**S3 Table:** Results of Quality Assessment & Risk Bias of Included Studies (After Inter-Author Agreement)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Authors** | **Objectives** | **Methodology** | | | | | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Limitations** | **Score** | **Quality** |
|  | **Objective/**  **Hypothesis is explicitly stated in the study** | **Are methodological details given, as appropriate, for the decontamination technique such as dose of irradiation, duration of exposure, concentration of the chemical disinfectants, temperature etc.** | **Are classes of respirators explicitly described** | **Sampling methodology clearly defined as per defined objective** | **Sample size calculation described** | **Statistical analysis is done to reject or accept hypothesis** | **Is control group used to compare results** | **Primary outcome measures clearly defined** | **Was the primary outcome measured objectively rather than subjectively** | **Are limitations of the study discussed in relevant section** | **Combined scores based on assessment by both the authors** | **Quality of studies based on scoring** |
| Lindsley et al 20158 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Bergman et al 201014 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | 9 | Good |
| Lore et al 201115 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Viscusi et al 200916 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Fisher et al 201117 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Heimbuch et al 201418 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | 7 | Moderate |
| Mills BS et al 201819 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Heimbuch et al 201120 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Viscusi et al 201121 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 10 | Good |
| Viscusi et al 200722 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | 8 | Good |
| Bergman et al 201123 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | 9 | Good |
| Fisher et al 201024 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Vo et al 200925 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Fisher et al 200926 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Salter et al 201027 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | N | Y | Y | Y | 7 | Moderate |
| Lin et al 201728 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | 9 | Good |
| Lin et al 201829 | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | 7 | Moderate |

**Legend: Scoring Pattern:** 1 Marks for each Y, 0 Mark for Each N. **Grading of studies** – Score (8-10): Good quality, Score (6-7): Moderate quality, Score (≤5): Poor quality