Supplementary Table 1. Summary of studies included in review

Study	Dressings	Cell types	Methods	Results
Wadström, 1985	**DACC:** hydrophobic dressing **Comparator:** N/A	*S. aureus* (planktonic)	• wound infection • wound healing in porcine wound model	• signs of healing seen in wounds treated with hydrophobic dressing on days 3 and 4 after dressing treatment • no infection seen by days 5 and 6 • conclusion that removal of *S. aureus* by hydrophobic dressing allowing wound healing to occur
Bowler, 1999	**DACC:** Sorbact **Comparator:** Aquacel; Algosteril; Kaltostat	*S. aureus; P. aeruginosa* (all planktonic)	• binding of bacteria to dressings	• DACC-coated dressing did sequester *S. aureus* but was the lowest amongst the dressings tested • dressings just as good as each other at sequestering *P. aeruginosa* • DACC-coated dressing showed good retention (60-80%) of both *S. aureus* and *P. aeruginosa*
Ljungh, 2006	**DACC:** Cutisorb Sorbact **Comparator:** N/A	*S. aureus; P. aeruginosa; C. albicans; E. faecalis; B. fragilis; F. nucleatum* (all planktonic)	• binding bacteria to DACC	• binding increased after 10 minutes • binding maximum of *P. aeruginosa* (10^7 out of 10^9) after 120 minutes • binding counts remained stable for *P. aeruginosa* for 20 hours • increased for *S. aureus* after 20 hours from 10^6 to $10^{6.5}$ indicating that microbes multiply only slowly after binding • capacity to bind different microbes varies between microbes
Rosana, 2009	**DACC:** Cutimed Sorbact: **Comparator:** conventional dressing	MRSA; *P. aeruginosa* (all planktonic)	• binding bacteria to DACC	• binding capacity began at 30 seconds and reached a maximum at 2 hours • binding capacity for MRSA and *P. aeruginosa* more for DACC-coated dressing compared with conventional dressing
Hastings, 2009	**DACC:** Cutimed Sorbact **Comparator:** N/A	*C. difficile; S. aureus* (all planktonic)	• binding bacteria to DACC	• *C. difficile* bacteria and spores adhere to DACC-coated dressing • binding seen within 10 minutes' exposure • *S. aureus* binding also seen
Falk, 2012	**DACC:** Sorbact **Comparator:** N/A	human dermal fibroblasts (CCL-110)	• cell morphology • cell viability	• fibroblasts did not adhere easily to DACC-coated dressing • presence of DACC-coated dressing increased proliferation rate • significantly increased healing rate in scratch model
Brackman, 2013	**DACC:** Cutimed Sorbact **Comparator:** Aquacel Ag; Askina Calgitrol Ag; Atrauman Ag; Mepilex Ag; Silvercel; Tegaderm Alginate Ag; Bactigras; Braunol; Isobetadine; Algisite M; Allevyn nonadhesive; Kaltostat; Melgisorb; Seasorb Soft; Stella gauze; Tegaderm Alginate; Flamigel; Flaminal; Forte gel; Flaminal Hydro gel; Flamazine cream; Flamizol; Fucidine cream; L-Mesitran ointment; Prontosan wound gel	*S. aureus; S. epidermidis* (all biofilm)	• inhibition of biofilm formation • effect on mature biofilm	• DACC-coated dressing (along with the majority of other dressings) inhibited S. aureus biofilm formation • DACC-coated dressing moderately eradicated mature biofilm but there was no reduction in CFU per biofilm
Geroult, 2014	**DACC:** Sorbact **Comparator:** untreated control	*M. ulcerans; S. aureus* (all planktonic)	• hydrophobicity of microorganisms • binding of bacteria to DACC • microorganisms • binding of bacteria to DACC	• enhanced binding of microorganisms to DACC compared with untreated control
Ronner, 2014	**DACC:** Sorbact Compress **Comparator:** N/A	*S. aureus;* MRSA (all planktonic)	• binding of bacteria to DACC	• microorganisms (including MRSA) bound to DACC-coated dressings • antibiotic resistant microorganisms bound equally well
Braunwarth, 2014	**DACC:** Cutimed Sorbact; Cutimed Siltec Sorbact **Comparator:** Biatain Ag; Biatain; Alione; gauze	MRSA; *P. aeruginosa* (all planktonic)	• hydrophobicity of dressing • bacteria eliminating effect	• hydrophobic dressings were able to bind bacteria onto their surface • hydrophobic effect of DACC has no boosting effect on binding of bacteria
Braunwarth, 2014	**DACC:** Cutimed Sorbact; Cutimed Siltec Sorbact **Comparator:** Biatain Ag; Biatain; Alione; gauze	*P. aeruginosa* (planktonic)	• antimicrobial activity • endotoxin concentration	• silver dressings show a lower release of endotoxins compared with other dressings tested • 100-10,000x lower than gauze, 10,000x lower than Cutimed Sorbact, and 10-100x lower than Cutimed Siltect Sorbact • "silver dressings bind larger proportion of endotoxin compared with DACC wound dressings"
Larkö, 2015	**DACC:** Sorbact absorption dressing **Comparator:** DryMax Extra; Sorbion Sachet S	*P. aeruginosa* (biofilm)	• binding bacteria (biofilm) to dressings from 3D collagen-based tissue with biofilm grown on surface	• all dressings removed bacteria from the synthetic model • the dressings retained the bacteria
Cooper, 2016	**DACC:** Cutimed Sorbact **Comparator:** uncoated version	MRSA; *P. aeruginosa* (all biofilm)	• binding of biofilm to DACC	• DACC-coated dressings enhanced binding of MRSA biofilm • *P. aeruginosa* bound to dressings but not greater than binding to uncoated version
Husmark, 2022	**DACC:** Sorbact Compress **Comparator:** Acticoat Flex 3; Mepitel Ag; gauze bandage	*S. aureus;* MRSA; *P. aeruginosa; E. faecium* (VRE); *P. aeruginosa* (ESBL); E. cloacae (ESBL); *A. baumannii* (all planktonic)	• binding of biofilm to DACC	• high antibacterial activity of DACC-coated dressing against WHO-prioritised bacteria by irreversible binding and inhibition of growth of bound bacteria • strong antibacterial activity at high concentrations • protein-augmented media did reduce antibacterial activity • pH did not affect antibacterial activity • DACC-coated dressing sustained antibacterial activity over reinfection steps
Morgner, 2022	**DACC:** Sorbact Compress **Comparator:** uncoated version	HaCaT keratinocytes; normal human dermal fibroblasts	• healing of cells in scratch model • inflammation • growth factor induction • fibroblast collagen synthesis	• DACC-coated dressing promoted cell viability • DACC-coated dressing supported wound healing progression • no cell attachment to DACC-coated version • slightly induced KGF, VEGF, GM-CSF • fibroblast stimulation of collagen
Ortega-Peña, 2022	**DACC:** Cutimed Sorbact **Comparator:** N/A	**Microbial:** oxacillin-sensitive S. aureus (planktonic) **Eukaryotic:** murine macrophage (RAW 264.7); murine fibroblasts (3T3)	• stimulation of eukaryotic cells with *S. aureus* (treated with DACC-coated dressing) supernatants • cytotoxicity assay • cytokine expression • MMP activity	• DACC-coated dressing bound 1.8-6.1% of all bacteria • dressing-treated cultures prevented biofilm formation in the dressing and limited formation outside of dressing • supernatants from DACC-treated *S. aureus* did not overly stimulate TNF-alpha or TGF-beta1 expression or increase MMP activity (bacterial integrity maintained)
Susilo, 2022	**DACC:** Sorbact Compress; Sorbact Foam Dressing **Comparator:** Mepitel Ag; UrgoTul Ag; Acticoat Flex 3; Acticoat Flex 7; Mepilex Ag	*P. aeruginosa* (planktonic	• binding of purified endotoxin to DACC • binding of endotoxin released from bacteria • killing of bacteria	• DACC-coated dressings efficiently and rapidly binds purified and shed endotoxin • no zones of inhibition were observed for the two DACC-coated dressings
Meredith, 2023	**DACC:** Sorbact Compress **Comparator:** gauze; Aquacel Extra; Mepilex	MRSA; *P. aeruginosa* (ESBL) (planktonic & biofilm)	• removal of planktonic and biofilm bacteria	• only 5% planktonic *P. aeruginosa* (ESBL) removed at 2, 4 or 6 hours by DACC-coated dressing • no detectable removal of planktonic MRSA by DACC-coated dressing • between 15-39% of *P. aeruginosa* (ESBL) in mature biofilm removed by DACC-coated dressing • no detectable MRSA removed by DACC-coated dressing • carboxymethylcellulose gelling fibre performed best for both planktonic and mature biofilm microorganisms in this model
Malone, 2024	**DACC:** Sorbact **Comparator:** Mepitel One	*P. aeruginosa* (planktonic)	• binding of bacteria to DACC • effect of media (saline, simulated wound fluid) on binding • viability	• DACC-coated dressings did not appear to boost effects on binding of bacteria as compared to other modern wound dressings • presence of protein in media reduced bacterial attachment for all dressings • presence of DACC-containing dressing reduced bacterial load in saline suspensions, no effect in protein-supplemented media • increase in attachment over time for both dressings