites lacked PPE, which revealed their baseline level of preparedness for MERS. Certain improvements in donning and doffing PPE were observed in the post-training evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferranti, 2016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD</td>
<td>E-learning: online PowerPoint slides</td>
<td>3-day course</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Knowledge increased significantly from pre-to post and retention test (75.9 % to 90.7 % and 89.8 %, respectively).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanley, 2008</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>SARS, H1N1</td>
<td>Nurses, respiratory therapy students, general internists, physician assistants, nurse practitioners, non-critical care nurses, veterinarians, and physical therapists</td>
<td>Knowledge and technical skills: Infection control, manual ventilation, mechanical ventilation, airway maintenance, and airway suctioning.</td>
<td>E-learning: video (DVD); simulation-based training</td>
<td>Just-in-time training (90 mins)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No detailed information of results from the assessment, however, groups passed based on their cognitive scores to the questions and performance scores during the dry lab competency testing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones-Konneh, 2017</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Nurses, other HCW (not specified)</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD; Technical skills on PPE and other IPC skills such as hand hygiene, mixing of chlorine solutions, etc.</td>
<td>Simulation-based training</td>
<td>3 phases of training: A. 3 days theory, 2 days for SBT; B. 1-day theory and 2 days SBT; C. 3 days for basic IPC/PPE</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Feeling of comfort decreased anxiety during patient care; no other quantification of training outcome presented. It is speculated that HCWs had improved understanding of EVD, IPC and patient care, which subsequently could have contributed to the survival of patients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, 2018</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>H1N1</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses</td>
<td>Knowledge: basic hemodynamics, ECMO physiology, circuit anatomy, and hemostasis of patients on ECMO; Technical and behavioral skills to manage ECMO scenarios; &quot;Nontechnical&quot; skills: team communication</td>
<td>Lectures; simulation-based training</td>
<td>Every month (duration not mentioned)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Mortality rate of patients markedly lower during period 2 (after program implementation) as compared to period 1 (before implementation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klomp, 2020</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>CDC staff (non-clinical deployers)</td>
<td>“Non-technical skills”: resilience</td>
<td>Traditional didactics</td>
<td>3-day training</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin, 2008</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Patient-hired attendants and outsourced workers</td>
<td>Knowledge: control of nosocomial infections</td>
<td>Lecture; video-based demonstration (CD)</td>
<td>2-hour session</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, 2008</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Nurses, social workers and student, public health student</td>
<td>Knowledge: Bioterrorism preparedness</td>
<td>Problem-based learning</td>
<td>3-hour session; follow-up session 1 week later</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathias, 2015</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>SARS, EVD, H1N1</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD; roles pharmacists play as health care professionals; “Non-technical” skill: critical thinking skills</td>
<td>Learner-led discussions and presentations</td>
<td>3-hour/week, offered over two consecutive years</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maunder, 2010</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>H1N1</td>
<td>Nurses, other HCW (not specified)</td>
<td>“Non-technical” skill: Resilience</td>
<td>E-learning: Course materials on a flash drive for self-learning and audio and video mini lectures</td>
<td>3 course lengths (short/medium/long): 7/12/17 sessions</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td>Knowledge Related to EVD</td>
<td>E-learning</td>
<td>Multiple Modules, Each Approx. 5 Minutes</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Kenna, 2019</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Community HCW</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD</td>
<td>E-learning</td>
<td>mobile training platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For module II (relevant to the disease), there was an increase of 3 % in CHCWs correctly answering &gt;80 % of the questions. For CHCWs with 50-79 % correct answers there was a regression in performance after training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McInnes, 2005</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Security guards, volunteer students</td>
<td>Knowledge related to SARS; Technical skills: handwashing, putting on N-95; temperature taking; “Non-technical” skills: reporting, interpersonal skills, accurate decision making</td>
<td>Lectures; demonstrations and role playing</td>
<td>Education day (number of hours not detailed)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The training enabled the trainees to problem solve, think critically, and use the guidelines established by the screening tool to make decisions about individuals trying to enter the hospital. It also enabled them to realize the importance of their interpersonal skills through mock interactions with different people in a variety of circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MenkinSmit h, 2018</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Medical fellows and residents, nursing specialty training, others (students)</td>
<td>Knowledge safety measures in Ebola patient care; Technical skills in donning and doffing of PPE, infection control practices</td>
<td>E-learning</td>
<td>information via online software; Simulation-based training (team training scenarios)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Both groups demonstrated a significant increase in their knowledge test scores after completing the online curriculum, with average scores for novices increasing from 19.7 to 24.3 (n = 9, p &lt; 0.01) and average score in experienced participants increasing from 19.2 to 22.3 (n = 9, p = 0.03). Overall high performance of both groups in the simulation scenarios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narra, 2016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>HCW</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD, infection prevention and control; Technical skill: donning and doffing of PPE</td>
<td>Lectures; small-group discussions, and practical exercises</td>
<td>3-day course</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This course quickly increased the number of clinicians who could provide care in West Africa ETUs, showing the feasibility of rapidly developing and implementing training in response to a public health emergency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Keeffe, 2016</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Nurses, respiratory therapists, laboratory technicians, and ancillary staff</td>
<td>Knowledge related to EVD and safety management; Technical skills: donning and doffing of PPE, airway management, dressing care and IV infusion, urinary catheter care</td>
<td>Simulation-based training (interprofessional)</td>
<td>4-hour program</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Increased level of confidence in three key areas: Contamination breach (pre: 2.17; post: 3.71; p&lt;.001), clinical skills in PPE (pre: 2.04; post: 3.82; p&lt;.001), donning and doffing PPE (pre: 2.04; post: 3.88; p&lt;.001).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu, 2016</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Nurses, community HCW, midwives, laboratory scientists, auxiliary nurses, pharmacy technicians and health record staff.</td>
<td>Knowledge on EVD disease specific information; “Non-technical” skill: attitude</td>
<td>E-learning</td>
<td>tablet computers with Ebola awareness tutorial (EAT)</td>
<td>2 weeks allowed to review training materials</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Increased in knowledge pre- and post-intervention (61.2 to 68.2, 11% improvement &lt; 0.05); Fear of EVD reduced significantly from 89 to 52%. Positive attitudes between pre- and post-EAT scores regarding contact with EVD patients: (83 to 92%); eating bush meat (57 to 64%) and risky burial practices (67 to 79%),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Technical Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phransus, 2016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses, other response team members</td>
<td>Knowledge on Ebola, principles of PPE, response, equipment, personal safety, policies; Technical skills: donning and doffing of PPE;</td>
<td>Onsite and online pre-course modules; simulation-based training</td>
<td>4-hour sessions 4 days/week for 3 weeks</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehman, 2020</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Knowledge: EVD awareness</td>
<td>Lectures; video demonstration and discussion</td>
<td>3-hour session</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, 2019</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Nurses, respiratory therapists, certified nursing assistants, industrial hygienists, safety and occupational health professionals, infection Preventionists &amp; others identified with respiratory protection practice</td>
<td>Knowledge: Respiratory protection practice such as infectious agent transmission routes, hand hygiene, hazard assessment, respirator selection and care, medical evaluation and monitoring, fit-testing and training, respirator donning/doffing and seal checks.</td>
<td>Educational program (lecture) Clinical observations, focus group interviews</td>
<td>Educational program: 1-day training</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sijbrandij, 2020</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Nurses, community HCW, midwives, maternal health assistant, vaccinators, lab assistant, etc</td>
<td>Knowledge: psychological first aid (PFA)</td>
<td>Traditional didactics</td>
<td>one day (no. of hours not mentioned)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soeters, 2018</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EVD</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory, health tech, midwife, admin, students,</td>
<td>Knowledge on IPC; Technical skills: donning and doffing of PPE, triage, waste management</td>
<td>Traditional didactics; hands-on training</td>
<td>First course: 3 days Second course: condensed 2 days</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, Year, Location</td>
<td>H1N1 Impact</td>
<td>Intervention Details</td>
<td>Tech Skill Details</td>
<td>Adherence</td>
<td>Confidence Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, 2011 USA</td>
<td>Doctors, nurses, respiratory therapist, support technicians, pharmacists, physician extenders and students</td>
<td>Technical skill: PPE adherence</td>
<td>Simulation-based training (in-situ) 8-week observation period</td>
<td>2.0 1.3 1.0 2b</td>
<td>Observed adherence with PPE use= 61% for eye shields, 81% for filtering facepiece respirators or powered air-purifying respirators, and 87% for gown/gloves. Use of a &quot;gatekeeper&quot; to control access and facilitate donning of PPE was associated with 100% adherence with gown and respirator precautions and improved respirator adherence. All simulations showed deviation from pediatric basic life support protocols. The median time to bag-valve-mask ventilation improved from 4.3 to 2.7 minutes with a gatekeeper present. Confidence in PPE use improved from 64% to 85% after the mock code and structured debriefing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu, 2009 Taiwan</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Knowledge on IPC</td>
<td>Formal lectures, hands-on demonstrations, simulation scenarios, role play, brainstorming and group discussion</td>
<td>1.5 1.3 0.5 2b</td>
<td>Intervention cohort improved significantly on pre- to post-training test and follow-up test (8.87, 9.85, 11.00 points, respectively) compared with the control cohort (8.87, 8.67, 8.70 points, respectively).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou, 2020 China</td>
<td>Nurses and nursing students</td>
<td>Knowledge: emergency and critical care nursing; Technical skills: CPR, use of defibrillator, use of ECG, collection of various specimens, artificial airway techniques, usage of oropharyngeal ventilation tube and mask; gastric lavage technology of gastric lavage machine; Hemostasis, bandaging, and fixation technology</td>
<td>Traditional didactics and simulation-based training; micro-video (webcasts) 10-hr class sessions</td>
<td>2 1.75 2 2b</td>
<td>The total scores of theoretical assessment and practical assessment were 60 and 40, respectively, with 100 points in total. For the theory and practice of group 2: no significant difference between the two groups in terms of theory and practice (p = 0.654; p = 0.813; p = 0.180) Teaching satisfaction: the interns' teaching satisfaction of group 2 was higher than that of group 1: There was overall satisfaction; significant difference between the two groups (p = 0.020, p = 0.039; p = 0.012; p = 0.029). There was no significant difference in content rationality between the two groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ Quality Appraisal using the Educational intervention checklist. Each item is assigned a score of 0/1/2 (higher is better) based on descriptive anchors.

*Kirkpatrick levels*: Level 1=learner's view regarding the educational experience; level 2a=modification of behaviour or attitude; level 2b=acquisition or modification of knowledge/skills; level 3=actual behavioural change documented by transfer of learning to the workplace; level 4a=changes in organisational practice that are attributable to the intervention; and level 4b= outcomes at the level of patient health and well-being

**Abbreviations:** SARS- severe acute respiratory syndrome; H1N1- H1N1 influenza virus infection; MERS- Middle East respiratory syndrome; EVD- Ebola virus disease; COVID-19- corona virus disease 2019; HCW – healthcare workers; PPE – personal protective equipment; IPC – infection prevention and control; ECMO – extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; SBT – simulation-based training; CPR- Cardiopulmonary resuscitation; ECG- electrocardiogram