**Supplementary Material**

*Summary Statistics*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Min | 1st Qtr | Median | Arithmetic Mean | 3rd Qtr | Max |
| Sodium Hypochlorite Control | 0.0 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 30.7 | 46.0 | 155.0 |
| FFUV Control | 0.0 | 8.0 | 16.5 | 31.1 | 42.8 | 140.0 |
| Sodium Hypochlorite Treatment | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
| FFUV Treatment | 0.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 6.4 | 8.0 | 76.0 |

*Model Specification and Results*

Normal (0, 2.5) priors were specified for fixed effects and normal (0, 2) priors for varying intercepts. A student t (3, 1.6, 2.5) and gamma (0.01, 0.01) prior were specified for the intercept and negative binomial dispersion parameter, respectively. The model was assessed for convergence and fit using MCMC trace plots, Rhat diagnostic, and posterior predictive checks.

Model Results

|  |
| --- |
| Negative Binomial Model Results on Analysis Dataset (n experiments=86, n obs=344) |
|  | Estimate for Mean | SE of mean | Lower Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval | Upper Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval |
| Intercept | 3.02 | 0.28 | 2.46 | 3.58 |
| Treatment  | -5.22 | 0.30 | -5.38 | -4.65 |
| Experiment | 0.08 | 0.13 | -0.18 | 0.34 |
| Treatment:Experiment | 3.52 | 0.33 | 2.90 | 4.18 |

*Sensitivity Analysis*

The results of the analysis model for both the analysis dataset and the full dataset (minus the 2 erroneous experiments) are shown below. The estimates differed slightly, but the conclusions remained the same, despite the lack of overlap in the controls for UV and bleach group in the full dataset.

|  |
| --- |
| Negative Binomial Model Results on Analysis Dataset (n experiments=86, n obs=344) |
|  | Estimate for Mean | SE of mean | Lower Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval | Upper Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval |
| Intercept | 3.02 | 0.28 | 2.46 | 3.58 |
| Treatment  | -5.22 | 0.30 | -5.38 | -4.65 |
| Experiment | 0.08 | 0.13 | -0.18 | 0.34 |
| Treatment:Experiment | 3.52 | 0.33 | 2.90 | 4.18 |

|  |
| --- |
| Negative Binomial Model Results on Full Dataset (n experiments=98, n obs=392) |
|  | Estimate for Mean | SE of mean | Lower Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval | Upper Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval |
| Intercept | 3.19 | 0.32 | 2.53 | 3.84 |
| Treatment  | -5.16 | 0.25 | -5.67 | -4.68 |
| Experiment | 0.30 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.57 |
| Treatment:Experiment | 3.25 | 0.28 | 2.70 | 3.82 |

*Group-level effects*

Results of the varying intercepts in the hierarchical structure of the data are reported below.

|  |
| --- |
| Negative Binomial Model Results on Analysis Dataset: Group-level effects |
| Varying Intercept | Estimate for Mean of SD | SE of mean | Lower Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval | Upper Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval |
| Objects | 0.47 | 0.34 | 0.04 | 1.36 |
| Experiments | 0.86 | 0.10 | 0.66 | 1.07 |
| Matched Pairs | 0.34 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.63 |

The largest variability appears to be at the experiment level, indicating that variability was higher between experiments than between objects or between matched pairs.

The varying intercepts for object are shown below. The varying intercepts are deviations off of the population-level intercept, thus positive numbers indicate values higher than the population-level intercept and negative indicate values less than the population-level intercept. The population-level intercept can be viewed as the ‘average’ on the scale of the linear predictor (natural log).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Estimate for Mean | SE of mean | Lower Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval | Upper Limit of 95% Uncertainty Interval |
| bedrail | -0.24 | 0.32 | -0.95 | 0.33 |
| keyboard | 0.14 | 0.30 | -0.44 | 0.80 |
| manikin | 0.33 | 0.34 | -0.21 | 1.09 |
| table | -0.29 | 0.32 | -1.01 | 0.26 |
| wow | 0.03 | 0.30 | -0.60 | 0.66 |

The results suggest that the manikin had the highest bioburden for controls, while the table had the lowest, however the 95% uncertainty intervals cross zero for all estimates.