

A Systematic Review of Droplet and Aerosol Generation in Dentistry

N. Innes¹, I.G. Johnson¹, W. Al-Yaseen², R. Harris³, R. Jones⁴, S. KC⁵, S. McGregor⁶, M. Robertson², W.G. Wade⁷ and J.E. Gallagher⁵

¹ Applied Clinical Research and Public Health, School of Dentistry, College of Biomedical and Life Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

² Child Dental and Oral Health, School of Dentistry, University of Dundee, Dundee, UK

³ Department of Public Health, Policy and Systems, Institute of Population Health, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

⁴ Education, Scholarship and Innovation, School of Dentistry, College of Biomedical and Life Sciences, Cardiff University, UK

⁵ Faculty of Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences King's College London, London, UK

⁶ Library & Learning Centre, University of Dundee, Dundee, UK

⁷ Centre for Host-Microbiome Interactions, Faculty of Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences, King's College London, London, UK

Corresponding author: Prof Nicola Innes

Professor Nicola P T Innes

Head of School of Dentistry

Professor and Honorary Consultant, Paediatric Dentistry

College of Biomedical & Life Sciences

Cardiff University

Heath Park

Cardiff

CF14 4XY

E-mail: InnesN@cardiff.ac.uk

Web: <https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/dentistry>

Words: 3868

Figures: 4

Tables: 1

Supplementary files: 1 Appendix

Keywords: Aerosol generating procedures, Evidence-based dentistry, Systematic reviews, Infection control, COVID-19, aerosols.

A Systematic Review of Droplet and Aerosol Generation in Dentistry

Abstract

Objectives: Against the COVID-19 pandemic backdrop and potential disease transmission risk by dental procedures that can generate aerosol and droplets, this review aimed to identify which clinical dental procedures do generate droplets and aerosols with subsequent contamination, and for these, characterise their pattern, spread and settle.

Data Sources: Six databases were searched and citation chasing undertaken (to 11/08/20).

Study selection: Screening stages were undertaken in duplicate, independently, by two researchers. Data extraction was performed by one reviewer and verified by another.

Results: Eighty-three studies met the inclusion criteria and covered: Ultrasonic scaling (USS, n=44), highspeed air-rotor (HSAR, n=31); oral surgery (n=11), slow-speed handpiece (n=4); air-water (triple) syringe (n=4), air-polishing (n=4), prophylaxis (n=2) and hand-scaling (n=2). Although no studies investigated respiratory viruses, those on bacteria, blood splatter and aerosol showed activities using powered devices produced the greatest contamination. Contamination was found for all activities, and at the furthest points studied. The operator's torso operator's arm, and patient's body were especially affected. Heterogeneity precluded significant inter-study comparisons but intra-study comparisons allowed construction of a proposed hierarchy of procedure contamination risk: higher risk (USS, HSAR, air-water syringe [air only or air/water together], air polishing, extractions using motorised handpieces); moderate (slow-speed handpieces, prophylaxis with pumice, extractions) and lower (air-water syringe [water only] and hand scaling).

Conclusion: Significant gaps in the evidence, low sensitivity of measures and variable quality limit firm conclusions around contamination for different procedures. However, a hierarchy of contamination from procedures can be proposed for challenge/verification by future research which should consider standardised methodologies to facilitate research synthesis.

Clinical significance (49 words):

This manuscript addresses uncertainty around aerosol generating procedures (AGPs) in dentistry. Findings indicate a continuum of procedure-related aerosol generation rather than the current binary AGP or non-AGP perspective. This informs discussion around AGPs and direct future research to help support knowledge and decision making around COVID-19 and dental procedures.

Background

SARS-CoV-2 is the highly infectious virus which causes COVID-19 [1]. Transmission has been thought to be primarily via respiratory droplets, direct contact and fomites. Virus particles can be detected up to 72 hours after inoculation of plastic and steel surfaces [1-3]. However, SARS-CoV-2 has been found to remain viable in air for at least three hours with growing evidence and concern over possible airborne transmission [2, 4].

Dental care involves close patient contact for prolonged periods leading to concern over transmission through aerosol generation during dental procedures [5, 6], compounded by consistent detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva [7]. In dentistry, universal precautions have been standard practice, based on evidence-informed infection control. These evolve as evidence emerges, particularly in response to blood and water borne infections and prion transmission [8-10].

The term Aerosol Generating Procedure (AGP) has been described as, “any procedure on a patient that can induce the production of aerosols of various sizes” although there is currently no agreed definition and a confusing lack of consistency in terminology. The UK National Emerging Respiratory Virus Threats Advisory Group has described “dental procedures (using highspeed devices such as Ultrasonic scalers and highspeed drills)” [11] as posing an increased risk of respiratory infection transmission. New terms such as aerosol generating exposure (AGE) have been suggested [12]. Policy documents have focused on ultrasonic scalers (USS), high-speed air-rotors (HSAR), air-water syringes (also known as triple or 3-in-1), and air polishers as sources of aerosols, with rubber dam and high-volume suction as mitigating measures [13-15].

To manage transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2, the extent and contamination of droplets and aerosols involved in dental procedures need to be identified. Similarly, the pattern, and timing, associated with spread and settle of droplets and aerosols in the context of clinical dentistry need to be understood to inform policy on surgery fallow times between patients. Globally specified patient spacing times for AGPs vary from none to 120 minutes [16].

An aerosol is defined as a suspension of liquid or solid in air [17, 18]. When an aerosol is created with a liquid, a wide range of droplet sizes are produced. Particle size is a continuum, from larger heavier droplets, $> 5 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter that fall rapidly to the ground, typically within 1 m of the source as splatter. Aerosols are composed of droplet nuclei $\leq 5 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter and can remain suspended in air for many hours and be moved by air currents. At present, dental procedures are categorised dichotomously as either aerosol producing or non-aerosol producing. The former refers to procedures considered to produce smaller droplets of $\leq 5 \mu\text{m}$ and the latter referring to procedures that are considered to produce few or no smaller droplets but may still produce larger droplets ($> 5 \mu\text{m}$). For the purposes of this review, aerosol will refer to suspensions of particles $\leq 5 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter.

This review aims to critically assess existing knowledge and reduce uncertainty around dental procedures that generate droplets and aerosol, supporting policy making and local IPC protocols.

Research question

What is known and what is not known about aerosols and droplets relevant to clinical dentistry?

Objectives:

1. To identify and catalogue activities within clinical dentistry and the dental surgery that generate aerosols and droplets
2. For these activities, to:
 - a. Characterise the pattern of droplet and aerosol spread and settle relevant to the dental surgery and dental laboratories
 - b. Identify whether there is evidence of an association with exposure, infection and transmission of pathogenic micro-organisms
 - c. List micro-organisms that have been studied
 - d. Record outcomes and outcome measures
3. To identify gaps in the evidence related to aerosols and droplets relevant to clinical dentistry

Methods

Protocol and Registration

This review has been conducted and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) [19], registered under the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews ID number [CRD42020193058](#) and Appendix 1 gives full details.

Eligibility Criteria for study selection

Inclusion criteria:

- Study methodology – including but not limited to; trials, observational, experimental (including those using manikins, modelling studies, etc.), qualitative studies, non-clinical reports and other relevant studies;
- Topic of study - investigate activities that generate aerosols etc. relevant to clinical dentistry;
- Where there is a measure of aerosols and droplets;
- Types of settings: dental practices and hospital settings, including simulated environments where there are relevant to the conduct of dental procedures and investigations; and

- English or Chinese language

Information Sources

Medline (OVID), Embase (OVID), Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Scopus, Web of Science and LILACS databases were searched for studies meeting the inclusion criteria and ClinicalTrials.gov was searched for recently completed, ongoing, or recruiting trials from the start of the databases to May 2020. The search was updated on 11 August 2020 to identify new studies published since the original search was conducted.

Search

The search strategy (Appendix 2) comprised controlled vocabulary and keywords. The references of all reviews, policy documents and included studies were screened for eligible studies.

Screening and selection of studies

Titles and abstracts were deduplicated and screened in Rayyan [20] independently and in duplicate by two reviewers. Where either reviewer considered a paper potentially eligible for inclusion, the full text was sought. Full texts of potential articles were retrieved and assessed independently and in duplicate. Full texts were exported into Endnote and a database created in Excel. Differences were resolved by consensus involving at least one other research group member.

Data extraction

A standardised data extraction form was developed a priori and refined based on repeat pilot testing with a minimum of five publications and three data extractors. Eight reviewers were trained in data extraction form completion. Reviewers extracted data into an excel spreadsheet singly but consulted another reviewer where data reporting was unclear. Key missing data items were managed by contacting study investigators where possible. For studies where an intervention was measured for its ability to alter droplet and aerosol spread, only data relating to the baseline or control (i.e. without the intervention effect) was extracted.

Data items

The items of data extracted included: study demographics; dental procedures investigated; methodology; findings – (related to the reviews' outcomes). Detection methods for contamination were categorised as microbial, blood and other (non-microbial/non-blood) methodologies.

Quality assessments

The quality of the papers (see Protocol in Appendix 1) was assessed. Increases in evidence production aligning to infectious disease outbreaks was checked to investigate publication bias.

Sensitivity assessments

The sensitivity of contamination assessment tools was assessed using schema tailored to the individual methodologies: microbial measures; blood measures; other [non-

microbial/non-blood measures). These are presented overall for all studies and grouped by procedure to allow a picture of the sensitivity of the methods used, and therefore accuracy of the results in reflecting actual contamination. This allowed a judgement on the likelihood of under- or over-reporting of contamination for each study, and by procedure.

Relative contamination of procedures

Where methodology was similar enough to compare contamination levels or studies included multiple procedures, the relative contamination levels between procedures were examined.

Results

There were 83 studies (Appendix 3) which met the inclusion criteria and for which we could obtain full manuscripts (see PRISMA flow chart Figure 1.).

Figure 1.

Studies originated from 24 countries, the majority conducted in the USA (n=26) and India (n= 21). They were published between 1963 to 2020 with 43/83 (52%) of the studies published in the last decade (Figure 2.)

Figure 2.

A full description of the studies' characteristics and the data extracted can be found in Appendix 4.

The extracted data were heterogeneous across key characteristics, including; aims, methodology and outcomes. A narrative summary was undertaken and within study comparisons of relative contamination made. Whilst there were no studies showing a direct association between dental procedures with exposure, infection and transmission of pathogenic micro-organisms (outcome 2b), there was evidence of contamination of persons in the dental surgery and the surgery environment (surfaces, equipment etc.) and air from all procedures investigated although the levels of contamination varied (Appendix 4).

Approaches to the investigation varied: some studied procedures, some instruments and some both. Data were separated into the following categories: USS (n=44 studies), HSAR (n=31); oral surgery (n=11), slow-speed handpiece (n=4); air-water syringe (n=4), air polishing (n=4), prophylaxis with cup and pumice (n=2) and hand scaling (n=2).

Table 1 Main characteristics of the included studies categorised by dental procedure/ instrument use (n=83). Please note that the numbering in this table refers to the list of references (included studies) in Appendix 3 and are not the same numbering system as found in the main text.

Procedure category (no of studies) (First author year) Unique study identification numbers	Procedures investigated (e.g. cavity preparation) and type of investigation (clinical/ laboratory, patient/ mannequin)	Investigated contamination of operator, assistant, patient	Area within dental surgery investigated*	Different timepoints sampled (hours, minutes, seconds) * Unique study identification numbers	Sensitivity scores for outcome methodologies
USS (n=44) Balcos 2019 ⁵ , Barnes 1998 ⁶ , Bentley 1994 ⁸ , Choi 2018 ⁹ , Chuang 2014 ¹⁰ , Devker 2012 ¹⁶ , Feres 2010 ²¹ , Fine 1992 ²² , Fine 1993 a ²³ , Fine 1993b ²⁴ , Graetz 2014 ²⁵ , Grenier 1995 ²⁹ , Gupta 2014 ³¹ , Hallier 2010 ³² , Harrel 1998 ³⁴ , Harrel 1996 ³³ , Holloman 2015 ³⁷ , Jawade 2016 ⁴¹ , Kaur 2014 ⁴⁴ , King 1997 ⁴⁵ , Labaf 2011 ⁴⁸ , Miller 1971 ⁹⁰ , Mohan 2016 ⁵² , Narayana 2016 ⁵⁴ , Nejatidanesh 2013 ⁵⁵ , Prospero 2003 ⁵⁹ , Purohit 2009 ⁶⁰ , Ramesh 2015 ⁶¹ , Rao 2015 ⁶² , Reddy 2012 ⁶⁴ , Retamal-Valdes 2017 ⁶⁵ , Rivera-Hidalho 1999 ⁶⁶ , Sadun 2020 ⁶⁹ , Saini 2015 ⁷⁰ , Sawhney 2015 ⁷¹ , Serban 2013 ⁷² , Sethi 2019 ⁷³ , Shetty 2013 ⁷⁴ , Singh 2016 ⁷⁶ , Swaminathan 2014 ⁷⁸ , Timmerman 2004 ⁸⁰ , Veena 2015 ⁸³ , Watanabe 2013 ⁸⁵ , Yamada 2011 ⁸⁷	Ultrasonic scaling (n=44) Simulation Mannequin (n=3) ^{8,25,83} Simulation Typodont Laboratory (n=3) ^{33,34,66}	Operator (n=18) 5,8,9,10,16,21,31,44,45,55,59,60,63,65,70,72,83,85 Head/face (n=13) ^{8,9,10,16,21,31,44,53,59,65,72,83,85} Body (n=8) ^{5,8,10,31,60,70,83,85} Assistant (n=4) Head (n=2) ^{16,83} Body (n=3) ^{31,70,83} Patient (n=14) Chest (n=14) ^{5,8,16,21,31,44,60,61,62,65,70,71,73,85}	Environmental surfaces < 1m (n=15) 8,16,21,33,37,45,52,54,61,66,71,73,74,76,78) >1m (n=3) 25,44,64 < 1m and > 1m (n=9) 10,41,48,69,90,70,80,83,87 Air Samples (n=7) ^{6,22,23,24,29,32,87}	During procedure (n=28) 8,9,22,23,24,25,32,48,90,52,54,59,60,61,62,64,65,66,69,70,72,73,74,76,78,80,85,87 During and after combined (n=8) 10,16,21,31,41,44,45,71 After procedure (n=3) 0-30 min ^{29,37,83} 30 min-1 hr ^{29,37,83} 1-2 hr ^{29,83} 2-4 hr ²⁹	High sensitivity (n=5) Moderate sensitivity (n=3) Low sensitivity (n=34) Uncategorized sensitivity (n=2)
HSAR (n= 31) Al-Amad 2017 ³ , Belting 1963 ⁹³ , Bentley 1994 ⁸ , Cochrane 1989 ⁹² , Dahlke 2012 ¹³ , Day 2008 ¹⁵ , Earnest ²⁰ , Greco 2008 ²⁸ , Grenier 1995 ²⁹ , Grundy 1967 ³⁰ , Hallier 2010 ³² , Hausler 1966 ³⁶ , Junevičius 2005 ⁴² , Labaf 2011 ⁴⁸ , Larato 1966 ⁹¹ , Manarte-Monteiro 2013 ⁵⁰ , Micik 1969 ⁸⁹ , Miller 1971 ⁹⁰ , Miller 1995 ⁵¹ , Neiatidanesh 2013 ⁵⁵ , Oliveira 2018 ⁵⁶ , Prospero 2003 ⁵⁹ , Purohit 2009 ⁶⁰ , Rautemaa 2006 ⁶³ , Samaranayake 1989 ⁸⁸ , Stevens 1963 ⁹⁶ , Tag El-Din 1997 ⁹⁴ , Toroğlu 2001 ⁸¹ , Toroğlu 2003 ⁸ , Travaglini ⁹⁵ , Yamada 2011 ⁸⁷	Tooth/cavity preparation (clinic) (n= 24) Mannequin/ Typodont (clinic) (n=3) ^{8,36,42} Mannequin/ typodont simulation (laboratory) (n=4) ^{13,30,51,89}	Operator (n=10) Head/face (n=9) ^{96,95} 20,8,81,59,63,55,3 Body (n=2) ^{8,60} Assistant (n=3) Head/face (n=3) ^{8,81,63} Body (n=1) ⁸ Patient (n=6) Intra-oral (n=1) ²⁰ Head/face (n=1) ⁹⁵ Body (n=4) ^{92,20,8,94}	Using settle plate within 1m of operating area (n=12) ^{93,8,92,42,48,59,63,90,60,81,94,87} Using settle plate 1m or more from operating area (n=9) ^{93,48,90,56,63,94,60,63,81}	Within the first 30 minutes after the procedure (n=4) ^{8,29,51,94} Between (30 min -1 hr) after procedure (n=2) ^{29,51} 1-2 hr (n=2) ^{29,51} 2-4 hr (n=2) ^{29,51} > 4 hr (n=1) ⁵¹	High sensitivity (n=4) Moderate sensitivity (n=6) Low sensitivity (n=21)

<p>Oral surgery (including extractions) (n=11)</p> <p>Al-Eid 2018⁴, Divya 2019¹⁷, Hallier 2010³², Ishiharma 2008³⁸, Ishiharma 2009³⁹, Janani 2018⁴⁰, Jimson 2015⁴³, Kobza 2018⁴⁶, Wada 2010⁸⁴, Yamada 2011⁸⁷, Aguilar-Duran 2020⁹⁸</p>	<p>Surgical removal of teeth (clinic) (n=8)^{4, 17, 38, 39, 84, 43, 87, 98}</p> <p>Implants (clinic) (n=1)⁹⁸</p> <p>Extraction (clinic) (n=2)^{32, 98}</p> <p>Other: restorative and periodontal procedures (clinic) (n=1)⁸⁷</p> <p>Not verified/ unclear (clinic) (n=2)^{40, 46}</p>	<p>Operator (n=5)</p> <p>Head/ face/neck (n=4)^{4, 38, 40, 98}</p> <p>Arms/ Cuffs/ hands (n=3)^{4, 38, 40}</p> <p>Abdomen/ shoes (n=3)^{4, 38, 40}</p> <p>Nearby operator (n=1)⁴³</p> <p>Assistant (n=3)</p> <p>Head/ face/neck (n=2)^{4, 98}</p> <p>Arms/ Cuffs/ hands, (n=1)⁴</p> <p>Other body parts (n=1)⁴</p> <p>Nearby assistant (n=1)⁴³</p> <p>Patient: (n=3)</p> <p>Head/ face, (n=1)⁴</p> <p>Chest (n=2)^{4, 17, 43}</p>	<p>Environment and surfaces within 1m from operating area (n=4)^{17, 32, 39, 46, 87}</p> <p>Environment and surfaces 1m or more from operating area (n=0)</p> <p>Sampled at mouth (n=0)</p>	<p>Up to 30 min during procedure (n=2)^{17, 43}</p> <p>During treatment with agar plates replaced every 10 min (n=1)³²</p>	<p>High sensitivity (n=3)</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity (n=2)</p> <p>Low sensitivity (n=6)</p>
<p>Slow-speed handpiece (n=5)</p> <p>Agostinho 2004², Dawson 2016¹⁴, Day 2008¹⁵, Ireland 2003⁹⁷, Kritivasan 2019⁴⁷</p>	<p>Removal of excess material following fixed orthodontic appliance removal (n=3)^{14, 15, 97}</p> <p>Polishing and trimming of denture (n=2)^{2, 47}</p>	<p>Operator (n=1)² (thorax and abdomen area of technician)</p>	<p>Air sampler 30cm from patient's mouth (n=2)^{14, 15}</p> <p>Air sampler 10cm from patient's mouth (n=1)⁹⁷</p> <p>Settle plates at 1ft, 2ft and 3ft from the motor n=1⁴⁷</p>	<p>Not specified (n=5)</p>	<p>High sensitivity (n=3)</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity (n=0)</p> <p>Low sensitivity (n=2)</p>
<p>Air-water syringe (n=4)</p> <p>Belting 1963⁹³, Mick 1969⁸⁹, Miller 1971⁹⁰, Miller 1995⁵¹</p>	<p>Air-water syringe with air and water used together (n=3)^{89, 90, 95}</p> <p>Air-water syringe with air alone (n=4)^{51, 89, 90, 93}</p> <p>Air-water syringe with water alone (n=4)^{51, 89, 90, 93}</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Experimental simulation-Air Samples</p> <p>Human aerosol test chamber⁸⁹</p> <p>Quartz crystal microbalance cascade impactor (QCMCI)⁹⁵</p> <p>Clinical (splatter plate)^{90, 91}</p> <p>0-1m^{90, 91}</p> <p>1-2m^{90, 91}</p>	<p>During procedure (n=3)^{89, 90, 93}</p> <p>After procedure (n=1)⁵¹: at 2 min, 35 min, 2 hr, 4 hr and 6 hr.</p>	<p>High sensitivity (n=0)</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity (n=1)</p> <p>Low sensitivity (n=3)</p>
<p>Air polishing (n=4)</p>	<p>Air polishing (clinic)</p>	<p>Operator</p> <p>Head/face</p>	<p>Air sampled 12 in from</p>	<p>30 min including procedure of 2</p>	<p>High sensitivity (n=0)</p>

Dos Santos 2014 ¹⁸ , Harrel 1999 ³⁵ , Logothetis 1995 ⁴⁹ , Muzzin 1999 ⁵³	(n=3) ^{18,49,53} Mannequin/typodont simulation (laboratory) (n=1) ³⁵	(n=3) ^{18,49,53} Patient Body (n=1) ¹⁸	patients' mouth at a 50 degree angle ⁵³ Air sampled < 1m of operating area ³⁵ Surface < 1m operating area (n=1) ⁴⁹ Surface > 1 m (n=1) ⁴⁹	min ^{49,53} During procedure (n=2) ^{18,35}	Moderate sensitivity (n=1) Low sensitivity (n=3)
Prophy: cup and pumice (n=2) Micik 1969 ⁸⁹ , Miller 1971 ⁹⁰	Prophy on patient's head in closed experimental test chamber with side glove ports (clinic) (n=1) ⁸⁹ Prophy (clinic) (n=1) ⁹⁰	N/A	Air sampling of the closed chamber around the patient's head ⁸⁹ Air sampled 3 ft from floor and 1 ft from patients' mouth (in front) to the sides and end of the surgery ⁹⁰	During the procedure (10-120 sec) with 4 min clearance period of quiet breathing before and after ⁸⁹ During procedure (30 sec) ⁹⁰	High sensitivity (n=0) Moderate sensitivity (n=0) Low sensitivity (n=2)
Hand scaling (n=2) Harrel 1998 ³⁴ , Micik 1969 ⁸⁹	Hand scaling patient head in closed test chamber with side glove ports (clinic) (n=1) ⁸⁹ Mannequin/typodont simulation (laboratory) (n=1) ³⁴	N/A	Air sampling of the closed chamber around the patient's head ⁸⁹ Air sampled around mouth distance not specified ³⁴	During procedure (10-120 sec) with 4 mins clearance period of quiet breathing before and afterwards ⁸⁹ During procedure (2 sec) ³⁴	High sensitivity (n=0) Moderate sensitivity (n=0) Low sensitivity sampling/measuring approach (n=3)

*m = meter(s); ft – foot/feet; in = inch(es); cm = centimetre(s); hr = hour(s); min = minute(s); sec = second(s).

Settle plates were used in 48 studies, 12 used visual inspection and 23 used air samplers (specific for aerosol). The main findings for each of the instruments/ procedure categories is summarised below (n= number of studies), with further detail provided in Table 1 and Appendix 4.

USS (n=44 studies)

All 37 studies with measures for droplet contamination (splatter) and where samples were collected from the air (n=7) had positive findings including those that used high volume and standard suction. There was greater droplet contamination within 1m distance of the patient (n=8) [21-28]. The operator's face (mask and visor area) were heavily contaminated (n=10) as were areas closer to the patient (operator's nearest arm) (n=2) [27, 29]. When assessed, contamination was identified on the assistant's face and

arm (n=4). The patient's body was heavily contaminated and their chest one of the most heavily contaminated areas. Contamination levels reduced with increasing distance from the mouth. At the maximum measured distance of 3 m, contamination was identified. Air sampling (n=3) found contaminated aerosol was generated during treatment [27, 30, 31] with a small proportion detectable at four feet before returning to baseline two hours post-treatment [30].

HSAR (31 studies)

There was wide variability in the procedures investigated: Restorative (n=27); cavity preparation, gaining endodontic access, fixed prosthesis tooth preparation; and Orthodontic (n=4); cement removal [following fixed appliances]; and procedural time (10 seconds to four hours). Contamination was detected on settle plates on surfaces across all (n=15) areas measured up to three meters from patient mouth [23, 32]. Contamination levels were highest in front of the patient and reduced with increasing distance from the mouth [21, 32, 33] and the lowest areas of contamination levels were behind the patient [33]. One study found approximately 80% of aerosol settled immediately following the procedure and reached baseline levels after two hours [30]. The operator, assistant and patient were consistently contaminated, most heavily on the operator's head and patient's chest. One study directly compared both single and multi-surgeries and found that contamination was detected over a larger distance when there were multiple dental chairs in an area [30].

Oral surgery (n= 11)

Oral surgery involving removal of teeth, generally third molars, used motorised handpieces of variable speeds (n=10; 1 assumed), reporting the use of irrigation (n=6), intra-oral suction/aspiration (n=5) in single and multiple chair dental settings, found risk of contamination (mostly blood, with evidence of anaerobic bacteria). Contamination was present on the patient (chest and face), operator (face/head, arm/glove/cuff, chest, abdomen, leg) and assistant (face/head, arm/glove/cuff, body) as well as the dental operatory and air environment (< 1 meter). Surgeons and assistants wore surgical PPE including gowns and the research was conducted in a range of settings, mainly dental hospital outpatient facilities (n=10). Most evidence was of blood spatter (visible and imperceptible) whilst microbiological examination was limited to aerobic testing. Imperceptible blood splatter was significantly higher than visible stains. Very limited evidence on extractions (n=2) suggests lower risk but not without risk of contamination. Risk increased with time, type of procedure and decreased with distance.

Slow-speed handpiece (n=5)

Three studied removal of excess material following fixed orthodontic appliance treatment [34-36] with air sampling equipment (to detect aerosol). Findings varied but could be related to study design differences. Dawson et al. [36] and Day et al. [35] found a marked increase in bacterial load during debonding and enamel cleaning compared to baseline

levels. Ireland et al. [34] detected particles (2 μ m to >30 μ m diameter) demonstrating facilitation of aerosol and droplets.

With denture polishing and trimming [37, 38] microbiological contamination was highest 2 feet from the operatory position compared to 1ft and 3ft [37] and microorganisms such as yeasts and Gram-negative bacteria were in the aerosol generated [38].

Air-water syringe (n=4)

All studies identified contamination following use [21, 39-41]. However, the extent of contamination varied widely (n=3). Air and water used together (spray) generated more than air alone and water alone the least [21, 39, 40]. Smaller particles remained in the air for more than 6 hours [41]. Bacterial contamination from droplets was detectable at 4 feet from the patient [39] and 6 feet from patients [21]. These were the maximum points sampled

Air polishing (n=4)

Air polishing demonstrated contamination of, in ascending order, the operator's forehead, operator's mouth and patients' chest. Contamination from air polishing was found nine feet from the treatment area even in a surgery with 13 air changes/hour [42].

Prophylaxis (n=2)

Prophylaxis with cup and pumice (n=2), [21, 40] produced less contamination than air-polishing (n=4). It produced a higher rate of contamination than washing teeth with a water stream, but lower than drying teeth with an air spray or using a high turbine with water coolant, as measured using the same closed test chamber (n=1).

Hand scaling (n=3)

Hand scaling produced minimal contamination (two artificial environments; patients' head in a closed experimental test chamber with side glove ports for the operator (n=1), and a mannequin in a closed box (n=1). Levels of air contamination in the test chamber were comparable to a clinical examination in the same experiment. When hand scaling with orthodontic treatment was compared to HSAR contamination was much lower when no powered instruments were used [33].

Relative contamination levels

Although there were 83 studies, the degree of heterogeneity in methodology meant it was not possible to compare data between them. The outcome of interest was contamination. It could be grouped as being microbial, blood and non-microbial/non-blood. However, within these, there were a large variety of outcome measures (Appendix 4). For example, even within those looking at colony forming units, the outcome measures encompassed; whole plate (CFU/mm²); (CFU/mm³); (CFU/cm²); (CFU/m³),

volume of sampled air (CFU/cm²/min), Index of Microbial Air Contamination (CFU/m²/h) and rate of production (CFU/min).

However, it was evident that there was a hierarchy of contamination levels with some procedures generating more contamination than others. A network diagram (Figure 3) illustrates where intra-study comparisons exist. Data from these 13 studies were tabulated (Appendix 5, Table 1) and compared for relative contamination levels within studies (Appendix 5, Table 2).

Figure 3

These studies and their data were then categorised as higher, moderate and lower relative contamination levels (Figure 4). This is a proposed hierarchy model and it should be noted that positions denote relative positions along a spectrum rather than definitive cut-offs between the three levels.

Figure 4

Quality Assessment

The quality assessment (Appendix 6) for the studies showed a mixed picture for each of the seven domains; the majority of studies scored “high” quality for one domain (controls), “moderate” for four (study funding, conflict of interest, procedure description and outcome reporting) and “low” for two (equipment use and sample size).

Sensitivity

Across all studies, for detecting contamination, 59 were rated as low sensitivity, 11 were moderate and 11 as having a high sensitivity. Sensitivity gradings for each procedure and by study are detailed in Appendix 6.

Discussion

The 83 studies included in this review looked at eight different activities classified as; USSs, HSAR and slow-speed handpieces, oral surgery, air-water syringe, air polishing and hand scaling. There was heterogeneity between methodologies used to investigate contamination and a lack of consistency even when the same methodology was used by different studies. Few studies used a high sensitivity measure making under-reporting of levels of contamination a concern. Despite the variable methodology and broadly low sensitivity of the methods used, all activities and all studies identified contamination from droplets that had either settled (splatter) or droplet nuclei remaining in the air as aerosol and at the furthest points studied.

Contamination levels varied with some activities such as hand scaling generating contamination no greater than occurs during speaking [21]. The greatest levels of contamination were found with procedures involving powered devices and water (HSAR and USS). Devices that used air and water together also generated splatter and aerosol and highest nearest the patient. It was not possible to draw conclusions around the use of the slow-speed handpiece with any certainty because no study compared it with anything else for either use of carious tissue removal or orthodontic cement removal.

Although dental procedures are commonly categorised dichotomously as either aerosol producing or non-aerosol producing, this is an over-simplification, bearing in mind that while droplet nuclei $\leq 5 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter are categorised as aerosols, in reality droplet size lies on a continuum. Since SARS-CoV2 transmission has been reported up to 4 m from the source [43], aerosol transmission remains a possibility.

The majority of studies used a settle plate methodology which is limited to capturing droplets which can carry viruses. Settle plates can detect droplets that have fallen onto a

surface. However, air turbulence caused by movement in the surgery may affect what is captured. Air samplers, most of which actively sample the air in the room, will therefore detect both aerosol and airborne droplets before they have fallen to ground (n=23 studies). Many of the studies that stated they were detecting aerosols, did not use a methodology that investigated airborne transmission (i.e. droplets <5 µm) such as air samplers. Most studies' findings related to droplet splatter detected on settle plates. However, both droplets and aerosols can carry viruses although the universal precautions currently in use will provide protection from droplet transmission.

Although we identified 83 studies investigating eight different procedures, it was difficult to draw definitive conclusions about relative droplet and aerosol generation between procedures. Firstly, because diverse methodologies had been used and secondly, because study quality was generally low, especially in relation to sensitivity of measuring contamination. Low sensitivity could result in significant underestimates: for example, saliva cultured under highly sensitive conditions will yield c 10⁸ CFU/ml but only 10⁵-10⁶ using low-sensitivity methods. Thirdly, all studies found contamination as far as they measured it and most, for as long as they measured it – which begs the question as to whether greater distances and times measured would have resulted in further positive findings. There was also insufficient data to explore differences according to environmental context such as ventilation or single/multi-chair surgeries (although where multi-surgery environments were studied this showed contamination over larger distances [30, 44]).

There has been growing research in this area with over half of the studies being published in the last decade. Most studies (n=62) used microbes purported to be from the oral cavity to monitor contamination from procedures. All, apart from two looking at the bloodborne virus Hepatitis B [45, 46] and three at fungi, investigated bacteria. None of the studies investigated contamination by respiratory viruses. This is despite several significant outbreaks of respiratory viruses where AGPs might have been a risk factor (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) 2003; Swine flu 2009; Middle East Respiratory Syndrome in 2012). Viruses are difficult to culture, in comparison to bacteria, which may account for this. Most of the studies looked at easily cultured oral bacteria as surrogates of contamination from the droplets and aerosol generated from the procedure. However, viruses are small (typically between 20-300 nm in diameter) and can be carried in the same way as bacteria, therefore patterns of bacterial splatter and aerosol can provide some information to inform viral spread.

None of the studies directly explored exposure (for the dental team or patient) to potentially pathogenic micro-organisms. Studies did, however, identify significant contamination relating to the operator's head and the patient's body when powered devices (HSARs and USSs) were used. Visors, glasses and masks were often heavily contaminated, with a small number of ultrasonic studies finding contamination under the visor and mask. The body and operating arm of the operator were subject to significant contamination and studies of the assistant found less contamination (although this varied depending on the area of the mouth being worked on). Areas closest to the patient were most affected. This has implications for decisions about personal protective equipment and the coverage needed. The patient's face and body were significantly contaminated as a result of powered devices (HSARs and USSs) and were often measured in the oral surgery procedures were also found to be contaminated. No studies investigated contamination of other areas, notably the patient's (and dentist's) leg areas but there is no reason to expect them to not be contaminated, given the spread noted across surgery areas in front of the patient. This has implications for infection control measures.

Beyond time, distances and settings there were further obvious gaps in the data as a

whole. These include a lack of negative controls and baseline measures, clarity of reporting over specific procedure times and time periods during and following them to see when there was no longer contamination from the procedure. However, the most concerning gap may be the general failure across the studies to report the limits of contamination for distance and very few reporting on time for settle. Studies on mitigating interventions (such as high-volume evacuators, HEPA filters, air changes etc.) may be able to clarify this area further. However, it is encouraging to see more research in the field being undertaken, with three papers published since this search was undertaken, fitting the inclusion criteria [47-49] and one further paper [50] awaiting full text assessment at the time of submission, hopefully these will add to the body of well conducted research informing risk and risk mitigation in relation to AGPs.

This review has focused on droplet and aerosol contamination relating to specific dental procedures, extending beyond previous work that looked at micro-organisms and hazards generated in dental practice [51]. This provides evidence which may be used to determine the baseline risks associated with dental procedures, helping dental professionals to identify clinical situations with increased aerosol transmission risks where mitigation would be strongly advisable.

Conclusion

Despite generally low sensitivity measures being used, there was evidence of contamination of surfaces around the surgery environment/ personnel or contamination in air from all procedures that were looked at: USS (n=44); HSAR (n=31 studies); oral surgery (n=11), slow-speed handpiece (n=4); air-water (triple) syringe (n=4), air polishing (n=4) hand scaling (n=2), prophylaxis with cup and pumice (n=2). There was evidence that this varied by procedure type. Most studies used microbial surrogate measures (mainly oral microbiota) and blood or colored water for detecting contamination following these procedures. None looked at respiratory viruses. The variability in methodology and variety of outcome measures thwarted attempts to synthesise across studies. By looking at comparisons of procedures within studies, blunt generalisations could be made over higher, moderate and lower risk procedures. There are significant gaps in the evidence and its quality that limit conclusions around all aspects of contamination for different procedures. These hamper evidence-based clinical recommendations and policy decision making, especially relevant for dentistry and COVID-19.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank library team at the British Dental Journal, for their quick response and dedication to try to supply the full text of papers we required where there was limited access to hard copies in the face of challenges imposed by the COVID-19 lockdown. A special thanks to the American Journal of Dentistry, who provided us a copy of one of their articles at no charge.

Authors contributions:

NI, IJ, RH, JG had oversight of the study planning and execution, and to the conception, design, data acquisition, synthesis, visualisation and interpretation, drafted

and critically revised the manuscript. **WW** conception, design, data synthesis and interpretation, drafted and critically revised the manuscript **WA, MR** data acquisition, synthesis, visualisation and interpretation, drafted and critically revised the manuscript. **SKC, RH, RJ** data acquisition, synthesis and interpretation, drafted and critically revised the manuscript. **SM** design of the study, provision of and management of study literature resources and critically revised the manuscript.

All authors gave their final approval and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding

There are no external sources of funding for this research and it was supported by the authors' institutions

Conflict of Interest

All of the authors confirm they have no conflict of interest with regard to this work, to report.

References

- [1] World Health Organization, Naming the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) and the virus that causes it, (2020a). [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-2019\)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it).
- [2] N. Van Doremalen, T. Bushmaker, D.H. Morris, M.G. Holbrook, A. Gamble, B.N. Williamson, A. Tamin, J.L. Harcourt, N.J. Thornburg, S.I. Gerber, J.O. Lloyd-Smith, E. de Wit, V.J. Munster, Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1, *N. Engl. J. Med.* 382(16) (2020) 1564-1567.
- [3] World Health Organization, Modes of transmission of virus causing covid-19: Implications for ipc precaution recommendations, (2020b). <https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/modes-of-transmission-of-virus-causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precaution-recommendations>.
- [4] D. Lewis, Is the coronavirus airborne? Experts can't agree, *Nature* 580(7802) (2020) 175.
- [5] L. Meng, F. Hua, Z. Bian, Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Emerging and Future Challenges for Dental and Oral Medicine, *J. Dent. Res.* 99(5) (2020) 481-487.
- [6] X. Peng, X. Xu, Y. Li, L. Cheng, X. Zhou, B. Ren, Transmission routes of 2019-nCoV and controls in dental practice, *Int J Oral Sci* 12(1) (2020) 9.
- [7] K.K. To, O.T. Tsang, C. Chik-Yan Yip, K.H. Chan, T.C. Wu, J.M.C. Chan, W.S. Leung, T.S. Chik, C.Y. Choi, D.H. Kandamby, D.C. Lung, A.R. Tam, R.W. Poon, A.Y. Fung, I.F. Hung, V.C. Cheng, J.F. Chan, K.Y. Yuen, Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in saliva, *Clin. Infect. Dis.* ciaa149 (2020).
- [8] S. Porter, Dental treatment and risk of vCJD, *Br. Dent. J.* 202 (2007) 470–471.
- [9] I. Johnson, J.E. Gallagher, J.H. Verbeek, N.P.T. Innes, Personal protective equipment: a commentary for the dental and oral health care team. *Cochrane Oral Health.*, 2020. <https://oralhealth.cochrane.org/news/personal-protective-equipment-commentary-dental-and-oral-health-care-team>.

- [10] J.H. Verbeek, B. Rajamaki, S. Ijaz, R. Sauni, E. Toomey, B. Blackwood, C. Tikka, J.H. Ruotsalainen, F.S. Kilinc Balci, Personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases due to exposure to contaminated body fluids in healthcare staff, *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 4(4) (2020) Cd011621.
- [11] NHS National Services Scotland, Assessing the evidence base for medical procedures which create a higher risk of respiratory infection transmission from patient to healthcare worker, 2020. https://hpspubsrepo.blob.core.windows.net/hps-website/nss/3055/documents/1_agp-sbar.pdf.
- [12] Faculty of General Dental Practice, COVID-19: updated guidance and resources as lockdown eases, (2020a). <https://www.fgdp.org.uk/news/covid-19-updated-guidance-and-resources-lockdown-eases>. (Accessed 18 June 2020).
- [13] American Dental Association, ADA Coronavirus (COVID-19) Center for Dentists, 2020. https://success.ada.org/en/practice-management/patients/infectious-diseases-2019-novel-coronavirus?utm_source=adaorg&utm_medium=covid-hubspot-lp&utm_content=cv-virus&utm_campaign=covid-19&_ga=2.258854413.600422100.1594463817-1866440118.1594463817.
- [14] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Guidance for Dental Settings. Interim Infection Prevention and Control Guidance for Dental Settings During the COVID-19 Response, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/dental-settings.html>.
- [15] Faculty of General Dental Practice, Implications of COVID-19 for the safe management of general dental practice A practical guide, (2020b). <https://www.fgdp.org.uk/sites/fgdp.org.uk/files/editors/FGDP%20CGDent%20Implications%20of%20COVID-19%20for%20the%20safe%20management%20of%20general%20dental%20practice%2016%20June%202020%20ed1.1.pdf>. 18 June 2020).
- [16] Cochrane Oral Health, Recommendations for the re-opening of dental services: a rapid review of international sources, UK, 2020.
- [17] R. Tellier, Aerosol transmission of influenza A virus: a review of new studies, *J R Soc Interface* 6 Suppl 6(Suppl 6) (2009) S783-90.
- [18] S.D. Judson, V.J. Munster, Nosocomial Transmission of Emerging Viruses via Aerosol-Generating Medical Procedures, *Viruses* 11(10) (2019).
- [19] D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D.G. Altman, Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement, *PLoS Med.* 6(7) (2009) e1000097.
- [20] M. Ouzzani, H. Hammady, Z. Fedorowicz, A. Elmagarmid, Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews, *Systematic Reviews* 5(1) (2016) 210.
- [21] R.L. Miller, R.E. Micik, C. Abel, G. Ryge, Studies on dental aerobiology. II. Microbial splatter discharged from the oral cavity of dental patients, *J. Dent. Res.* 50(3) (1971) 621-5.
- [22] M.F. Timmerman, L. Menso, J. Steinfors, A.J. van Winkelhoff, G.A. van der Weijden, Atmospheric contamination during ultrasonic scaling, *J. Clin. Periodontol.* 31(6) (2004) 458-62.
- [23] H. Labaf, P. Owlia, A. Taherian, R. Haghgoo, Quantitative analysis of changes in bacterial aerosols during endodontic, periodontic and prosthodontic treatments, *Afr. J. Microbiol. Res.* 5(27) (2011) 4946-4948.
- [24] H. Yamada, K. Ishihama, K. Yasuda, Y. Hasumi-Nakayama, S. Shimoji, K. Furusawa, Aerial dispersal of blood-contaminated aerosols during dental procedures, *Quintessence international* (Berlin, Germany : 1985) 42(5) (2011) 399-405.
- [25] C.Y. Chuang, H.C. Cheng, S. Yang, W. Fang, P.C. Hung, S.Y. Chuang, Investigation of the spreading characteristics of bacterial aerosol contamination during dental scaling treatment, *Journal of Dental Sciences* 9(3) (2014) 294-296.

- [26] R. Saini, Efficacy of preprocedural mouth rinse containing chlorine dioxide in reduction of viable bacterial count in dental aerosols during ultrasonic scaling: A double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial, *Dent. Hypotheses* 6(2) (2015) 65-71.
- [27] H.R. Veena, S. Mahantesha, P.A. Joseph, S.R. Patil, S.H. Patil, Dissemination of aerosol and splatter during ultrasonic scaling: A pilot study, *Journal of Infection and Public Health* 8(3) (2015) 260-265.
- [28] R. Jawade, V. Bhandari, G. Ugale, S. Taru, S. Khaparde, A. Kulkarni, M. Ardale, S. Marde, Comparative Evaluation of Two Different Ultrasonic Liquid Coolants on Dental Aerosols, *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research* 10(7) (2016) ZC53-ZC57.
- [29] A. Watanabe, N. Tamaki, K. Yokota, M. Matsuyama, S. Kokeyuchi, Use of ATP bioluminescence to survey the spread of aerosol and splatter during dental treatments, *J. Hosp. Infect.* 99(3) (2018) 303-305.
- [30] D. Grenier, Quantitative analysis of bacterial aerosols in two different dental clinic environments, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 61(8) (1995) 3165-8.
- [31] J.L. Holloman, S.M. Mauriello, L. Pimenta, R.R. Arnold, Comparison of suction device with saliva ejector for aerosol and spatter reduction during ultrasonic scaling, *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 146(1) (2015) 27-33.
- [32] L.P. Samaranyake, J. Reid, D. Evans, The efficacy of rubber dam isolation in reducing atmospheric bacterial contamination, *ASDC J. Dent. Child.* 56(6) (1989) 442-444.
- [33] R. Rautemaa, A. Nordberg, K. Wuolijoki-Saaristoe, J.H. Meurman, Bacterial aerosols in dental practice - a potential hospital infection problem?, *J. Hosp. Infect.* 64(1) (2006) 76-81.
- [34] A.J. Ireland, T. Moreno, R. Price, Airborne particles produced during enamel cleanup after removal of orthodontic appliances, *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 124(6) (2003) 683-6.
- [35] C.J. Day, R. Price, J.R. Sandy, A.J. Ireland, Inhalation of aerosols produced during the removal of fixed orthodontic appliances: a comparison of 4 enamel cleanup methods, *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 133(1) (2008) 11-7.
- [36] M. Dawson, V. Soro, D. Dymock, R. Price, H. Griffiths, T. Dudding, J.R. Sandy, A.J. Ireland, Microbiological assessment of aerosol generated during debond of fixed orthodontic appliances, *Am. J. Orthod. Dentofacial Orthop.* 150(5) (2016) 831-838.
- [37] S. Kritivasan, I. Nazia Zareen, N.P. Muralidharan, Assessing the extent of aerosol spread in prosthetic dental lab, *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research* 8(11) (2019) 3190-3192.
- [38] A.M. Agostinho, P.R. Miyoshi, N. Gnoatto, H.d.F.O. Paranhos, L.C.d. Figueiredo, S.L. Salvador, Cross-contamination in the dental laboratory through the polishing procedure of complete dentures, *Braz. Dent. J.* 15(2) (2004) 138-43.
- [39] C.M. Belting, G.C. Haberfelde, L.K. Juhl, Spread of organisms from dental air rotor, *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.* 68 (1964) 648-51.
- [40] R.E. Micik, R.L. Miller, M.A. Mazzarella, G. Ryge, Studies on dental aerobiology. I. Bacterial aerosols generated during dental procedures, *J. Dent. Res.* 48(1) (1969) 49-56.
- [41] R.L. Miller, Characteristics of blood-containing aerosols generated by common powered dental instruments, *Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J.* 56(7) (1995) 670-6.
- [42] D.D. Logothetis, J.M. Martinez-Welles, Reducing bacterial aerosol contamination with a chlorhexidine gluconate pre-rinse, *Journal of the American Dental Association* (1939) 126(12) (1995) 1634-1639.
- [43] P. Bahl, C. Doolan, C. de Silva, A.A. Chughtai, L. Bourouiba, C.R. MacIntyre, Airborne or droplet precautions for health workers treating COVID-19?, *J. Infect. Dis.* (2020).
- [44] J. Kobza, J.S. Pastuszka, E. Bragoszewska, Do exposures of aerosols pose a risk of dental professionals?, *Occupational Medicine-Oxford* 68(7) (2018) 454-458.

- [45] M.S. Toroglu, M.C. Haytac, F. Koksak, Evaluation of aerosol contamination during debonding procedures, *The Angle orthodontist* 71(4) (2001) 299-306.
- [46] M.S. Toroglu, Z. Bayramoglu, F. Yarkin, A. Tuli, Possibility of blood and hepatitis B contamination through aerosols generated during debonding procedures, *Angle Orthod.* 73(5) (2003) 571-578.
- [47] R. Teichert-Filho, C.N. Baldasso, M.M. Campos, M.S. Gomes, Protective device to reduce aerosol dispersion in dental care in times of COVID-19 pandemic, *Int. Endod. J.* [published online ahead of print] (2020).
- [48] B. Chanpong, M. Tang, A. Rosenczweig, P. Lok, R. Tang, Aerosol-Generating Procedures and Simulated Cough in Dental Anesthesia, *Anesthesia progress* (2020).
- [49] Z.-Y. Ge, L.-M. Yang, J.-J. Xia, X.-H. Fu, Y.-Z. Zhang, Possible aerosol transmission of COVID-19 and special precautions in dentistry, *J Zhejiang Univ Sci B* 21(5) (2020) 361-368.
- [50] T.D. Ravenel, R. Kessler, J.C. Comisi, A. Kelly, W.G. Renne, S.T. Teich, Evaluation of the spatter-reduction effectiveness and aerosol containment of eight dry-field isolation techniques, *Quintessence international* (Berlin, Germany : 1985) 51(8) (2020) 660-670.
- [51] C. Zemouri, H. De Soet, W. Crielaard, A. Laheij, A scoping review on bio-Aerosols in healthcare & the dental environment, *PLoS One* 12(5) (2017) e0178007.

Table 1 Main characteristics of the included studies categorised by dental procedure/ instrument use (n=83). Please note that the numbering in this table refers to the list of references (included studies) in Appendix 3 and are not the same numbering system as found in the main text.

Figure 1 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (Moher et al. 2009) flow chart. A full description of study characteristics can be found in Appendix 4.

Figure 2. Publications by date (n=81; 2 publications from 2020 were not included).

Figure 3. Network diagram illustrating where studies included comparison between different procedures within them. (See also Appendix 5). The nodes represent the eight procedures and the lines between them show where a study compares them. The number of studies is shown by 'n=' and also the relative thickness of the lines. Where a node has no linkages, there are no studies comparing it with another procedure.

Figure 4. Proposed levels of contamination associated with different procedures, drawn from Appendix 5 showing levels of contamination within studies to minimize dissimilarities in methodology, procedures and outcomes that might account for differences. Note that this must be interpreted with caution and will need to be modified as further evidence becomes available. *Indicates very low certainty.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3

Higher contamination	Moderate contamination	Lower contamination
HSAR	Slow speed	Air-water
USS	handpiece	syringe (water only)
Extractions using motorised handpieces	Extractions with pumice	Hand scaling
Air-Water syringe (air/water spray)		
Air-water syringe (air alone)		
Air polishing		

