



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

Pedram Gerami, MD,^{a,b} and Walter Liszewski, MD^a

From the Department of Dermatology^a and Robert H. Lurie Cancer Center, Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois.^b

Funding sources: None.

Disclosure: Dr Gerami has served as a consultant for Myriad Genomics, DermTech, Merck, and Castle Biosciences and has received honoraria for this. Dr Liszewski has no conflicts of interest to declare.

IRB approval status: Not applicable.

Reprint requests: Pedram Gerami, MD, Department of Dermatology, Northwestern University, 676 N St Clair St, Suite 1765, Chicago, IL 60611

E-mail: pedram.gerami@nm.org

REFERENCES

1. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, et al. Risk factors associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome and death in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2020;180(7):1-11.
2. Jacobson CC, Resneck JS, Kimball AB. Generational differences in practice patterns of dermatologists in the United States. *Arch Dermatol.* 2004;140:1477-1482.
3. Down B, Kulkarni S, Khan AHA, Barker B, Tang I. Novel coronavirus (COVID-19) infection: what a doctor on the frontline needs to know. *Ann Med Surg (Lond).* 2020;55:24-29.
4. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral load in upper respiratory specimens of infected patients. *N Engl J Med.* 2020; 382:1177-1179.
5. Chan JF, Zhang AJ, Yuan S, et al. Simulation of the clinical and pathological manifestations of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in golden Syrian hamster model: implications for disease pathogenesis and transmissibility. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa325>.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2020.07.035>

Application of hydrogel patches to the upper margins of N95 respirators as a novel antifog measure for goggles: A prospective, self-controlled study



To the Editor: During the COVID-19 pandemic, proper use of personal protective equipment has played an important role in protecting frontline health care workers from infection.¹ Because of temperature differences between the inner and outer surfaces of goggles, moist, warm exhaled air escaping from respirators can condense into tiny water droplets on the inner surface. This obscures visibility and impairs workflow. In our previous research, we showed the effectiveness of

hydrogel patches in reducing facial pressure injuries caused by N95 respirators.² Thereafter, we conducted a prospective, self-controlled study to evaluate the efficacy of hydrogel patches as an antifog measure.

This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Huazhong University of Science and Technology (no. [2020]0131-1). Twenty health care workers aged 25 to 55 years took part in 2 separate experiments, conducted at a temperature of 64.4°F to 77°F. In both experiments, the right, inner side of the goggles was treated with an antifog agent, and the left side remained untreated. In the first experiment, participants wore only goggles and an N95 respirator. The left, untreated side was the control. In the second experiment, participants wore goggles and hydrogel patches, which were placed in a “W” shape under the upper edges of the N95 respirator (Fig 1). Before starting, the respirator seal was checked for air leaks (Supplemental Materials; available via Mendeley at <https://doi.org/10.17632/rbrw7zvp6y.2>).³ At hourly intervals, participants and a clinician scored the fogging observed on each side of the goggles by using the Subject Self-Assessment Fogging Score (SSAFS) and Clinician Assessment Fogging Score (CAFS), respectively (Supplemental Materials; available via Mendeley at <https://doi.org/10.17632/rbrw7zvp6y.2>). Statistical analysis was performed with SPSS 26.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY) using a paired-sample *t* test ($P < .05$).

A total of 19 participants (14 [73.7%] female) were included. At 1 hour, the mean score for goggles with hydrogel patches was lower than control individuals (SSAFS: 3.29 ± 2.80 vs 5.35 ± 2.47 ; $P < .01$; CAFS: 1.91 ± 1.35 vs 4.35 ± 2.06 ; $P < .001$). Hydrogel patches plus antifog agent resulted in lower scores than just antifog agent (SSAFS: 1.82 ± 1.88 vs 2.41 ± 2.81 ; $P < .05$; CAFS: 0.91 ± 0.71 vs 1.62 ± 0.78 ; $P < .01$). This difference persisted at 2, 3, and 4 hours. There was no statistically significant difference between hydrogel and antifog agent scores at 1, 3, and 4 hours, except at 2 hours by the SSAFS (Fig 2). Twelve (63.2%) participants without hydrogel patches reported mild air leaks from the N95 respirator versus only 3 (15.8%) with hydrogel patches. Participants did not report skin irritation with hydrogel patches. The main reasons reported by participants for reluctance to use antifog agents were difficulty in even application, long drying times, and concerns about viral contamination of goggles during processing.

This study suggests that hydrogel patches are a useful adjunct to respirators; they enable a tighter fit of the respirators, are well tolerated, and prevent facial pressure injuries. The efficacy of these patches




Fig 1. Study flowchart.

is similar to commercially available antifog agents, and they provide better antifogging results when used in combination with the latter.

Study limitations included the unblinded design and possible confounders between the 2 experiments, such as amount of speech, activities performed, and environmental humidity. A larger, controlled, and blinded study is warranted to further verify these findings.

Nuoya Zhou, MD,^{a,b} Huinan Suo, MD,^{a,b} Mahin Alamgir, MD,^c Yan Li, MD, PhD,^{a,b} Jing Yang, MD, PhD,^{a,b} Liu Yang, MD, PhD,^{a,b} Xiangjie An, MD, PhD,^{a,b} Yamin Zhang, MD, PhD,^{a,b} Jiajia Lan, MD,^{a,b} Lianbin Zhang, PhD,^d Jintao Zhu, PhD,^d Liyun Dong, MD,^{a,b} and Juan Tao, MD, PhD^{a,b}

From the Department of Dermatology, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuban, China^a; Hubei Engineering Research Center for Skin Repair and Theranostics, Wuban, China^b; Department of Dermatology, Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, New Jersey^c;

and Key Laboratory of Material Chemistry for Energy Conversion and Storage, Ministry of Education, School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuban, China.^d

Drs Zhou and Suo contributed equally to this article.

Funding sources: Supported by Huazhong University of Science and Technology COVID-19 Rapid Response Call Program (2020kfyXGYJ056 and 2020kfyXGYJ081) and Hubei Provincial Emergency Science and Technology Program for COVID-19 (2020FCA037).

Conflicts of interest: None disclosed.

IRB approval status: Reviewed and approved by Medical Ethics Committee of Huazhong University of Science and Technology (approval no. [2020]0131-1).

Reprints not available from the authors.

Correspondence to: Liyun Dong, MD

E-mail: dlydong@163.com




Fig 2. Photographs after wearing the goggles for 4 hours and fogging scores plotted with respect to time. **A**, Without hydrogel patches: the left side of the goggles is the blank control; the right side is treated with an antifog agent. The fogged goggles are placed on a lettered background, and red circles show the extent of fogging. **B**, With hydrogel patches: the left side is untreated; the right side is treated with an antifog agent. **C**, Graphs plotted to show the SSAFS for both experiments after every hour. **D**, The CAFS for both experiments after every hour. * $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$, *** $P < .001$. CAFS, Clinician Assessment Fogging Score; ns, not statistically significant; SSAFS, Subject Self-Assessment Fogging Score.

REFERENCES

- Gupta MK, Lipner SR. Personal protective equipment recommendations based on COVID-19 route of transmission. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2020;83:e45-e46.
- Dong L, Yang L, Li Y, et al. Efficacy of hydrogel patches in preventing facial skin damage caused by mask compression in fighting against coronavirus disease-2019: a short-term, self-controlled study. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol.* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jdv.16638>.
- Ortega R, Gonzalez M, Nozari A, Canelli R. Personal protective equipment and Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382:e105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2020.07.053>