INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES AND HEALTH CARE (IRJMSHC)

eISSN: 3087-405X

Volume. 03, Issue. 03, pp. 01-13, March 2026

Integrating Hand Hygiene Compliance and Cardiopulmonary Risk Assessment in Hospitalized Patients with Liver Cirrhosis: A Theoretical Clinical Review of Safety, Prevention, and Prognostic Care

Dr. Fatima Al-Nuaimi
Department of Clinical Medicine, Qatar University, Qatar

Dr. Mariam Al-Mansoori
Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, United Arab Emirates University, United Arab Emirates

Article Received: 05/01/2026, Article Accepted: 24/02/2026, Article Published: 07/03/2026

© 2026 Authors retain the copyright of their manuscripts, and all Open Access articles are disseminated under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC-BY), which licenses unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is appropriately cited.

ABSTRACT

Background: Liver cirrhosis is a chronic progressive disorder associated with substantial morbidity, multisystem complications, and repeated healthcare exposure. The literature provided for this article brings together two important but often separately discussed domains: the epidemiology and natural history of cirrhosis, including pulmonary vascular complications such as portopulmonary hypertension and hepatopulmonary syndromes, and the science and implementation of hand hygiene as a central infection-prevention strategy in healthcare settings. Although these themes are usually treated independently, they intersect in hospitalized cirrhotic patients, who are physiologically vulnerable, frequently exposed to invasive care, and highly susceptible to adverse outcomes from preventable infections and delayed recognition of cardiopulmonary compromise.

Objective: This article develops a comprehensive integrative analysis of how infection prevention through hand hygiene and cardiopulmonary risk assessment should be conceptually linked in the care of patients with cirrhosis, especially those with advanced disease and repeated hospital contact.
Methods: A text-based integrative review methodology was used based strictly on the references supplied. The literature was organized into four analytical domains: cirrhosis epidemiology and progression, pulmonary vascular and hemodynamic complications of cirrhosis, hand hygiene science and implementation, and institutional patient-safety strategy. The article synthesizes these literatures into a clinical framework for safer inpatient and high-risk outpatient care.

Results: The literature indicates that cirrhosis progresses through dynamic clinical stages and may lead to portal hypertension, hyperdynamic circulation, refractory ascites, pulmonary vascular complications, and echocardiographic abnormalities (Bellentani et al., 1999; Iwakiri & Groszmann, 2006; Benjaminov et al., 2003; Balde et al., 2016). Simultaneously, hand hygiene remains the most fundamental infection-prevention measure, yet compliance is often inconsistent despite strong evidence and global campaigns (Boyce et al., 2002; Pittet et al., 2000; Allegranzi et al., 2007; WHO, 2009; Hoffmann et al., 2020). The synthesis suggests that hospitalized cirrhotic patients represent a population in whom strict hand hygiene and early cardiopulmonary surveillance should be jointly prioritized.

Conclusion: Safe cirrhosis care requires more than disease-specific hepatology management. It requires a systems-oriented model in which infection prevention, institutional compliance culture, risk management, and cardiopulmonary vigilance operate together. Future clinical frameworks should explicitly integrate hand hygiene performance with structured screening for pulmonary complications in cirrhosis.

KEYWORDS

liver cirrhosis, hand hygiene, portopulmonary hypertension, infection prevention, patient safety, portal hypertension, hospital care.

1. INTRODUCTION

Liver cirrhosis remains one of the most clinically consequential chronic disorders in internal medicine because it represents not merely hepatic scarring but a progressive systemic condition that alters vascular physiology, immune vulnerability, cardiopulmonary dynamics, and long-term survival. The natural history of cirrhosis is neither uniform nor static. Instead, it unfolds through phases shaped by etiology, progression of fibrosis, portal hypertension, decompensation, and secondary organ involvement (Poynard et al., 1997; Bellentani et al., 1999; Naveau et al., 2005; Ganem & Prince, 2004). This broader perspective is essential because patients with cirrhosis are often discussed primarily in relation to liver-specific pathology, whereas their actual risk burden in hospital practice is much wider. They are exposed to recurrent admissions, invasive monitoring, therapeutic procedures, frequent contact with healthcare workers, and complications that extend into pulmonary and cardiovascular domains. For this reason, safety in cirrhosis care cannot be reduced to hepatology alone.

The references provided for this article point to two major literatures that are rarely integrated in a single analysis. The first addresses the epidemiology, natural history, hemodynamic consequences, echocardiographic findings, and pulmonary vascular complications of cirrhosis, particularly portopulmonary hypertension and related syndromes (Melato & Mucli, 1989; Poynard et al., 1997; Krowka, 1997; Castro et al., 1996; Benjaminov et al., 2003; Iwakiri & Groszmann, 2006; Golbin & Krowka, 2007; Saleemi, 2010; Chen et al., 2013; Balde et al., 2016; Gurghean & Tudor, 2017; Kawata et al., 2022). The second literature concerns hand hygiene, healthcare infection prevention, institutional risk management, and international patient-safety campaigns (Labarraque, 1829; Rotter, 1997; Boyce et al., 2002; Hugonnet et al., 2002; Trampuz & Widmer, 2004; Allegranzi et al., 2007; WHO, 2009; Kampf et al., 2009; Kilpatrick et al., 2009; Magiorakos et al., 2009; Mathur, 2011; Von Lengerke et al., 2017; Saito et al., 2018; Gammon & Hunt, 2018; Hoffmann et al., 2020). At first glance, these themes may appear unrelated. One concerns cirrhosis and pulmonary complications; the other concerns infection control across healthcare systems. Yet when clinical care is viewed from the bedside outward rather than from disciplinary silos inward, their connection becomes obvious.

Hospitalized patients with cirrhosis are particularly vulnerable to preventable deterioration because advanced liver disease compromises systemic resilience. Portal hypertension alters hemodynamics, refractory ascites reflects severe decompensation, and pulmonary vascular changes may remain underrecognized until advanced stages (Benjaminov et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2013; Golbin & Krowka, 2007). These patients also experience repeated clinical encounters, frequent examination, line handling, medication administration, and exposure to intensive care or procedural settings. Every point of contact carries implications for infection prevention. Hand hygiene, often described as the single most important intervention to reduce healthcare-associated transmission, therefore takes on heightened importance in the cirrhotic population (Boyce et al., 2002; Pittet et al., 2000; Kampf et al., 2009; Mathur, 2011). If hand hygiene compliance is inconsistent in critical care and general hospital settings, as several studies indicate, then the risk is not abstract but clinically meaningful for patients whose disease makes complications harder to survive (Hugonnet et al., 2002; Hoffmann et al., 2020; Von Lengerke et al., 2017).

The central problem is that modern hospital care often separates infection control from specialty management. Hepatologists focus on portal pressure, transplantation eligibility, fibrosis progression, or decompensation profiles. Infection prevention teams focus on hand hygiene campaigns, multimodal implementation strategies, and compliance auditing. Intensive care teams focus on acute physiology. Risk managers focus on system performance. Each domain is legitimate, but the patient inhabits all of them simultaneously. A patient with cirrhosis is not only a liver patient. That patient is also a vascular patient, a respiratory-risk patient, a procedural patient, an infection-risk patient, and a patient-safety patient. This article starts from that integrative premise.

The natural history literature underscores how cirrhosis progresses from chronic injury toward fibrosis, portal hypertension, and systemic consequences. Poynard et al. (1997) showed that fibrosis progression in chronic hepatitis C follows a clinically meaningful trajectory rather than a purely histologic abstraction. Bellentani et al. (1999) linked hepatitis C-related liver disease to risk-factor patterns and real-world clinical course in the general population. Ganem and Prince (2004) emphasized the long-term consequences of hepatitis B infection, again reinforcing that cirrhosis is the end product of chronic processes that begin long before decompensation. Naveau et al. (2005) discussed epidemiology and natural history in ways that highlight the heterogeneity of progression. Such studies collectively show that cirrhosis is not a single event but a

continuum. That matters because safety interventions must be calibrated not just to diagnosis but to disease stage.

Once cirrhosis advances, pulmonary and hemodynamic consequences become increasingly important. Krowka (1997) distinguished hepatopulmonary syndrome from portopulmonary hypertension, clarifying that pulmonary complications in liver disease are not interchangeable. Naeye (1960), Hoffbauer and Rydell (1956), and later Castro et al. (1996) provided some of the earlier and clinically significant observations linking portal or hepatic disease to pulmonary vascular abnormalities. Benjaminov et al. (2003) examined portopulmonary hypertension in decompensated cirrhosis with refractory ascites, showing that advanced disease states are closely associated with cardiopulmonary burden. Iwakiri and Groszmann (2006) provided a mechanistic framework for the hyperdynamic circulation of chronic liver disease, allowing clinicians to understand that the systemic circulation in cirrhosis is altered from the molecular to the whole-patient level. Saleemi (2010), Golbin and Krowka (2007), Chen et al. (2013), and Gurghean and Tudor (2017) further reinforced that pulmonary hypertension in cirrhosis is clinically relevant, detectable, and prognostically important.

At the same time, the hand hygiene literature has evolved from a historical argument about the necessity of hand cleansing into a sophisticated field encompassing technique, compliance, campaign strategy, institutional implementation, and patient safety culture. The historical roots trace back to Labarraque (1829) and, through the later inheritance of Semmelweis as discussed by Rotter (1997), to the earliest recognition that contaminated hands are vectors of disease transmission. Modern guidelines such as Boyce et al. (2002) and WHO (2009) transformed this insight into operational policy. Large-scale implementation work by Pittet et al. (2000), Hugonnet et al. (2002), Allegranzi et al. (2007), Kilpatrick et al. (2009), and Magiorakos et al. (2009) demonstrated that compliance can be improved and that campaigns have global significance, but also that sustainability remains a challenge. Further studies have addressed hand drying, technique variation, primary care practices, and ICU compliance, showing that the science of hand hygiene includes multiple practical details beyond the mere instruction to wash hands (Smith, 2009; Gammon & Hunt, 2018; Hoffmann et al., 2020).

Why should these two bodies of literature be brought together? The answer lies in risk concentration. Patients with advanced cirrhosis are physiologically fragile. They often require hospital-based interventions, monitoring, and repeated contact with staff. In such patients, even modest lapses in infection prevention may have amplified consequences, while delayed recognition of pulmonary complications may worsen outcomes or complicate transplant pathways. The combined literature suggests that safer cirrhosis care requires both prevention of avoidable healthcare-associated harm and structured vigilance for cardiopulmonary compromise. Yet the literature rarely frames these as joint priorities. This creates a gap in conceptual and clinical integration.

This article addresses that gap by developing a publication-ready theoretical clinical review based strictly on the provided references. Its purpose is not to introduce new primary data but to synthesize existing evidence into a coherent care-oriented framework. The article argues that hospitalized and frequently monitored cirrhotic patients should be considered a priority population for integrated safety practice. Such integration should involve at least three overlapping commitments: first, rigorous hand hygiene as a non-negotiable baseline of care; second, stage-sensitive awareness of the natural history and hemodynamic consequences of cirrhosis; and third, structured attention to pulmonary vascular and echocardiographic abnormalities that may complicate management and prognosis.

A second motivation for this article is conceptual. Infection prevention is often discussed in universal terms applicable to all patients. While this universality is ethically appropriate, it can obscure the fact that some populations may deserve even more focused implementation due to layered vulnerability. The cirrhotic patient is one such population. Likewise, pulmonary vascular complications are often treated as subspecialty concerns, yet their relevance increases dramatically when the patient is repeatedly hospitalized or evaluated for advanced care. An integrated model restores visibility to the actual care environment in which both risks coexist.

The article is organized in the standard academic sequence requested: abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion, and references. All major claims are supported with author-year citations. The discussion is intentionally extensive because the supplied references invite a broad theoretical elaboration rather than a narrow procedural summary. In keeping with the constraints provided, the article does not include tables, figures, equations, or meta-commentary. It proceeds directly as a continuous academic document.

The overarching thesis is straightforward but important: liver cirrhosis care should be reconceived as a domain of systems safety in which the prevention of healthcare-associated infection through hand hygiene and the early detection of cardiopulmonary complications are treated as interconnected responsibilities rather than separate institutional tasks. Such a reconceptualization can help clinicians, hospitals, and policy-makers move closer to a patient-centered model of risk prevention in advanced liver disease.

Methodology

This article uses an integrative text-based review methodology grounded exclusively in the references supplied by the user. The methodological choice follows directly from the structure of the evidence base. The provided references are not drawn from a single disease subfield or one narrowly standardized research tradition. Instead, they span historical infection-control texts, global guidelines, observational hospital studies, implementation science, epidemiological analyses, hepatology reviews, pulmonary hypertension studies, echocardiographic investigations, and conceptual patient-safety literature. Because of this heterogeneity, a formal quantitative meta-analysis would not be methodologically appropriate. The studies differ in population, outcome type, context, design, and analytic purpose. An integrative review is therefore better suited because it allows the synthesis of conceptually related but methodologically diverse sources into a clinically meaningful framework.

The methodological orientation of this article is interpretive, comparative, and theory-building. It is interpretive because it seeks to derive patterns of meaning from the supplied literature rather than statistically aggregate effect sizes. It is comparative because it places different research traditions into dialogue, especially hepatology and infection prevention. It is theory-building because it aims to generate a coherent conceptual model for integrated cirrhosis safety care rather than merely list existing findings in sequence. The article does not claim to produce new causal estimates. Instead, it builds a structured argument from the convergence of published observations, guidelines, and clinical analyses.

The first step in the methodology involved categorizing the literature into analytically coherent domains. Four domains emerged from close reading. The first domain included studies on the epidemiology and natural history of cirrhosis, fibrosis progression, and hepatic disease course, such as Melato and Mucli (1989), Poynard et al. (1997), Bellentani et al. (1999), Ganem and Prince (2004), and Naveau et al. (2005). These studies collectively establish that cirrhosis is progressive, heterogeneous, and clinically consequential beyond hepatic histology. The second domain included studies on pulmonary and hemodynamic complications in cirrhosis, especially portopulmonary hypertension, hepatopulmonary syndrome distinctions, hyperdynamic circulation, echocardiographic abnormalities, and related hemodynamic indicators, such as Krowka (1997), Castro et al. (1996), Benjaminov et al. (2003), Iwakiri and Groszmann (2006), Golbin and Krowka (2007), Saleemi (2010), Chen et al. (2013), Balde et al. (2016), Gurghean and Tudor (2017), and Kawata et al. (2022). The third domain included core hand hygiene science, infection prevention guidelines, and compliance studies, such as Labarraque (1829), Rotter (1997), Boyce et al. (2002), Pittet et al. (2000), Hugonnet et al. (2002), Trampuz and Widmer (2004), WHO (2009), Kampf et al. (2009), Mathur (2011), Smith (2009), Gammon and Hunt (2018), and Hoffmann et al. (2020). The fourth domain included patient-safety campaigns and institutional strategy, such as Allegranzi et al. (2007), Kilpatrick et al. (2009), Magiorakos et al. (2009), Sendlhofer et al. (2015), Von Lengerke et al. (2017), and Saito et al. (2018).

The second methodological step was to identify the clinical problem that could legitimately connect these domains without forcing artificial coherence. The common thread selected was hospital safety in patients with advanced or clinically significant cirrhosis. This problem was chosen because the cirrhosis literature emphasizes systemic vulnerability and pulmonary complications, while the hand hygiene literature emphasizes preventable harm in clinical contact environments. The integration is clinically plausible because cirrhotic patients frequently undergo repeated examination, hospitalization, and invasive care, making infection prevention and cardiopulmonary vigilance relevant simultaneously. The methodology thus rests on a patient-centered integration rather than a topic-centered juxtaposition.

The third step involved thematic extraction. For each reference, the main substantive contribution was identified and assigned to one or more recurring themes: disease progression, decompensation severity, portal hemodynamics, pulmonary vascular risk, echocardiographic detection, hand hygiene effectiveness, compliance barriers, institutional strategy, campaign-based improvement, or risk management implementation. The goal was not to summarize each paper individually in isolation, but to extract concepts that could be synthesized across literatures. For example, Iwakiri and Groszmann (2006) were used not merely as a hepatology citation, but as a conceptual source for understanding how systemic circulation in cirrhosis differs from normal physiology. Similarly, WHO (2009) was used not merely as a guideline citation, but as a source for the logic of multimodal hand hygiene improvement as a systems intervention.

The fourth methodological step involved cross-domain synthesis. This is the distinguishing feature of the article. Rather than present the hand hygiene literature first and the cirrhosis literature second, the analysis asked how insights from each domain modified the meaning of the other. For instance, the observation that hand hygiene compliance remains imperfect even in high-risk settings (Hoffmann et al., 2020; Von Lengerke et al., 2017) gains added significance when viewed in relation to populations with advanced cirrhosis and cardiopulmonary compromise. Likewise, the clinical seriousness of portopulmonary hypertension and hemodynamic abnormalities becomes more operationally relevant when placed within broader patient-safety thinking, where early detection and structured surveillance are core principles. This cross-domain

synthesis allowed the article to move beyond parallel review into integrated argument.

The methodology also used a principle of interpretive hierarchy. Sources were not treated as equivalent in evidentiary purpose. Formal guidelines such as Boyce et al. (2002) and WHO (2009) were used to establish standard-of-care principles for hand hygiene. Observational and implementation studies such as Pittet et al. (2000), Hugonnet et al. (2002), Hoffmann et al. (2020), and Von Lengerke et al. (2017) were used to discuss real-world compliance patterns and improvement challenges. Hepatology reviews and disease-course papers such as Ganem and Prince (2004), Iwakiri and Groszmann (2006), and Golbin and Krowka (2007) were used for pathophysiological interpretation, while clinical observational studies such as Castro et al. (1996), Benjaminov et al. (2003), Chen et al. (2013), and Balde et al. (2016) were used to ground the discussion of specific complications in patient data. Historical texts such as Labarraque (1829) and Rotter (1997) were used to situate the long-standing recognition of hand-borne transmission within a modern safety context.

An important methodological decision was to treat the article as a theoretical clinical review rather than a narrow systematic review. This decision was necessary because the reference list includes topics that no strict systematic-review protocol would ordinarily combine unless a highly specific a priori question had already been established. However, the user requested a full original research article based strictly on the references. The most academically defensible way to satisfy that request while respecting the reference set was to produce an integrative review article with a clinically original framing. The originality of the article therefore lies in its synthesis and argument, not in new experimental data.

The article also adopts textual caution where the evidence is indirect. For example, the supplied literature strongly supports the independent importance of hand hygiene and of pulmonary complications in cirrhosis, but it does not include a direct interventional trial on hand hygiene specifically in cirrhotic patients with portopulmonary hypertension. Therefore, the article does not claim a direct experimentally established relationship between those precise variables. Instead, it argues that an integrated care model is justified by converging evidence on vulnerability, hospital exposure, preventable infection risk, and the need for structured surveillance. This distinction preserves scholarly integrity.

The analytical lens used in the results and discussion sections is influenced by patient-safety theory, even though no single standalone patient-safety model is imposed from outside the provided literature. This lens emerges organically from sources such as Allegranzi et al. (2007), Sendlhofer et al. (2015), and WHO (2009), which emphasize system-level implementation, risk management, and culture change. It also emerges from cirrhosis studies that show how delayed recognition of cardiopulmonary abnormalities can have major clinical implications. The resulting methodological stance is that patient safety should be understood not merely as prevention of procedural error, but as the intentional integration of preventive hygiene, physiologic awareness, and institutional reliability.

The methodology has several strengths. It allows historically grounded infection-control science to be meaningfully connected with contemporary hepatology. It privileges patient-centered coherence over disciplinary fragmentation. It is flexible enough to incorporate guideline literature, observational findings, and conceptual analysis without flattening their differences. Most importantly, it enables the development of a clinically useful framework from literature that might otherwise remain compartmentalized.

At the same time, the methodology has limitations that must be stated clearly. First, the article is restricted to the user-provided references and does not claim completeness beyond them. Second, because the literature spans different topics, not every source contributes equally to the central argument. Third, the integration is interpretive rather than statistical, and alternative syntheses would be possible. Fourth, a few references, such as Hassan et al. (2019) and McMichael (2019), are more peripheral to the core cirrhosis-hand hygiene axis, though they still inform broader thinking about respiratory vulnerability and hygiene environments. Fifth, the absence of primary studies directly linking hand hygiene interventions to cirrhosis-specific outcomes means that some parts of the article appropriately remain conceptual and strategic rather than empirically conclusive.

Despite these limitations, the methodology is well suited to the article's purpose. It provides a rigorous and transparent way to construct a clinically meaningful narrative from the reference base while remaining faithful to the instruction to use only the supplied sources.

Results

The integrative analysis produced several major findings. These findings did not emerge as isolated observations but as a layered understanding of how cirrhosis progression, pulmonary vascular complications, infection prevention, and institutional patient safety intersect in hospital care.

The first major finding is that cirrhosis should be understood as a progressive systemic disease rather than a liver-confined diagnosis. The natural history literature consistently shows that cirrhosis reflects cumulative and dynamic pathology. Poynard et al. (1997) demonstrated that fibrosis progression in chronic hepatitis C follows a

recognizable trajectory with significant clinical consequences. Bellentani et al. (1999) showed that hepatitis C-related liver disease in the general population is shaped by identifiable risk factors and can evolve toward advanced disease states. Ganem and Prince (2004) similarly emphasized that hepatitis B infection carries serious long-term consequences, including chronic liver damage and cirrhosis. Naveau et al. (2005) discussed cirrhosis as a condition whose epidemiology and natural history are deeply relevant to prognosis and care planning. Together these studies establish that cirrhosis is not merely an endpoint label. It is a long-evolving syndrome with important systemic expressions.

This broader understanding matters because once cirrhosis is seen as systemic rather than local, it becomes easier to recognize why patient-safety measures that are often presented generically may have heightened relevance in this group. The result of the literature synthesis is that cirrhosis should not be conceptualized only in terms of fibrosis severity, but in terms of accumulated physiologic fragility. That fragility increases exposure to harm from both endogenous progression and exogenous healthcare-related risks.

The second major finding is that pulmonary vascular and hemodynamic complications are clinically significant in cirrhosis and deserve a more central place in hospital surveillance. Krowka (1997) highlighted the need to distinguish hepatopulmonary syndrome from portopulmonary hypertension, underscoring that pulmonary abnormalities in cirrhosis require diagnostic precision rather than generic attribution of breathlessness to advanced disease. Earlier observations by Hoffbauer and Rydell (1956) and Naeye (1960) showed that portal and hepatic disease may coexist with pulmonary vascular pathology. Castro et al. (1996) reported increased pulmonary artery pressures in liver transplant patients, emphasizing the clinical implications of these abnormalities in a population already undergoing high-stakes evaluation. Benjaminov et al. (2003) found portopulmonary hypertension in decompensated cirrhosis with refractory ascites, making clear that decompensated disease is not only a hepatic issue but also a cardiopulmonary one. Chen et al. (2013), Gurghean and Tudor (2017), and Saleemi (2010) all reinforced the relevance of pulmonary hypertension in cirrhotic populations.

The collective result is that pulmonary complications are not rare curiosities in cirrhosis literature. They are sufficiently recurrent and clinically important to justify structured vigilance. The studies suggest that symptoms may be subtle, that diagnostic underrecognition is possible, and that screening considerations become more pressing in advanced disease and transplantation contexts. This is particularly important because some manifestations of cirrhosis, such as fatigue, reduced exercise tolerance, fluid retention, and dyspnea, may overlap with the symptoms of cardiopulmonary complications, potentially delaying recognition if clinicians rely on nonspecific impressions alone.

The third major finding is that hyperdynamic circulation provides a crucial explanatory bridge for understanding why cirrhosis should be approached as a disease of altered systemic physiology. Iwakiri and Groszmann (2006) described the hyperdynamic circulation of chronic liver disease in a way that connects clinical findings to deeper pathophysiological processes. This literature shows that the hemodynamic state of cirrhosis is characterized by abnormalities that extend beyond portal pressure alone. The body's circulatory adaptation to chronic liver disease has consequences for vascular tone, cardiac workload, and hemodynamic interpretation. The result of this synthesis is that clinicians should understand pulmonary vascular findings in cirrhosis within a larger matrix of circulatory alteration rather than as isolated events.

The fourth major finding is that echocardiographic abnormalities and hemodynamic markers may help identify risk or severity in cirrhosis. Balde et al. (2016) reported echocardiographic abnormalities in cirrhosis and correlated them with Child-Pugh severity, suggesting that disease progression is reflected in measurable cardiovascular changes. Gurghean and Tudor (2017) added evidence from echographic study of pulmonary hypertension in hepatic cirrhosis and portal hypertension. Kawata et al. (2022), although not specific to cirrhosis alone, showed that inferior vena cava diameter and respiratory variation are influenced by hemodynamic factors and can be interpreted in relation to broader circulatory data. When these sources are read together, they indicate that structured noninvasive assessment can contribute meaningfully to the clinical understanding of the cirrhotic patient's cardiopulmonary status.

This does not mean that every cirrhotic patient requires identical surveillance intensity. Rather, the result is a stage-sensitive implication: patients with advanced disease, refractory ascites, transplant candidacy, unexplained dyspnea, or signs of decompensation may particularly benefit from deliberate cardiopulmonary evaluation. The literature thereby supports a more proactive posture rather than a reactive one.

The fifth major finding is that hand hygiene remains the foundational infection-prevention measure across healthcare settings, and its importance has been repeatedly established over time. The historical arc begins with early disinfection thinking in Labarraque (1829) and continues through the inherited legacy of Semmelweis described by Rotter (1997). Modern infection control consolidated this legacy into robust recommendations. Boyce et al. (2002) provided a major guideline framework for hand hygiene in healthcare settings, and WHO (2009) elevated hand hygiene to a

global patient-safety priority. Kampf et al. (2009) reaffirmed its importance for preventing nosocomial infections. Trampuz and Widmer (2004) described hand hygiene as a frequently missed lifesaving opportunity during patient care. Mathur (2011) further emphasized that hand hygiene remains the basic core of infection control despite all advances in modern medicine.

The result here is not merely that hand hygiene is useful. Rather, the literature strongly supports the conclusion that hand hygiene is indispensable and remains central even in technologically advanced hospital environments. The basicness of hand hygiene should not be mistaken for simplicity of implementation. In fact, the literature suggests the opposite: precisely because hand hygiene is ubiquitous and routine, consistent compliance is difficult to sustain without culture, monitoring, and systems design.

The sixth major finding is that compliance with hand hygiene is often suboptimal, even in settings where the stakes are high. Pittet et al. (2000) showed that a hospital-wide program could improve compliance, implying that baseline behavior left room for significant improvement. Hugonnet et al. (2002) demonstrated that alcohol-based hand rub improved compliance in intensive care units, again indicating that implementation strategy affects actual behavior. Hoffmann et al. (2020) observed hand hygiene compliance in ICUs and reinforced that compliance remains an active challenge rather than a solved problem. Smith (2009), Gammon and Hunt (2018), and Von Lengerke et al. (2017) all indicate that technique, promotion, and practical barriers matter in real-world settings.

The implication of this finding becomes sharper when read against cirrhosis care. If compliance gaps exist in high-acuity areas, then vulnerable patients such as those with advanced liver disease are inevitably exposed to preventable risk. The literature does not need to contain a cirrhosis-specific hand hygiene trial for this conclusion to matter. The universal importance of clean hands acquires heightened urgency when applied to a clinically fragile population.

The seventh major finding is that hand hygiene improvement requires multimodal and institutional approaches, not simple exhortation. WHO (2009) and the Guide to Implementing the WHO Multimodal Hand Hygiene Improvement Strategy explicitly frame hand hygiene as a systems challenge. Allegranzi et al. (2007) described the first global patient-safety challenge and its progress, showing that large-scale change requires coordinated effort. Kilpatrick et al. (2009) emphasized the global impact of hand hygiene campaigning. Magiorakos et al. (2009) documented national hand hygiene campaigns in Europe, suggesting that culture change can be pursued at scale. Saito et al. (2018) linked a WHO campaign specifically to sepsis targets, underscoring the continuing relevance of clean hands in severe illness prevention. Sendlhofer et al. (2015) demonstrated that systematic implementation of clinical risk management influences hospital function, reinforcing the idea that safety requires organizational architecture rather than isolated reminders.

The result of this body of literature is that infection prevention should be viewed as an institutional competency. Compliance cannot depend solely on individual goodwill. It depends on accessibility of hand rub, leadership, audit, feedback, education, workflow design, and safety culture. For cirrhosis care, this finding suggests that hepatology units, transplant programs, medical wards, and intensive care services should not assume that general hospital campaigns are sufficient. They may require local reinforcement for high-risk populations.

The eighth major finding is that the neglect of seemingly minor practical details can undermine infection prevention. Gammon and Hunt (2018) focused on hand drying, an issue sometimes overlooked in discussions that concentrate only on washing or alcohol rub use. Noble (1975) examined dispersal of skin microorganisms, reminding readers that the biology of contamination is practical and physical. Smith (2009) reviewed hand-washing techniques in community and primary care settings, further showing that implementation includes method and context, not merely intention. These findings indicate that effective hygiene is not a symbolic ritual but a concrete procedural act whose details matter. For patients with advanced liver disease, such details may have disproportionate significance because their margin for tolerating additional complications is small.

The ninth major finding is that the literature supports an integrated patient-safety interpretation of cirrhosis care. This is the central synthetic result of the article. On one side, cirrhosis progression leads to decompensation, altered hemodynamics, refractory ascites, echocardiographic changes, and pulmonary vascular complications that require timely recognition (Benjaminov et al., 2003; Iwakiri & Groszmann, 2006; Balde et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2013). On the other side, healthcare-associated infections remain preventable in part through rigorous hand hygiene, yet compliance is inconsistent without structured institutional effort (Boyce et al., 2002; WHO, 2009; Hoffmann et al., 2020). The synthesis of these domains suggests that patients with cirrhosis occupy a zone of concentrated vulnerability where infection prevention and cardiopulmonary surveillance should be jointly prioritized.

The tenth major finding is that hospital contact itself should be understood as a risk amplifier in cirrhosis. Many of the provided cirrhosis studies concern patients with advanced disease, transplantation evaluation, or

decompensation. Such patients inevitably interact repeatedly with healthcare environments. Every episode of admission, monitoring, procedural intervention, or intensive care exposure creates opportunities for both benefit and harm. The hand hygiene literature teaches that contact without compliance can transmit danger, while the cirrhosis literature teaches that delay in recognizing hemodynamic or pulmonary deterioration can worsen prognosis. Therefore, the hospital encounter in cirrhosis should be treated as a crucial site of risk management, not simply treatment delivery.

An eleventh finding concerns the importance of stage-specific vigilance. The literature on decompensated cirrhosis, refractory ascites, transplant evaluation, and severity correlations suggests that not all patients with cirrhosis carry identical cardiopulmonary risk (Benjaminov et al., 2003; Castro et al., 1996; Balde et al., 2016). At the same time, hand hygiene remains universally necessary. The synthesis therefore yields a two-tier logic: hygiene expectations are universal, but cardiopulmonary assessment may need to intensify according to disease severity and clinical context. This allows a nuanced framework rather than a one-size-fits-all model.

The twelfth and final major finding is that the literature implicitly argues for a broader redefinition of excellence in cirrhosis care. Excellence is not only accurate diagnosis or advanced hepatology therapeutics. It is also clean contact, vigilant observation, timely detection of complications, reliable institutional processes, and coordination across specialties. The integrative evidence supports the conclusion that safe management of cirrhosis requires both microscopic attention to hands and macroscopic attention to systems.

Discussion

The findings of this review invite a substantial rethinking of how cirrhosis should be managed in hospital and high-contact clinical settings. The most important implication is conceptual: cirrhosis care should no longer be understood solely as the management of hepatic insufficiency, portal pressure, and etiologic disease. It should also be understood as a patient-safety domain where infection prevention and cardiopulmonary vigilance are inseparable from specialty treatment. This perspective is not an abstract layering of topics. It arises directly from the supplied literature. The hepatology references show that cirrhosis is progressive, systemically disruptive, and associated with pulmonary vascular complications. The hand hygiene references show that healthcare-related transmission remains a serious and preventable risk, but one that requires constant institutional reinforcement. When these insights are placed together, a new clinical logic becomes visible.

A first discussion point concerns the nature of vulnerability in cirrhosis. Vulnerability is often discussed in purely biochemical terms, for example reduced hepatic synthetic function, portal hypertension, or decompensated ascites. Those are undeniably central, but they do not fully capture the patient's risk landscape. The patient with cirrhosis is vulnerable because multiple protective reserves are diminished simultaneously. Hemodynamics are altered, the cardiopulmonary burden may be rising, clinical reserve is reduced, and repeated healthcare exposure becomes more likely. Such patients are not simply sicker; they are more exposed to the consequences of system failure. This is why lapses that might be tolerated in healthier populations can become far more consequential in advanced liver disease.

The literature on hyperdynamic circulation is particularly valuable in expanding this understanding. Iwakiri and Groszmann (2006) remind us that chronic liver disease transforms systemic circulatory behavior. This transformation complicates clinical interpretation. Symptoms such as dyspnea, fatigue, exercise intolerance, or edema cannot always be assigned simplistically to hepatic disease progression alone. They may also reflect pulmonary vascular changes, altered preload, or other hemodynamic disturbances. Balde et al. (2016), Gurghean and Tudor (2017), and Kawata et al. (2022) further suggest that structured cardiovascular assessment can reveal meaningful patterns. Thus, one implication of the present review is that safe cirrhosis care should incorporate greater sensitivity to subtle cardiopulmonary signals rather than waiting for dramatic decompensation.

A second discussion point concerns the significance of portopulmonary hypertension in clinical reasoning. Portopulmonary hypertension is sometimes treated as a specialized diagnostic category relevant primarily to transplant candidates or advanced hepatology practice. The reviewed literature supports a broader concern. Krowka (1997), Golbin and Krowka (2007), Saleemi (2010), Benjaminov et al. (2003), and Chen et al. (2013) all indicate that pulmonary hypertension in cirrhosis is clinically meaningful, potentially underrecognized, and connected with severe disease states. This means that hospital teams managing cirrhosis should be alert to cardiopulmonary complication patterns even outside highly specialized centers. The issue is not that every ward physician must become a pulmonary hypertension expert, but that the threshold for considering pulmonary vascular pathology should be appropriately lower in cirrhotic patients with compatible symptoms or hemodynamic clues.

A third discussion point is that infection prevention is not a separate administrative layer added on top of clinical care; it is part of clinical care itself. This may sound obvious, but hospital culture often behaves as if infection control is a support service rather than a core therapeutic responsibility. The hand hygiene literature directly challenges this separation. Boyce et al. (2002), WHO

(2009), and Kampf et al. (2009) position hand hygiene as a central determinant of nosocomial infection prevention. Trampuz and Widmer (2004) explicitly describe missed hand hygiene as a missed lifesaving opportunity. When applied to cirrhosis, the point becomes even sharper. A fragile patient does not experience "specialty care" and "infection prevention" as separate realities. The patient experiences one continuum of contact. Therefore, the clean hand of the clinician is not a peripheral compliance metric; it is part of the therapeutic environment.

A fourth discussion point concerns the recurring gap between knowledge and compliance. Few areas in medicine are supported by such longstanding consensus as hand hygiene. From historical roots in Labarraque (1829) through the Semmelweis legacy reviewed by Rotter (1997), to modern WHO campaigns, the principle is settled. Yet compliance remains inconsistent. This discrepancy reveals that the problem is not ignorance alone. It is behavioral, institutional, cultural, and logistical. Pittet et al. (2000) and Hugonnet et al. (2002) demonstrated that behavior can improve with systematic programs and alcohol-based hand rub availability. Hoffmann et al. (2020) and Von Lengerke et al. (2017) show that the challenge persists. The discussion implication is that cirrhosis units and services should not assume that because guidelines exist, actual protection exists. Compliance must be designed, monitored, and re-earned continuously.

A fifth important implication concerns how patient populations are prioritized in infection-prevention strategy. Hand hygiene campaigns are correctly universal, but universality can sometimes create practical sameness where strategic differentiation is needed. All patients deserve safe hands. However, some patients face layered consequences from any lapse. The current synthesis argues that advanced cirrhosis is one such context. These patients may have repeated admissions, intensive interactions, procedural exposure, and less ability to withstand complications. An institution that wishes to take risk stratification seriously could reasonably identify cirrhotic patients, especially decompensated or transplant-evaluated patients, as a subgroup for intensified hygiene vigilance and multidisciplinary coordination. This does not reduce standards elsewhere; it sharpens them where compounded vulnerability is highest.

A sixth discussion point concerns the often-overlooked practicality of hygiene implementation. The literature by Smith (2009), Gammon and Hunt (2018), and Noble (1975) shows that hand hygiene is not only about whether cleansing occurs, but how it occurs. Technique, drying, contamination dispersal, and workflow all matter. This insight has philosophical as well as practical value. Medicine frequently privileges dramatic interventions over everyday precision. Yet preventable harm often arises from ordinary failures. The current review suggests that excellence in cirrhosis care may depend as much on the reliability of routine hygiene and observation as on advanced pharmacologic or procedural expertise. In other words, the mundane is clinically profound.

A seventh discussion point concerns risk management and institutional responsibility. Sendlhofer et al. (2015) demonstrate that systematic clinical risk management affects hospital performance. Allegranzi et al. (2007), Kilpatrick et al. (2009), Magiorakos et al. (2009), and Saito et al. (2018) show that campaign-based improvement can build a safety culture that matters globally. These sources collectively support the idea that safe care is produced by organized systems, not isolated intentions. When applied to cirrhosis, this means hospitals should consider whether their current structures sufficiently connect hepatology, nursing practice, infection prevention, echocardiographic assessment, transplant pathways, and ward-level risk recognition. A patient with cirrhosis may move through several units; if responsibility is too fragmented, key risks may fall between teams.

An eighth implication concerns the epistemic problem of symptom interpretation in cirrhosis. Because cirrhosis is a multisystem disease, many symptoms are easy to normalize. Shortness of breath may be attributed to ascites or deconditioning. Fatigue may be ascribed to chronic disease generally. Peripheral findings may be read through a liver-first lens. However, the pulmonary hypertension and echocardiographic literature warns against this simplification (Castro et al., 1996; Benjaminov et al., 2003; Balde et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2013). The discussion implication is that the clinical team should maintain a disciplined suspicion for cardiopulmonary involvement rather than collapsing all manifestations into "advanced cirrhosis." This is particularly important because some complications may affect transplant decisions, therapeutic strategy, and prognosis.

A ninth discussion point is that public health and bedside medicine are more connected than they often appear. The hand hygiene literature includes global campaigns, national programs, and WHO strategies (Allegranzi et al., 2007; Magiorakos et al., 2009; WHO, 2009). The cirrhosis literature includes epidemiology and population-level disease progression (Bellentani et al., 1999; Ganem & Prince, 2004; Naveau et al., 2005). Together they illustrate that patient outcomes are shaped by both biological disease burden and institutional-public health frameworks. The bedside patient with cirrhosis carries within one body the accumulated effects of viral epidemiology, chronic disease progression, hospital practice, and safety culture. This insight argues against reductionism. Better cirrhosis outcomes require both clinical sophistication and public health reliability.

A tenth discussion point concerns the possible role of

repeated healthcare contact as a turning point in disease trajectory. The literature provided does not directly quantify this in cirrhosis-specific infection terms, so caution is necessary. However, it is reasonable to infer that repeated exposure to healthcare settings, especially during advanced disease, increases the relevance of hand hygiene and surveillance quality. The patient who returns often to wards, clinics, procedure areas, or intensive care is repeatedly entrusted to the system. That system must therefore be designed not merely to treat the liver, but to minimize avoidable exposure to infectious risk and to identify deterioration promptly.

An eleventh discussion point is the importance of integrating specialty-specific and system-wide metrics. Cirrhosis care often tracks laboratory values, Child-Pugh class, transplant eligibility, or etiology-specific treatment milestones. Infection-prevention teams track compliance percentages, hand-rub utilization, and campaign performance. Cardiopulmonary assessment may be reported in echocardiographic terms. Yet the patient's true safety depends on the conjunction of these domains. A future-ready hospital would not treat them as disconnected dashboards. Instead, it would understand that a patient with severe cirrhosis and frequent clinical contact is an institutional signal for elevated integrated risk. This article therefore suggests a conceptual shift from siloed measurement to linked surveillance.

A twelfth discussion point concerns the place of hepatology in broader patient-safety thinking. Specialty medicine sometimes assumes that safety is adequately handled by general hospital policy. However, disease-specific populations often have distinctive safety profiles. Cirrhosis is one example because its patients are medically complex, physiologically unstable, and often recurrently exposed to care environments. The findings of this review support the idea that hepatology services and liver units should actively participate in infection-prevention design rather than passively inherit hospital-wide policies. They should ask whether staff education, workflow, bedside reminder systems, and monitoring practices are optimized for patients whose risk tolerance is especially low.

The review also has implications for training. Clinicians caring for cirrhotic patients may benefit from being trained to recognize that infection prevention and cardiopulmonary vigilance are not separate competencies delegated to different teams. Nursing staff, ward physicians, intensivists, hepatologists, and risk managers should all recognize the dual priorities. Training can help prevent the common fragmentation in which one team assumes another is addressing the relevant risk. The literature on multimodal strategy strongly supports such cross-functional implementation logic (WHO, 2009; Allegranzi et al., 2007).

At the same time, the article must acknowledge its interpretive limits. First, the reference list includes no direct prospective study measuring hand hygiene intervention outcomes specifically in cirrhotic patients with pulmonary complications. Therefore, the integrated framework advanced here is strongly plausible and clinically useful, but not directly trial-proven in that exact configuration. Second, the hepatology references vary in era and scope. Some are early observational reports, others are reviews, and others focus on specific populations such as transplant candidates or decompensated patients. Third, the hand hygiene literature is general to healthcare settings and not tailored to liver wards alone. These limits mean that the article's conclusions should be understood as a theoretically grounded clinical synthesis rather than a definitive evidence statement on every proposed linkage.

These limitations also generate future research priorities. One important direction is prospective research examining infection-prevention outcomes specifically in hospitalized cirrhosis populations. Another is clinical pathway research that integrates routine hand hygiene audit with severity-stratified cardiopulmonary screening for cirrhosis. Studies could examine whether dedicated safety bundles for cirrhotic inpatients reduce complication rates, length of stay, or escalation to intensive care. Further work might also explore how transplant programs incorporate or fail to incorporate ward-level hygiene reliability into broader safety culture. In addition, more studies are needed on the threshold and frequency of echocardiographic or pulmonary vascular assessment in different cirrhosis severity groups.

A final broader implication concerns the philosophy of medical care. The modern hospital often values what is advanced, specialized, and technologically visible. Yet the supplied literature collectively suggests that outcomes are also shaped by what is basic, repeated, and organizationally disciplined. Clean hands and careful listening for dyspnea may save as much as sophisticated interventions, especially when practiced early and consistently. The true lesson of the literature, therefore, is not only that cirrhosis is dangerous or that hand hygiene matters. It is that vulnerable patients are safest when medicine honors both complexity and simplicity at once.

Conclusion

The literature reviewed in this article supports a clear and clinically important conclusion: hospitalized and high-contact patients with liver cirrhosis should be managed within an explicitly integrated safety framework that combines rigorous hand hygiene with structured awareness of pulmonary vascular and hemodynamic complications. Cirrhosis is not merely progressive liver scarring. It is a systemic condition shaped by chronic disease evolution, portal hypertension, altered circulation, and potential cardiopulmonary compromise

(Poynard et al., 1997; Bellentani et al., 1999; Iwakiri & Groszmann, 2006; Golbin & Krowka, 2007). At the same time, hand hygiene remains the most fundamental and evidence-supported intervention for preventing healthcare-associated infection, yet implementation gaps persist in real clinical environments (Boyce et al., 2002; Pittet et al., 2000; WHO, 2009; Hoffmann et al., 2020).

The central contribution of this article is to bring these bodies of literature together around the real-world patient. The patient with cirrhosis often moves repeatedly through wards, procedural settings, clinics, and intensive care environments. That patient may simultaneously face risk from infection exposure, underrecognized pulmonary hypertension, echocardiographic abnormalities, and decompensated hemodynamics. Treating these risks as separate institutional concerns fragments care. A more mature model of clinical excellence treats them as interconnected aspects of vulnerability.

Accordingly, the article argues for a redefinition of safe cirrhosis care. Such care should include universal adherence to hand hygiene standards, multimodal institutional support for compliance, and deliberate cardiopulmonary assessment in patients with advanced disease, unexplained respiratory symptoms, refractory ascites, or transplant consideration. It should also include risk management structures that do not isolate hepatology from infection-prevention practice.

In practical terms, the message is simple but demanding: patients with cirrhosis need more than disease treatment; they need reliable systems. Those systems must ensure that every contact is clean, every symptom is interpreted carefully, and every stage of disease is approached with anticipatory vigilance rather than reactive rescue. When hand hygiene culture and cardiopulmonary awareness are combined, the hospital moves closer to a model of care that is not only technically competent but genuinely safe for one of medicine's most fragile patient populations.

References

1. Allegranzi B, Storr J, Dziekan G, et al. The first global patient safety challenge "clean care is safer care": from launch to current progress and achievements. J Hosp Infect 2007;65(Suppl 2):115–123. DOI: 10.1016/S0195-6701(07)60027-9.

2. Balde J, Rao NK, Ballala K, et al. Echocardiographic abnormalities in cirrhosis & their correlation with severity of cirrhosis using Child-Pugh score among patients in a tertiary care hospital. Indian J Med Res 2016;144:935–937. DOI: 10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_1486_15.

3. Bellentani S, Pozzato G, Saccoccio G, et al. Clinical course and risk factors of hepatitis C virus related liver disease in the general population: report from the Dionysos study. Gut 1999;44:874–880. DOI: 10.1136/gut.44.6.874.

4. Benjaminov FS, Prentice M, Sniderman KW, et al. Portopulmonary hypertension in decompensated cirrhosis with refractory ascites. Gut 2003;52:1355–1362. DOI: 10.1136/gut.52.9.1355.

5. Boyce JM, Pittet D, Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee, et al. Guideline for hand hygiene in health-care settings. Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA hand hygiene task force. MMWR Recomm Rep 2002;51:1–45.

6. Castro M, Krowka MJ, Schroeder DR, et al. Frequency and clinical implications of increased pulmonary artery pressures in liver transplant patients. Mayo Clin Proc 1996;71:543–551. DOI: 10.4065/71.6543.

7. Chen HS, Xing SR, Xu WG, et al. Portopulmonary hypertension in cirrhotic patients: prevalence, clinical features and risk factors. Exp Ther Med 2013;5(3):819–824. DOI: 10.3892/etm.2013.918.

8. Gammon J, Hunt J. The neglected element of hand hygiene—significance of hand drying, efficiency of different methods and clinical implication: a review. J Infect Prev 2018;20(2):66–74. DOI: 10.1177/1757177418815549.

9. Ganem D, Prince AM. Hepatitis B virus infection—natural history and clinical consequences. N Engl J Med 2004;350:1118–1129. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra031087.

10. Golbin JM, Krowka MJ. Portopulmonary hypertension. Clin Chest Med 2007;28:203–218. DOI: 10.1016/j.ccm.2006.11.004.

11. Guide to Implementing the WHO Multimodal Hand Hygiene Improvement Strategy.

12. Gurghean AV, Tudor IA. Pulmonary hypertension in patients with hepatic cirrhosis and portal hypertension. An echographic study. Clujul Med 2017;90:161–165. DOI: 10.15386/cjmed-705.

13. Hassan MZ, Chowdhury MAB, Hassan I, et al. Respiratory viral infection in early life and development of asthma in childhood: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore) 2019;98(18):e15419. DOI: 10.1097/MD.0000000000015419.

14. Hoffbauer FW, Rydell R. Multiple pulmonary arteriovenous fistulas in juvenile cirrhosis. Am J Med

1956;21:450–460. DOI: 10.1016/0002-9343(56)90043-2.

15. Hoffmann M, Sendlhofer G, Gombotz V, et al. Hand hygiene compliance in intensive care units: an observational study. Int J Nurs Pract 2020;26(2):e12789. DOI: 10.1111/ijn.12789.

16. Hugonnet S, Perneger TV, Pittet D. Alcohol-based hand rub improves compliance with hand hygiene in intensive care units. Arch Intern Med 2002;162(9):1037–1043. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.162.9.1037.

17. Iwakiri Y, Groszmann RJ. The hyperdynamic circulation of chronic liver diseases: from the patient to the molecule. Hepatology 2006;43:S121–S131. DOI: 10.1002/hep.20993.

18. Kampf G, Löffler H, Gastmeier P. Hand hygiene for the prevention of nosocomial infections. Dtsch Arztebl Int 2009;106(40):649–655. DOI: 10.3238/arztebl.2009.0649.

19. Kawata T, Daimon M, Nakanishi K, et al. Factors influencing inferior vena cava diameter and its respiratory variation: simultaneous comparison with hemodynamic data. J Cardiol 2022;79:642–647. DOI: 10.1016/j.jjcc.2021.11.022.

20. Kilpatrick C, Allegranzi B, Pittet D. The global impact of hand hygiene campaigning. Euro Surveill 2009;14:1–2.

21. Krowka MJ. Hepatopulmonary syndrome versus portopulmonary hypertension: distinctions and dilemmas. Hepatology 1997;25:1282–1284. DOI: 10.1002/hep.510250540.

22. Labarraque AG. Instructions and observations concerning the use of the chlorides of soda and lime. In: Porter J, editor. New Haven, CT: Baldwin and Treadway; 1829.

23. Larson E. A causal link between handwashing and risk of infection? Examination of the evidence. Infect Control 1988;9:28–36.

24. Magiorakos AP, Suetens C, Boyd L, et al. National hand hygiene campaigns in Europe, 2000–2009. Euro Surveill 2009;14:19190.

25. Mathur P. Hand hygiene: back to the basics of infection control. Indian J Med Res 2011;134(5):611–620. DOI: 10.4103/0971-5916.90985.

26. McMichael C. Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in schools in low-income countries: a review of evidence of impact. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2019;16(3):359. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph16030359.

27. Melato M, Mucli E. Something new in liver cirrhosis epidemiology. Lancet 1989;2:395–396. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(89)90578-3.

28. Naeye RL. Primary pulmonary hypertension with coexisting portal hypertension. A retrospective study of six cases. Circulation 1960;22:376–384. DOI: 10.1161/01.CIR.22.3.376.

29. Naveau S, Perlemuter G, Balian A. Epidemiology and natural history of cirrhosis. Rev Prat 2005;55:1527–1532.

30. Noble WC. Dispersal of skin microorganisms. Br J Dermatol 1975;93:477–485. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2133.1975.tb06527.x.

31. Pitet D, Hugonnet S, Harbarth S, et al. Effectiveness of a hospital-wide program to improve compliance with hand hygiene. Lancet 2000;356:1307–1312. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02814-2.

32. Poynard T, Bedossa P, Opolon P. Natural history of liver fibrosis progression in patients with chronic hepatitis C. Lancet 1997;349:825–832. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(96)07642-8.

33. Rotter ML. 150 years of hand disinfection—Semmelweis' heritage. Hyg Med 1997;22:332–339.

34. Saito H, Kilpatrick C, Pittet D. The 2018 World Health Organization save lives: clean your hands campaign targets sepsis in health care. Intensive Care Med 2018;44:499–501. DOI: 10.1007/s00134-018-5097-9.

35. Saleemi S. Portopulmonary hypertension. Ann Thorac Med 2010;5(1):5–9. DOI: 10.4103/1817-1737.58953.

36. Sendlhofer G, Brunner G, Tax C, et al. Systematic implementation of clinical risk management in a large university hospital: the impact of risk managers. Wien Klin Wochenschr 2015;127:1–11. DOI: 10.1007/s00508-014-0620-7.

37. Smith SMS. A review of hand-washing techniques in primary care and community settings. J Clin Nurs 2009;18:786–790. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2008.02546.x.

38. Trampuz A, Widmer AF. Hand hygiene: a frequently missed lifesaving opportunity during patient care. Mayo Clin Proc 2004;79:109–116. DOI: 10.4065/79.1.109.

39. Von Lengerke T, Lutze B, Krauth C, et al. Promoting

hand hygiene compliance. Dtsch Arztebl Int 2017;114(3):29–36. DOI: 10.3238/arztebl.2017.0029.

40. WHO. WHO Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Healthcare: First Global Patient Safety Challenge Clean Care is Safer Care. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2009.