Review

URF PUBLISHERS
connect with research world

American Journal of Pediatrics and Neonatology

https://urfpublishers.com/journal/pediatrics-and-neonatology

Vol: 2 & Iss: 1

Stethoscope Hygiene and Healthcare-Associated Infections: Evidence, Barriers and Opportunities for Prevention

Biswas Shrestha[1] Andrew Pastilha[1], Monica Smith[1] and Daniel Stromberg[1,2]*

[1]Skope Inc., Austin, Texas, USA

[2]Department of Pediatrics, Surgery and Perioperative Care, University of Texas, Dell Medical School, Austin, USA

Citation: Shrestha B, Pastilha A, Smith M, Stromberg D. Stethoscope Hygiene and Healthcare-Associated Infections: Evidence, Barriers and Opportunities for Prevention. *American J Pedia Neonat* 2026;2(1): 109-113.

Received: 10 February, 2026; **Accepted:** 18 February, 2026; **Published:** 20 February, 2026

***Corresponding author:** Daniel Stromberg, Department of Pediatrics, Surgery and Perioperative Care, University of Texas, Dell Medical School, 305 E Huntland Dr, Suite 506 Austin, Texas, 78752, USA, Tel: +1-214-533-5348; E-mail: dstromberg@austin.utexas.edu

ABSTRACT

Background: Healthcare-Associated Infections (HAI) affect 1 in 31 hospitalized patients annually in the United States, causing over 72,000 deaths and $28 to $45 billion in direct costs. Stethoscopes are contaminated with pathogenic bacteria in approximately 85% of cases yet remain absent from most infection control protocols. Despite Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) classification as "noncritical" devices, stethoscopes function as a "third hand" in disease transmission, touching patients multiple times daily while rarely being cleaned between uses.

Methods: Evidence synthesis examining stethoscope contamination rates, microbial species identified, compliance with cleaning practices and systemic barriers to hygiene. Analysis of behavioral change literature and successful infection control interventions.

Results: Observational studies document fewer than 15% of clinicians clean stethoscopes between patients. Cultured stethoscopes yield Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus (MRSA), Clostridium difficile (C. diff), Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci (VRE) and multidrug-resistant organisms at levels comparable to contaminated hands. Point of care disinfection stations paired with hand hygiene protocols increased compliance from baseline 19% to 54%, reaching 94% among active users. Isopropyl alcohol, the most common disinfectant, has proven ineffective against spore-forming organisms and viruses.

Discussion: This review summarizes evidence of stethoscope contamination and its role in transmission of HAIs, outlines the behavioural and systemic barriers that sustain poor compliance and proposes a practical, evidence-informed implementation framework for clinicians, hospitals, regulatory agencies and patients. Integrating stethoscope hygiene into standard multimodal infection prevention strategies and accreditation metrics represents a realistic opportunity to reduce preventable harm.

Keywords: Stethoscope hygiene, Healthcare-associated infections, Infection prevention, Device disinfection, Behavioral interventions, Patient safety

1. Introduction

The stethoscope, introduced by Rene Laennec in 1816[1], has evolved from a rolled paper tube to a dual-diaphragm instrument central to modern medical practice. Today, stethoscopes are reported to be used more than 15 million times daily across U.S. hospitals[2], making them among the most frequently used diagnostic instruments in clinical practice. The stethoscope remains indispensable for evaluating cardiac, pulmonary, abdominal and vascular conditions and it represents a symbol of clinical expertise and patient trust. Despite its widespread use, each patient encounter introduces the potential for microbial transfer.

Contamination is common. Studies shows about 85% of stethoscopes harbour bacteria[3]. Although most bacteria are non-pathogenic, they also include clinically important pathogens such as MRSA, C. diff, VRE and multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Importantly, the microbial burden on the diaphragm often parallels that on clinicians' fingertips after patient contact[4]. Healthcare workers are extensively trained in hand hygiene; however, stethoscope hygiene receives minimal emphasis, despite similar exposure and contamination potential.

The CDC classifies stethoscopes as noncritical devices[5,6]. This lack of standardization contrasts with robust expectations for hand hygiene and environmental cleaning. Stethoscope-associated transmission has been documented, including outbreaks involving Listeria monocytogenes, *Acinetobacter baumannii*, ESBL-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*[7,8].

Given the centrality of stethoscopes in patient care and the documented contamination burden, stethoscope hygiene represents a significant yet underrecognized component of infection prevention. This review synthesizes evidence across microbiology, behavioural science, clinical practice and regulatory policy to propose practical strategies for addressing this gap.

1.1. Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

This review collected from PubMed, Scopus and Google Scholar to identify literature from 2000 to 2025 with search terms including "stethoscope contamination", "stethoscope disinfection", "healthcare-associated infections", "fomite transmission", "MRSA", "C. diff", "VRE", "behavioural interventions" and "infection prevention". Grey literature was obtained from CDC, WHO, CMS and infection prevention organizations. Studies were included based on relevance to contamination, transmission risk, disinfectant effectiveness, behavioural barriers and clinical implementation strategies.

1.2. The Third Hand Problem

Experts describe the stethoscope as the clinician's "third hand"[9]. Unlike hands, however, it rarely receives consistent cleaning. Observational studies repeatedly show fewer than 15% of clinicians disinfect stethoscopes between patient encounters, with some settings reporting near-zero compliance despite education and reminders[10,11].

Contamination is comparable to that on hands. Longtin et al.[4] demonstrated that after examining a patient colonized with MRSA, MRSA was detected on either the examiner's fingertips or the stethoscope diaphragm in 76% of cases. The bacterial burden on the diaphragm strongly correlated with that on the fingertips, underscoring shared exposure and transmission potential during physical exams. Given this parallel, stethoscope hygiene should be held to a similar standard as hand hygiene.

1.3. Where Guidance Falls Short

CDC guidelines categorize stethoscopes as noncritical devices and recommend low-level disinfection, but do not specify cleaning frequency, monitoring or compliance requirements[5]. By contrast, frequently touched surfaces such as bed rails and bedside tables require routine cleaning. This inconsistency contributes to persistently low adherence.

The historical parallel to hand hygiene is significant. Ignaz Semmelweis showed in 1847 that handwashing reduced maternal mortality from 18% to under 2%[12], but hand hygiene was ridiculed and resisted for decades[13]. More than 175 years later, stethoscope hygiene remains in a similarly neglected position.

Literature has documented stethoscope-associated transmission of Listeria monocytogenes in neonatal intensive care units, *Acinetobacter baumannii* in intensive care units, as well as ESBL-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in various clinical settings[7,8]. These outbreaks underscore that stethoscope contamination is not merely a theoretical risk but a concrete threat to patient safety and must be addressed with actionable standards and cultural change.

1.4. The Human and Financial Cost

Healthcare-Associated Infections (HAIs) affect 1 in 31 hospitalized patients annually in the United States and result in more than 72,000 deaths[14]. The financial impact is substantial, with direct hospital costs estimated at $28 to $45 billion each year[15]. When infections do occur, individual cases carry considerable costs. Hospital-onset invasive MRSA infections cost hospitals an average of $30,998; carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter costs $74,306; and C. diff costs $24,205 per case[16,17].

To illustrate the potential financial impact at the unit level for MRSA and C. diff infection, a recent healthcare economic analysis modeled costs in a single hospital unit with three clinicians examining 20 patients daily. Using published per case costs and examining infection transmission rates ranging from 1% to 3% for immunocompetent patients to 10% to 30% for immunosuppressed patients, the model estimated that poor stethoscope hygiene could result in annual costs ranging from $1.6 million to $5.0 million[18]. These estimates illustrate the potential economic impact of this preventable transmission route and suggest that relatively modest improvements in stethoscope hygiene compliance could yield substantial cost savings.

Beyond direct treatment costs, hospitals face financial penalties from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). The HAI reduction program penalizes hospitals in the worst-performing 25% with a 1% reduction in Medicare inpatient payments[19,20]. These penalties amount to millions of dollars annually for large institutions.

When a patient develops an HAI, identifying the exact source is difficult. Infections result from multiple exposures: contaminated hands, invasive medical devices, catheters, surgical instruments, environmental surfaces and stethoscopes.

Because no single touchpoint can be pinpointed as the definitive cause, the only effective strategy is to eliminate risk at every opportunity. Consistent hygiene for both hands and devices is not just best practice; it is a practical necessity to prevent avoidable suffering and death.

2. Why Stethoscopes Stay Dirty

2.1. Time and Workflow Barriers

Clinicians often examine patients rapidly in high-demand environments. When cleaning supplies are not readily accessible at the point of care, compliance declines significantly. Providers cite limited time, forgetfulness and poor access to supplies as barriers[21]. Interventions that place disinfectants at the point of care have increased observed stethoscope disinfection in practice[22].

2.2. Product-Pathogen Mismatch

Isopropyl alcohol remains the most widely available disinfectant in hospitals. However, alcohol is ineffective against C. diff spores and norovirus[23,24]. Increased alcohol tolerance has been documented in some hospital strains of *Enterococcus faecium*[25] and ethanol exposure can induce stress responses in *Acinetobacter baumannii*[26]. These limitations reduce the protective value of alcohol-based stethoscope cleaning and may not be enough to prevent stethoscopes from serving as vectors for these pathogens.

2.3. Disposable Stethoscopes Have Significant Limitations

Some facilities use disposable or single-patient stethoscopes. While this approach seemingly reduces risk (a hypothesis that has yet to be proven), these devices also become contaminated through handling and surface exposure. Their inferior acoustic performance can also impair diagnosis. One controlled study reported a 10.9% misdiagnosis rate for serious auscultatory conditions when disposable stethoscopes were used[27]. Another peer-reviewed work also highlights compromised diagnostic performance with low-end stethoscopes and suggests their use can result in missed or incorrect findings in a significant portion of cases[28]. This diagnostic compromise, especially in settings where infection prevention is already challenging, represents an unacceptable trade-off.

2.4. Inaccurate Perceptions of Compliance

Multiple studies shows that even when clinicians report regular stethoscope cleaning, cultures frequently remain positive and overall contamination is not reduced compared with those who rarely clean[29]. Education alone produces little improvement, as shown in a study conducted at a large teaching hospital, where standard education and reminders failed to increase compliance[11].

3. Behavioural Science and Intervention Evidence

Behavioural science tells us that education alone does not change entrenched habits. Holleck, et al.[11], illustrates this principle: even with education and reminders, compliance remained at zero. This gap between knowledge and action shows that awareness is not enough to shift daily practice. The most successful infection control interventions share a common formula: put the desired action at the point of care, support the behaviour through culture and leadership, make it visible and easy and provide immediate feedback or cues that reinforce behaviour.

Hand hygiene is a prime example. In a multicentre study across six pilot sites in five countries, implementation of the WHO multimodal hand hygiene improvement strategy increased overall hand hygiene compliance from 51% to 67%[30]. In Western Switzerland, an 18-month hand hygiene breakthrough collaborative using similar multimodal approaches improved compliance from 61.9% to 88.3% and sustained this improvement at 88.9% twelve months after intervention[31]. More recently, Danish hospitals using electronic monitoring systems with individualized feedback achieved compliance improvements of approximately 15%[32]. These successes share a critical element: making the right action the easiest action is what matters most.

When we compare the point-of-care hand hygiene improvement studies, the behavioural outcomes are particularly striking. Stethoscope cleaning compliance improved from a baseline 19% to 54% following implementation, representing an absolute gain of 35 percentage points[33]. In relative terms, this represents a 184% improvement or 2.84-fold increase over baseline. This improvement substantially exceeds what was achieved with the WHO multimodal hand hygiene improvement strategy[30], which demonstrated a 16-percentage point increase in compliance. The absolute gain from the stethoscope intervention also matches or exceeds the 26-percentage point improvement from the Swiss breakthrough collaborative model[31] and surpasses the hand hygiene compliance improvements documented in Danish hospitals using electronic monitoring with individualized feedback. In the Danish study, overall hand hygiene compliance increased from 48% to 63% representing a 15-percentage point improvement, with the most substantial gains observed in patient rooms where compliance increased from 44% to 61% representing a 17-percentage point improvement[32].

What makes this finding significant is that stethoscope hygiene is a less-established clinical practice than hand hygiene. People already understand the importance of hand hygiene and have received extensive training on this topic. Yet introducing stethoscope hygiene as a completely new behaviour produced larger compliance improvements than interventions aimed at improving the already-known hand hygiene behavior. This likely reflects a fundamental principle from behavioral science: adding a new behavior to an existing routine is often more effective than attempting to change an established routine. When you ask clinicians to adopt something entirely new but attach it to something they already do well, you encounter less resistance than when you try to modify a deeply ingrained habit.

The mechanism underlying this success involves behavioral stacking. By positioning stethoscope cleaning stations directly adjacent to hand sanitizer dispensers, the intervention creates a powerful connection for clinicians who are already trained to sanitize their hands. When clinicians reach for the hand sanitizer dispenser, they simultaneously encounter the stethoscope cleaner in the same physical location and at the same moment in their workflow. This co-location eliminates the need for separate decision-making and reduces the cognitive burden of remembering to perform an additional task. Rather than thinking about two separate actions, clinicians can perform both as part of a single, unified hygiene routine. This architectural solution reduces friction in the workflow and leverages existing high-compliance behaviors to drive adoption of new ones.

The same principle applies to stethoscope hygiene. Effective solutions must be located at the point of care where exams happen, require minimal time to use, integrate seamlessly with existing hand hygiene protocols to constitute reinforcing behaviours and provide mechanical or chemical action against a broad spectrum of pathogens. Research demonstrates that placing stethoscope cleaning stations directly beside hand sanitizer dispensers creates a powerful behavioural link: clinicians already trained to sanitize their hands encounter the stethoscope cleaner in the same moment and location[33]. This proximity transforms two separate actions into a unified hygiene routine. The findings from the stethoscope intervention suggest that integrating device hygiene measures with existing high-compliance behaviour may be a more sustainable implementation strategy than introducing them as isolated interventions requiring clinicians to develop entirely new habits.

4. Implementation Strategy

4.1. For Clinicians

- Clean stethoscopes every time hands are cleaned.
- Use EPA-approved disinfectants according to labelled contact times.
- Ensure cleaning materials are available where patient exams occur.

4.2. For Hospitals

- Install point-of-care stethoscope cleaning stations.
- Co-locate device-cleaning tools with hand sanitizer dispensers.
- Standardize disinfectant products.
- Audit stethoscope cleaning with hand hygiene.
- Include device hygiene in training, competency assessments and performance dashboards.

4.3. For Regulatory Agencies

- Incorporate stethoscope hygiene metrics into accreditation scoring.
- Audit infrastructure, product standardization and compliance.
- Align requirements with hand hygiene expectations.
- Connect compliance to value-based purchasing incentives.

4.4. For Patients

Patients can appropriately ask, “Is your stethoscope clean?” Patient engagement reinforces transparency and safety culture.

5. Limitations

Most studies assessing stethoscope contamination rely on observational designs with variable sampling methods, limiting comparability. Large, randomized trials are lacking and data directly linking stethoscope hygiene to reductions in HAI incidence remain limited, although biological plausibility is strong. Behavioural interventions have primarily been implemented in selected units and may not generalize to all settings. Despite these limitations, the consistency of evidence across studies highlights the clinical relevance of stethoscope hygiene.

6. Conclusion

The stethoscope is a foundational tool in clinical medicine, yet its role as a potential vector of pathogen transmission remains under-recognized. Evidence demonstrates that stethoscopes are frequently contaminated with clinically significant organisms and can contribute to preventable transmission events. Barriers to consistent hygiene are primarily structural and behavioural, not educational. Low-cost, high-impact interventions, especially point-of-care cleaning stations integrated with hand hygiene workflows, offer a practical path forward. Given the human and financial burden of HAIs, incorporating stethoscope hygiene into routine audits and value-based purchasing metrics is a low-cost opportunity to improve patient safety. Integrating stethoscope hygiene into infection prevention programs and accreditation standards can help close a longstanding gap in patient safety.

7. References

1. Roguin A. Rene Theophile Hyacinthe Laennec. The Man Behind the Stethoscope. Clin Med Res. 2006;4(3): 230-235.
2. Amin A. Keeping the Stethoscope, the Clinician’s Third Hand, Clean. Infection Control Today. 2021;25(1).
3. O’Flaherty N, Fenelon L. The stethoscope and healthcare-associated infection: A snake in the grass or innocent bystander? J Hospital Infection. W.B. Saunders Ltd. 2015;91(1): 1-7.
4. Longtin Y, Schneider A, Tschopp C, et al. Contamination of Stethoscopes and Physicians’ Hands After a Physical Examination. Mayo Clin Proc. 2014;89(3): 291-299.
5. CDC. Recommendations for Disinfection and Sterilization in Healthcare Facilities from Guideline for Disinfection and Sterilization in Healthcare Facilities. CDC. 2008.
6. CDC. Clinical Safety: Hand Hygiene for Healthcare Workers. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2024.
7. Fullerton L, Norrish G, Wedderburn CJ, et al. Nosocomial Neonatal Listeria Monocytogenes Transmission by Stethoscope. Pediatr Infect Dis J. 2015;34(9).
8. Kanamori H, Rutala WA, Weber DJ. The Role of Patient Care Items as a Fomite in Healthcare-Associated Outbreaks and Infection Prevention. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2017;65(8): 1412-1419.
9. Peacock WF, Chemaly RF, Torriani F, et al. A new normal for the clinician’s third hand: Stethoscope hygiene and infection prevention. Am J Infect Control. 2023;51(1): 114-118.
10. Vasudevan RS, Mojaver S, Chang KW, et al. Observation of stethoscope sanitation practices in an emergency department setting. Am J Infect Control. 2019;47(3): 234-237.
11. Holleck JL, Merchant N, Lin S, et al. Can education influence stethoscope hygiene? Am J Infect Control. 2017;45(7): 811-812.
12. Paul S, Salunkhe S, Sravanthi K, et al. Pioneering Hand Hygiene: Ignaz Semmelweis and the Fight Against Puerperal Fever. Cureus. 2024;16(10).
13. Erasmus V, Daha TJ, Brug H, et al. Systematic Review of Studies on Compliance with Hand Hygiene Guidelines in Hospital Care. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2010;31(3): 283-294.
14. CDC. HAIs: Reports and Data. 2025.
15. Stone PW. Economic burden of healthcare-associated infections: an American perspective. Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res. 2009;9(5): 417-422.
16. Nelson RE, Hatfield KM, Wolford H, et al. National Estimates of Healthcare Costs Associated with Multidrug-Resistant Bacterial Infections Among Hospitalized Patients in the United States. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2021;72(1): 17-26.

17. Zhang D, Prabhu VS, Marcella SW. Attributable Healthcare Resource Utilization and Costs for Patients with Primary and Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection in the United States. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2018;66(9): 1326-1332.

18. Peacock WF. The hidden expense of stethoscope hygiene versus the real costs of failure. Clin Exp Emerg Med. 2024;11(1): 6-8.

19. CMS. Hospital-Acquired Condition (HAC) Reduction Program. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). 2025.

20. CMS. Hospital-Acquired Condition Reduction Program. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). 2025.

21. Muniz J, Sethi RK, Zaghi J, et al. Predictors of stethoscope disinfection among paediatric health care providers. Am J Infect Control. 2012;40(10): 922-925.

22. Gibbens K, Hota S, Seidelin P, et al. Point of Care Stations: A Novel Way to Improve Stethoscope Hygiene. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2020;41(1): 493-494.

23. Jabbar U, Leischner J, Kasper D, et al. Effectiveness of Alcohol-Based Hand Rubs for Removal of Clostridium difficile Spores from Hands. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2010;31(6): 565-570.

24. Escudero-Abarca BI, Goulter RM, Manuel CS, et al. Comparative Assessment of the Efficacy of Commercial Hand Sanitizers Against Human Norovirus Evaluated by an in vivo Fingerpad Method. Front Microbiol. 2022;13.

25. Pidot SJ, Gao W, Buultjens AH, et al. Increasing Tolerance of Hospital Enterococcus Faecium to Handwash Alcohols. 2018;10.

26. Edwards J, Patel G, Wareham DW. Low concentrations of commercial alcohol hand rubs facilitate growth of and secretion of extracellular proteins by multidrug-resistant strains of Acinetobacter baumannii. J Med Microbiol. 2007;56(12): 1595-1599.

27. Frank Peacock W. The Danger of Inferior Auscultation Tools. J Emergency Med. 2024;66(6): 741-742.

28. Mehmood M, Abu Grara HL, Stewart JS, et al. Comparing the auscultatory accuracy of health care professionals using three different brands of stethoscopes on a simulator. Medical Devices: Evidence Res. 2014;2014(7): 273-281.

29. Alali SA, Shrestha E, Kansakar AR, et al. Community hospital stethoscope cleaning practices and contamination rates. Am J Infect Control. 2020;48(11): 1365-1369.

30. Allegranzi B, Gayet-Ageron A, Damani N, et al. Global implementation of WHO's multimodal strategy for improvement of hand hygiene: a quasi-experimental study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2013;13(10): 843-851.

31. Staines A, Amherdt I, Lecureux E, et al. Hand Hygiene Improvement and Sustainability: Assessing a Breakthrough Collaborative in Western Switzerland. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2017;38(12): 1420-1427.

32. From-Hansen M, Hansen MB, Hansen R, et al. Empowering health care workers with personalized data-driven feedback to boost hand hygiene compliance. Am J Infect Control. 2024;52(1): 21-28.

33. Stromberg D, Smith M, Waddle AL, et al. Point-of-Care Stethoscope Disinfection Improves Hand Hygiene Compliance. Am J Infect Control. 2024;52(6): 2.