

Supplementary Materials: Assessment of the Toxicity of Bio-compatible Materials Supporting Bone Regeneration: Impact of the Type of Assay and Used Controls

Milena Chraniuk, Mirosława Panasiuk, Lilit Hovhannisyan, Sabina Żołędowska, Dawid Nidzworski, Lidia Ciołek, Anna Woźniak, Agnieszka Kubiś, Natalia Karska, Zbigniew Jaegermann, Sylwia Rodziewicz-Motowidło, Monika Biernat and Beata Gromadzka

Table S1. Results of the statistical analysis of cell proliferation of cells incubated with composites extracts. Control cells cultured in cell media were used as a baseline for the analysis.

| Comparison | Difference statistically significant | p value |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| CH vs. CHB | No | 0.2906 |
| CH vs. CHBp1-1 | Yes | < 0.0001 |
| CH vs. CHBp1-2 | Yes | 0.0001 |
| CH vs. CHBp3 | Yes | < 0.0001 |
| CH vs. CHBp2 | Yes | 0.0457 |
| CH vs. CHBp4-1 | Yes | 0.0197 |
| CH vs. CHBp4-2 | Yes | 0.0331 |
| CHB vs. CHBp1-1 | Yes | 0.0003 |
| CHB vs. CHBp1-2 | Yes | 0.0021 |
| CHB vs. CHBp3 | Yes | 0.0001 |
| CHB vs. CHBp2 | No | 0.1631 |
| CHB vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.0782 |
| CHB vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.1161 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp1-2 | No | 0.5251 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp3 | No | 0.6005 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp2 | Yes | 0.0457 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.0893 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.0623 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp3 | No | 0.4229 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp2 | No | 0.0936 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.1767 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.1262 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp2 | Yes | 0.0331 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.0623 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp4-2 | Yes | 0.0457 |
| CHBp2 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.5326 |
| CHBp2 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.6005 |
| CHBp4-1 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.6005 |

Table S2. Results of the statistical analysis of cell proliferation of cells incubated with composites extracts. Cells incubated with the chitosan extract were used as a baseline for the analysis.

| Comparison | Difference statistically significant | p value |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| CHB vs. CHBp1-1 | Yes | 0.0004 |
| CHB vs. CHBp1-2 | Yes | 0.0065 |
| CHB vs. CHBp3 | Yes | < 0.0001 |
| CHB vs. CHBp2 | No | 0.1710 |
| CHB vs. CHBp4-1 | Yes | 0.0077 |
| CHB vs. CHBp4-2 | Yes | 0.0077 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp1-2 | No | 0.4385 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp3 | No | 0.4319 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp2 | No | 0.1357 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.3968 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.4385 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp3 | No | 0.2170 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp2 | No | 0.3008 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.6823 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.7475 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp2 | Yes | 0.0233 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.1710 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.2266 |
| CHBp2 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.3369 |
| CHBp2 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.3008 |
| CHBp4-1 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.6823 |

Table S3. Results of the statistical analysis of cell proliferation of cells incubated with composites extracts. Cells incubated with the chitosan-bioglass extract were used as a baseline for the analysis.

| Comparison | Difference statistically significant | p value |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp1-2 | No | 0.7931 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp3 | No | 0.7136 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp2 | No | 0.7136 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.9337 |
| CHBp1-1 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.8645 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp3 | No | 0.2724 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp2 | No | 0.9557 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.9337 |
| CHBp1-2 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.9557 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp2 | No | 0.2724 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.4025 |
| CHBp3 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.3001 |
| CHBp2 vs. CHBp4-1 | No | 0.9047 |
| CHBp2 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.9499 |
| CHBp4-1 vs. CHBp4-2 | No | 0.9499 |