A Mobile Swabbing Booth to Address Singapore GPs’ Concerns About Swabber Protection: Human-Centred Design during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Boon See Teo (drteobs@gmail.com)  
Camry Medical Centre

Esther Li  
Camry Medical Centre

Yi-Lin Khoo  
Temasek International

Michelle Evaristo  
Temasek International

Yang Fang  
Nanyang Technological University

Helen Smith  
Nanyang Technological University

Research Article

Keywords: Quality Improvement, Safety Management, Ergonomics, Infection Control, Primary Health Care, Pandemic, swabbing booth, safety, COVID-19

Posted Date: December 18th, 2020

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-109189/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Read Full License

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at BMC Family Practice on September 8th, 2021. See the published version at https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-021-01531-8.
Abstract

Background

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Ministry of Health asked Singapore’s private general practitioners (GPs) to perform swab testing in their clinics, but some GPs had concerns about swabber protection. Our aim was to develop a swabbing booth to address these concerns.

Methods

We developed a prototype with potential GP users using a human-centred design approach and piloted it with 10 GP clinics. The pilot was then extended to 170 GP clinics around Singapore. These GPs were then surveyed on user satisfaction.

Results

93 GPs (54%) responded. The majority (75%) practiced in public residential estates in small practices (mean 1.93 doctors). 86% requested the booth to enhance swabber protection. 74% “would recommend” or “would strongly recommend” the booth to colleagues. 79% continue to use the booth to conduct swab tests. 92% liked that it offered swabber protection. 71% liked that the booth created a separate space for swabbing and 64% liked its ease of disinfection. 47% started swabbing only after receiving the booth and 58% said the booth was “important” or “very important” to their decision to participate in swab testing. However, 34% disliked that it took up too much space and the most frequently critiqued area was the gloves.

Conclusion

The human-centred design approach generated a product that had high user satisfaction, addressed GPs’ concerns of swabber protection and increased GPs’ participation in swab testing. The booth may be useful where GPs are concerned about swabber protection and space is limited.

Introduction

Private general practitioners (GPs) are in the frontline of Singapore’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic. There are 1,700 private GP clinics in Singapore, which provide 80% of Singapore’s primary care \(^{(1)}\). Mostly situated in residential estates, they are the point of first contact in the health system for most patients. About 930 of these clinics are designated Public Health Preparedness Clinics (PHPCs) \(^{(2)}\) and they provide subsidised treatment, investigations and medications during public health emergencies \(^{(3)}\).

Upper respiratory tract infections make up 44% of GPs’ acute caseloads \(^{(4)}\). Beginning in January 2020, GPs were asked to refer suspected cases of COVID-19 to hospitals for swab testing. Amid rising daily cases in March 2020, the Ministry of Health encouraged PHPCs to participate in the Swab-and-Send Home (SASH) Programme, which aimed to expand disease surveillance and support rapid case finding
(5). PHPCs on SASH would offer patients with acute respiratory illness same-day COVID-19 swab testing within the clinic. However, GPs were concerned about swabber protection and premise contamination as patients often coughed or sneezed while being swabbed. In April 2020, around 140 out of 930 PHPCs had joined the programme (2).

A potential solution to these concerns was the use of swabbing booths, which had been deployed to enhance protection for swabbers in various settings both locally (6) and internationally (7, 8, 9, 10), but to our knowledge, none in the GP setting. The Temasek Foundation (TF), a Singaporean philanthropic organization, collaborated with a PHPC, Camry Medical Centre (CMC), and a precision engineering company, Applied Total Control Treatment Pte Ltd (ATC), to design and build a swabbing booth that would address the safety concerns of PHPC GPs.

We followed human-centred design (HCD) principles to develop the prototype. HCD is defined by psychologist Donald Norman as “the process that ensures that the designs match the needs and capabilities of the people for whom they are intended” (11). It is characterised by iterative cycles of observation of users, idea generation, prototyping and user testing.

Our goal was to design a swabbing booth that addressed the GPs’ concerns about swabber protection and to evaluate user satisfaction.

Method

The project had 3 phases: design development, piloting and user survey. We started the design development on 14th May 2020 and closed the survey on 24th September 2020.

Design development (Phase 1) involved 4 GP testers (2 male, 2 female) from 3 PHPCs. Discussions and trials involving the GP testers, ATC engineers, and TF volunteers were conducted at a PHPC (CMC). The GPs reviewed preliminary prototypes and defined 6 functional requirements for a booth (see Table 1): swabber protection, ease of disinfection, outdoor use, mobility, good ergonomics and patient privacy.

Subsequently, CMC, TF and ATC developed the design in 3 iterations, each involving:

- Idea generation: CMC translated the GP testers’ inputs into a design drawing.
- Prototyping: ATC built a prototype based on the design drawing.
- Testing: The completed prototypes were tested on-site in CMC. GP testers role-played as swabber and patient, performing pretend swabs to test booth ergonomics, and provided feedback. Patients were not involved in testing at this stage.
- Observation: TF and CMC consolidated the feedback. Design decisions were then translated into a final design drawing. Table 1 summarises the design strategies.

Table 1: Key user requirements and design strategies
| GPs’ requirements                              | Design strategies adopted                                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Swabber protection**                        | - A full-height cubicle served as a barrier between patient and swabber, with a roof to block upward transmission trajectory.  
- The joints of the structure were sealed to prevent droplet transmission. |
| Swabbers should be protected from droplets produced by coughing and sneezing during swabbing. |                                                                                        |
| **Ease of disinfection**                       | - For the panels, polycarbonate was chosen over acrylic as polycarbonate could withstand wipe-downs with alcohol.  
- Surfaces were made as smooth as possible with no nooks and crannies. |
| Wipe-down had to be simple as the booth would be disinfected between patients. |                                                                                        |
| **Outdoor or semi-outdoor use**                | - Aluminium and polycarbonate were chosen for their weather-resistance.  
- No electrical components were included.  
- The cubicles were open, without doors, to allow wind, humidity, heat and sunlight to combat pathogens. This would also reduce the number of surfaces needing wipe-down between patients. |
| GPs should be able to place it outside the clinic to segregate swabbing space from consultation space, for infection control. |                                                                                        |
| **Mobility**                                   | - Castors and handles were added.  
- It was made narrow enough to pass through standard doorways.  
- The footprint was made just large enough to contain both swabber and patient (600x800mm).  
- Lightweight materials and compact size made it easy for a single clinic staff to move and set up. |
| In order to be stored indoors after hours, it had to be sufficiently compact to fit within small clinic spaces, and require minimal manpower to set up as GP clinics run on lean teams. |                                                                                        |
| **Good ergonomics**                            | - Dimensions were specified for a standing swabber performing a nasopharyngeal swab on a patient 1.10-1.75m tall. Shorter patients could stand on a stool and taller patients could be seated.  
- Glove ports were fixed at a comfortable height for testers who were 1.55-1.75m tall.  
- Gloves had to be touch-sensitive, low cost and easy to replace.  
- Curved shelves in both cubicles provided space for swabbing equipment to be placed. |
| It should be comfortable for the swabber to perform the procedure. It should also accommodate patients of different builds. |                                                                                        |
| **Patient privacy**                            | - Semi-opaque cubicles for swabber and patient provided some privacy while allowing light to pass through for swabbing. |
| If the swabbing was done outside the clinic in a public area, patient privacy had to be respected. |                                                                                        |
In all, five prototypes of booths and four models of gloves were tested. The final booth design (see Figure 1 and Figure 2) had separate cubicles for swabber and patient. It was mobile and slim enough to go through doorways, and light enough to be moved by one person. We chose a model of gloves that fulfilled testers’ requirements for tactile-sensitivity, ease of disinfection, ease of replacement and low cost.

**Piloting (Phase 2)** was conducted in 10 clinics from different towns in Singapore to test the feasibility of the booth prototype. Over two weeks, 10 pilot GP participants used the booth to swab patients and provide feedback via a WhatsApp chat group. The GPs suggested two refinements: to increase the shelf size on the patient side to prevent swab kits from falling off, and to provide larger gloves. The refined prototype was then produced.

We then extended the pilot to all PHPC GPs, inviting applications for a booth via a mass e-mail from the College of Family Physicians to their members, and via messages to WhatsApp chat groups of Primary Care Networks (PCNs). By 19 September 2020, 170 clinics across Singapore had taken delivery of booths. All booths and gloves were provided free of charge.

A voluntary and anonymous online survey (Phase 3) was distributed to all GP booth recipients to evaluate their user experience. The survey questionnaire can be found in the Supplementary Material (COSMO Slim: Feedback Form for Pilot PHPC Participants). Structured and open-ended questions enquired about respondent demographics, patterns of booth usage, reasons for booth application, satisfaction with the booth and if the booth influenced their decision to perform swab testing.

Informed consent was taken and the survey was administered on Qualtrics, with ballot box stuffing disabled. The data was analysed using SPSS for Windows, version 22.0 (12).

The survey design was supported by Primary Care Research Network, Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University with ethics approval from NTU (NTU-IRB ref no. IRB-2020-07-031).

**Results**

A total of 170 GPs received the swabbing booth and the survey link. 54% of the GPs responded (n=93), of whom 91% (n=85) completed the entire survey. The number of respondents answering each question is indicated in the tables.

**Characteristics of the respondents and their practices**

As seen in Table 2, the GPs spanned a wide age range and majority (75%) practiced in public residential estates in small practices (mean=1.95 doctors).

**Table 2. Characteristics of respondents (n=93)**
### Table 3

| Age            | %    | n   | Mean | SD  |
|----------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 30-39          | 25%  | 23  | -    | -   |
| 40-49          | 30%  | 28  | -    | -   |
| 50-59          | 38%  | 35  | -    | -   |
| 60-69          | 6%   | 6   | -    | -   |
| 70 and above   | 1%   | 1   | -    | -   |
| **Type of practice** |      |     |      |     |
| Solo clinic    | 48%  | 45  | -    | -   |
| Group of 2-9 clinics | 33%  | 31  | -    | -   |
| Group of 10 or more clinics | 18%  | 17  | -    | -   |
| **Number of doctors in clinic** | - | - | 1.95 | 1.20 |
| **Number of clinic support staff** | - | - | 4.52 | 2.68 |
| **Location of GP clinic** |      |     |      |     |
| public residential estate | 75%  | 70  | -    | -   |
| shopping mall  | 14%  | 13  | -    | -   |
| private residential estate | 5%   | 4   | -    | -   |
| office building | 5%   | 5   | -    | -   |
| industrial estate | 1%   | 1   | -    | -   |

**Primary findings on user experience: reasons for booth application and booth satisfaction**

The primary findings are summarised in Table 3. The top 3 reasons for applying for the booth were: to increase swabber protection (86%), ease of disinfection (65%) and provided for free (55%).

We assessed overall satisfaction by whether the GPs were still using the booth at the time of the survey and whether they would recommend it to other GPs. We also assessed satisfaction towards individual attributes of the booth, with questions on likes, dislikes and ergonomics.

**Table 3. Primary findings on user experience**
### Reasons for applying for booth (multiple selections accepted) (n=92) #
- I felt it would be safer for the swabber: 86% (79)
- I felt it would make the disinfection process easier: 65% (60)
- It was provided free of charge: 55% (51)
- I did not have the necessary equipment to conduct a swab test (e.g. table, privacy screen): 32% (29)
- I felt it would provide privacy for the patients: 30% (28)
- Other (reduced patient anxiety, save time without having to wear full PPE, wanted designated work area for swabbing outside clinic): 4% (4)

### Are you currently using the booth to conduct swab tests? (n=87) #
- Yes: 79% (68)
- No, I swab without the booth now: 19% (16)
- No, I have stopped conducting swab tests in my clinic: 2% (2)

### How likely are you to recommend the booth to another colleague? (n=85) #
- Will strongly recommend: 40% (34)
- Will recommend: 34% (29)
- Neutral: 18% (15)
- Will not recommend: 7% (6)
- Strongly will not recommend: 1% (1)

### What do you like about the booth? (multiple selections accepted) (n=87) #
- It provides protection to the swabber: 92% (80)
- It creates a separate space for swabbing: 71% (62)
- It makes the disinfection process easier and quicker: 64% (56)
- It is easy to move around: 51% (44)
- It is easy to conduct swab tests using the booth: 47% (41)
- It provides privacy to the patient: 41% (36)
- Others: 2% (2)

### What do you not like about the booth? (multiple selections accepted) (n=86) #
- Others (e.g. gloves, glove port height): 44% (38)
- Takes up too much space: 34% (29)
- Difficult to conduct swab tests using the booth: 31% (27)
- Difficult to disinfect: 16% (14)
- Troublesome to set up and store: 16% (14)
- Inadequate patient privacy: 14% (12)
- Inadequate swabber protection: 1% (1)

### Were you swabbing patients prior to receiving the booth? (n=92) #
- Yes: 53% (49)
- No: 47% (43)

### How important was getting the booth in your decision to participate in Swab-and-Send-Home (SASH)? (n=92) #
- Very important: 35% (32)
- Important: 23% (21)
- Somewhat important: 25% (23)
- Not important: 17% (16)

# = number of respondents who answered this question.
**Exploratory analyses of factors associated with user experience**

In addition, we performed exploratory analyses (see Table 4) to investigate factors associated with continued use of the booth, ergonomics evaluations, and importance of the booth to participating in swab testing. To explore the effect of age on user experience, we also compared responses of users under 50 years old with those 50 years and above.

*Table 4. Exploratory analyses of factors associated with user experience*
### Likes and dislikes correlated with continued booth use

| Likes:                                                                 | Currently swabbing with booth (n=68) | Currently swabbing without booth (n=16) | p-value (Pearson’s $c^2$ test) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| It creates a separate space for swabbing                             | 78% (53)                             | 44% (7)                                | 0.006#                          |
| It is easy to move around                                            | 56% (38)                             | 25% (4)                                | 0.026                           |
| It is easy to conduct swab tests using the booth                     | 59% (40)                             | 0% (0)                                 | <0.001                          |
| It provides protection for the swabber                               | 96% (65)                             | 81% (13)                               | 0.045#                          |
| It provides privacy to the patient                                   | 49% (33)                             | 19% (3)                                | 0.030                           |
| It makes the disinfection process easier and quicker                 | 69% (47)                             | 44% (7)                                | 0.057#                          |
| Dislikes:                                                            |                                      |                                        |                                 |
| It takes up too much space                                           | 26% (18)                             | 63% (10)                               | 0.006#                          |
| Difficult to conduct swab tests using the booth                      | 19% (13)                             | 88% (14)                               | <0.001                          |
| Difficult to disinfect                                               | 15% (10)                             | 25% (4)                                | 0.320                           |
| Troublesome to set up and store                                      | 10% (7)                              | 44% (7)                                | 0.001#                          |
| Inadequate patient privacy                                           | 10% (7)                              | 25% (4)                                | 0.117                           |
| Inadequate swabber protection                                        | 0% (0)                               | 6% (1)                                 | 0.038#                          |
| Commented on gloves                                                  | 32% (22)                             | 25% (4)                                | 0.567                           |
| Commented on glove ports                                             | 13% (9)                              | 25% (4)                                | 0.242                           |

*# some cells have expected count less than 5
Results in **bold** are statistically significant*

### Comparison of users <50 years old and ≥50 years old

| Comparison of users <50 years old and ≥50 years old | <50 years old | ≥50 years old | Pearson’s $c^2$/t (p-value) |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Currently using the booth                            | 72% (36)       | 76% (32)      | $c^2 = 1.313$ (p=0.252)    |
| Not swabbing prior to receiving booth                | 36% (18)       | 60% (25)      | $c^2 = 5.074$ (p=0.024)    |
| Total number of likes                                | Mean = 3.45, SD= 1.74 | Mean = 4.13, SD= 1.34 | t= 2.048 (p=0.044)         |
| Total number of dislikes                             | Mean = 1.47, SD=1.25 | Mean = 1.74, SD=1.33 | t= 0.988 (p=0.326)         |
How important was getting the booth to your decision to participate in SASH? (1=not important; 4=very important)

Mean = 2.64, SD=1.17
Mean = 2.88, SD=1.04
t= 1.032 (p=0.305)

How likely are you to recommend the booth? (1=will strongly recommend; 5=strongly will not recommend)

Mean = 2.04, SD=1.07
Mean = 1.85, SD=0.88
t= -0.918 (p=0.361)

79% continued using the booth to conduct COVID swabs at the time of filling out the survey. 74% of the respondents said that they “would recommend” or “would strongly recommend” the booth to colleagues.

Top three features of the booth which the GPs liked were swabber protection (92%), creation of a separate space for swabbing (71%) and ease of disinfection (64%). We compared those who continued to use the booth to swab and those who were swabbing without the booth (see Table 4). Those who continued to use the booth were more likely to indicate their appreciation for the ease of moving the booth around (56% vs 25%, p=0.026), ease of swabbing (59% vs 0%, p<0.001) and the patient privacy it provided (49% vs 19%, p=0.030). They were less likely to indicate a dislike related to conducting a swabbing test in the booth (19% vs 88%, p<0.001).

Top dislikes were that it took up too much space (34%), difficulty in swabbing (31%) and difficulty in disinfecting (16%).

Ergonomics was rated as either poor, adequate or excellent. 56% of the GPs rated the ergonomics of the booth as adequate, 23% excellent and 21% poor. Poorer ratings were correlated with GPs' heights falling outside the range of 160-180cm (p=0.033) and the user making free-text comments on the glove ports (p=0.010), but not about the gloves (p=0.630, all Pearson chi-square). Poorer ratings on ergonomics were correlated with selecting the dislike of difficulty in swabbing (p=0.001, Pearson chi-square) and number of total dislikes (p<0.001).

47% of the GPs were not swabbing prior to receiving the booth. 58% of the GPs said the booth was “important” or “very important” to their decision to participate in the SASH programme.

Rating of importance to participation in SASH was correlated with the reason for applying for the booth because the GP did not have the necessary equipment (Pearson correlation p=0.002). It was also correlated with liking the swabber protection (p=0.005), ease of disinfection (p=0.004), ease of conducting swab tests (p<0.001), mobility of the booth (p=0.002) and patient privacy (p=0.034).

A significantly higher proportion of GPs 50 years and above (60%) were not swabbing before receiving the booth, compared to the younger GPs (36%) (Pearson chi-square p=0.024). Respondents over 50 years tended to indicate more likes than those below 50 (Total number of likes was 4.13 vs 3.45, 2-tailed significance p=0.050).

**Patterns of use**
52% of GPs swabbed outdoors or semi-outdoors. 85% of GPs swabbed ≤5 patients a day and 96% of the swabs were done by doctors. Swabbers wore N95 masks (94%), isolation gowns (97%), gloves (96%) and eye protection gear (75%) and 56% changed items of PPE after every swab. Booths were disinfected by clinic assistants (76%) and most often with alcohol (75%). 74% reported that the booth required only 1 person to move it around.

**Users’ free text comments on booth design**

55% of the GPs made free text comments on the booth (see Table 5). Main critiques were on the gloves, height of glove ports and the bulkiness of the booth.

7 respondents expressed appreciation for the booth. One memorable compliment was from an elderly GP:

“I am very grateful for the booth, without which I would not have started doing the swab. The peace of mind it gives me is tremendous, as I am already 67 and have co morbidity as well. Hence the swab booth gives me the opportunity to help in the fight against Covid. Thank you again.”

**Table 5. Themes in free text comments on the booth**
| Theme | Sub-theme | Examples |
|-------|-----------|----------|
| Gloves (35) | Prefer to swab without long gloves (9) | “I cut off the hands of the gloves as it was time consuming and difficult to use with the gloves” |
| | Wrong size (7) | “supplied gloves too small. Not used as a result.” |
| | Not touch-sensitive enough (6) | “glooves [sic] thick and lac [sic] ‘feel’”, “hand gloves are too stiff” |
| | Generally hard to use (6) | “The full length rubber glove that came with booth hard to use” |
| | Tear easily (5) | “Some difficulty applying gloves onto the booth - the gloves tear easily” |
| | Hard to insert/remove hands (4) | “the gloves are too rigid, VERY hard to even get my hands in, granted that I have big hands, size 8” |
| | Slippery (3) | “The gloves are slippery and makes handling poor.” |
| | Hard to change gloves (1) | “Gloves that can be easily fitted and changed” |
| Accommodating different-sized users (22) | Height & restrictiveness of glove port (16) | “Booth is not user friendly as there is a restriction in terms of height due to the fixed location of the hand glove position. it restricts the height of both the swabber and patients” |
| | Could not swab sitting/wheelchair patients (6) | “it is not wheelchair or elderly friendly.” |
| | Cubicle too small or short (2) | “however, the top of the booth is too low for Caucasian patients” “For a ladies [sic] frame it’s a good fit but not for the larger built guys” |
| Dimensions (19) | Too bulky/wanted foldable (10) | “Try to design a foldable one.” “no need to be so bulky and tall” |
| | Patient cubicle dimensions (3) | “Too far for patient. Patient can move away during swab.” |
| | Too heavy (3) | “heavy to push in and out of the clinic after every session” |
| Miscellaneous (19) | Want it more enclosed (6) | “There is no "door" to total close patient in so to ensure the aerosol particles are contain within the booth...” |
| | Enhance places to put things (5) | “Put a ledge on patients’ side so the things less likely to drop” “compartments to put disinfectants and swabbing material [sic]” |
| | Others (8) – 2 or fewer comments per theme | “Difficult for patient to hear me while swabbing - I bought a mic and speaker set to overcome this” |

**Discussion**

As of 19 November 2020 there were about 425 GPs publicly listed as being on the SASH programme. Our study found that 170 GPs had requested a swabbing booth. Around half (47%) of the respondents
only started swabbing after receiving the booth, suggesting that the booth helped to increase GP participation in swab testing. Around three-quarters of the users were satisfied with the booth with 79% of the GPs continuing to use it and 74% who would recommend it. Majority of the GPs liked the swabber protection (92%), creation of a separate space for swabbing (71%) and ease of disinfection (64%). 74% of the GPs reported that the booth required only one person to move it, suggesting that our booth design had achieved the objectives of being mobile, lightweight and easy to set up. The survey highlighted some areas of user dissatisfaction: 34% felt the booth took up too much space; 21% rated the ergonomics as poor. Free-text comments often criticized the gloves, height of glove ports and bulkiness of the booth. To our knowledge, this is the first study where a swabbing booth was designed by GPs for GPs. It is novel as it also assesses user satisfaction.

**Human-centred design in a pandemic**

A possible reason why the booth was well-received is that we applied human-centred design principles, involving GP users early in the design process.

At the design stage, we had considered the areas of user dissatisfaction, such as booth size, glove port height and gloves. However, there was no immediate solution to making the booth smaller or foldable without compromising the ergonomics or structural integrity. The glove port height was designed for a swabber 1.55-1.75m high but was not height adjustable. Although the gloves were the best of several ready-made products available, improvements are needed to facilitate swabbing.

The booth was designed under time, movement and resource constraints during the COVID-19 pandemic. There was urgency to complete the design in two weeks to be in time for the lifting of a national lockdown that we anticipated would increase demand for community swab testing. If there were fewer constraints, a more refined booth may have been achieved, perhaps with a choice of sizes and adjustable-height glove ports. In the future, gloves could be purpose-designed addressing the swabbers’ feedback.

The 10 pilot GP testers understood the constraints as they had been closely communicating with the design team. Thus, they did not expect a perfect product. However, when the final booth was delivered to 170 practices working independently, it became a “ready-to-use” product. The GPs were now the consumers and thus they may have had higher expectations. On reflection, we recognise that attention should have been given to communicating the booth features to users through providing documentation and setting up user networks where feedback can be rapidly addressed.

**Learning about booth users**

The survey revealed insights on the group of GPs motivated to take up the booth. These were PHPC GPs practicing in small clinics in public residential estates, concerned about swabber protection, disinfection, cost and proper equipment. Despite being supplied PPE, they still requested a swabbing booth, and more than half changed items of PPE after every swab, suggesting an acute consciousness of infection
control. Among these GPs, 50-59-year olds constituted the largest group. Those 50 years old and above were significantly less likely to be swabbing before receiving the booth and indicated more likes for the booth.

**Limitations**

The 170 GPs represent around one-sixth of the 930 PHPC GPs. The recruited GPs were from established GP networks (e.g. College of Family Physicians Singapore, Primary Care Networks), and their views may not reflect those of PHPC GPs in general. Replicating the study in a different time and place may not produce similar user satisfaction results if other forms of swabber protection were readily available.

**Conclusion**

The human-centred design approach generated a product that yielded user satisfaction, addressed GPs’ concerns of swabber protection and increased GPs’ participation in swab testing. The booth may be useful in settings where GPs are concerned about swabber protection and space is limited.
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Figures

**COSMO SafeSwab Slim Booth**

*A compact, mobile, easy-to-clean swabbing booth that can be used outdoors*

- **Clear polycarbonate** can be wiped down with alcohol
- **Glove ports** to attach removable gloves
- **Patient cubicle** with smooth surfaces for easy wipedown
- **Curved shelf**
- **3” lockable castors**
- **Removable roof** for shelter & containing spray
- **Frosted side panels** for privacy
- **Handles** for pushing the booth
- **Aluminium body**, total weight 27kg
- **Anti-microbial coating**
- **Gloves**
  - touch-sensitive
  - low cost
  - easy to replace

**Figure 1**

Final design of mobile swabbing booth
Figure 2

Photograph of the booth
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