

## Position statement

### ASA Position Statement on fit-testing for adequate respiratory protection

#### Fit-testing

Fit-testing is an essential and mandatory step in ensuring that workers obtain an effective seal when donning a P2/N95 respirator.

This is in accordance with Workplace Health and Safety Legislation and AS/NZS 1715:2009,<sup>1</sup> where at-risk anaesthetists and associated staff are required to wear P2/N95 respirators. Employers are required to implement a comprehensive respiratory protection program that includes respirator fit-testing and training in the donning and doffing of respirators.

The Australian Government *Guidance on the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) in hospitals during the COVID-19 outbreak* version 4 published on 24th April 2020, which was developed by the Infection Control Expert Group (ICEG) acknowledged that "Fit-testing is recommended as the gold-standard (AS/NZS1715:2009) for use of P2/N95 respirators".<sup>2</sup> This advice has since changed although the Australian Standard has not.

#### The ASA considers fit-checking (user seal check) alone to be insufficient

Fit-testing with a trained fit-tester not only confirms that an effective seal can be maintained, but also identifies which respirators provide the greatest protection. Fit testing also provides education about how to don a respirator correctly, what a correctly fitted respirator feels like and how to wear and fit-check it correctly. This is supported in the following studies:

- A Canadian study of 784 participants: 25% of those who considered they had an adequate seal failed quantitative fit-testing.<sup>3</sup>
- A Hong Kong study of 268 Chinese descent participants: the user seal check was correct on 71-75% of occasions.<sup>4</sup>
- A Hong Kong study of 204 Chinese descent participants: the ability of the fit-check to correctly identify a poor fit was 15-23%. Furthermore, the accuracy of the fit-check was higher for males than for females.<sup>5</sup>

These studies and our own experience consistently demonstrates that the fit-check is unable to serve as an effective alternative to fit-testing because of its low accuracy and predictive value. In healthcare, fit-checking is often taught in an ad-hoc fashion by inexperienced trainers and it could be anticipated that the reliability of fit-checking is worse than in the research settings.

#### Fit testing provides a valuable opportunity for education

An N95/P2 respirator will not provide adequate protection if facial hair prevents an adequate seal being formed. This and other techniques for obtaining optimal fit are learnt during fit-testing. Our own experience of testing ASA members found that for 55% of tests, education was required in order for the mask to pass fit-testing. In a study of 43 untrained fit-tested health workers followed for 14 months,

## ASA – PS21

44% successfully passed fit-testing without specific instruction. This increased to 74% after initial training.<sup>6</sup> Failure rates of fit-testing were high at 3 and 14 months follow up, but pass rates remained high amongst regular users. Wearing a P2/N95 respirator in daily work was found to improve the success of maintaining a face seal in the longer term. During the current pandemic, it could be anticipated that there is a high motivation to ensure correct use and that use will become regular by anaesthetic teams. For those who do not use P2/N95 respirators routinely, this emphasises the need for regular training.

### **Alternate respiratory protection**

Where an approved fit-tested P2/N95 respirator is not available, there are a number of options. These include removing the worker from high risk duties, providing a reusable (elastomeric) respirator or providing a powered air-purifying respirator (PAPR). Loose fitting PAPR may be most suitable for those unable to shave facial hair, for example due to religious reasons. Workers should not work with close-fitting respirators until they have been successfully fit-tested.

In summary, the ASA recommends:

- All health services be mandated to provide health workers in contact with patients with COVID-19 with adequate respiratory protection. This includes a fit tested N95/P2 respirator as a minimum and is in accordance with the National Guidelines and Australian Standards, except where State guidance recommends a higher level of PPE.
- Health workers should not undertake or be required to undertake tasks requiring PPE in situations where appropriately fit-tested and checked PPE is not available for use. Any such tasks should not proceed until required PPE is made available.
- In ensuring adequate PPE, fit-testing is essential to ensure P2/N95 respirators will provide adequate protection. Training as to their correct use should be provided and fit-checking must be performed with each individual mask application.
- Where fit-testing is not available, alternatives methods of protection are to be implemented (e.g. PAPRs).
- All anaesthetists must undertake training until they are proficient in the donning and doffing of PPE and team-based simulation for protected intubation and extubation as a minimum.

ASA – PS21

## References

1. 'AS/NZS 1715-2009', accessed August 25, 2020. <https://www.standards.org.au/standards-catalogue/sa-snz/publicsafety/sf-010-1/{designation}>.
2. Australian Government Department of Health. 'Guidance on the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) in hospitals during the COVID-19 outbreak'. Accessed April 29, 2020, <https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2020/04/guidance-on-the-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-ppe-in-hospitals-during-the-covid-19-outbreak.pdf>.
3. Danyluk Q et al. 'Health care workers and respiratory protection: Is the user seal check a surrogate for respirator fit-testing?', *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 8, no. 5 (May 2011): 267-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2011.566016>.
4. Derrick JL et al. 'Predictive value of the user seal check in determining half-face respirator fit', *The Journal of Hospital Infection* 59, no. 2 (February 2005): 152-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2004.09.009>.
5. Lam SC et al. 'Sensitivity and specificity of the user-seal-check in determining the fit of N95 respirators', *Journal of Hospital Infection, Proceedings from the Sporidical Workshop*, 77, no. 3 (March 1, 2011): 252-256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2010.09.034>.
6. Lee MC et al. 'Respirator-fit testing: Does it ensure the protection of healthcare workers against respirable particles carrying pathogens?', *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* 29, no. 12 (December 2008): 1149-1156. <https://doi.org/10.1086/591860>.

Promulgated 28/08/2020  
Reviewed 18/08/2020  
Latest Revision 27/08/2020

**Disclaimer** The Australian Society of Anaesthetists Limited is not liable for the accuracy or completeness of the information in this document. The information in this document cannot replace professional advice.

**Copyright** The Australian Society of Anaesthetists Limited owns the copyright in this material. This material may only be reproduced for commercial purposes with the written permission of the Australian Society of Anaesthetists Limited.